

Report on an unannounced full follow-up
inspection of

HMP Norwich

11–20 January 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2012

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary and main recommendations	9
1 Safety	19
<hr/>	
2 Respect	31
<hr/>	
3 Purposeful activity	45
<hr/>	
4 Resettlement	51
<hr/>	
5 Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	59
<hr/>	
6 Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	67
II Progress on recommendations from the last report	68
III Prison population profile	83
IV Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	85

Introduction

Dispersed on three adjacent sites, Norwich is a large and complex prison and poses a significant management challenge. At our previous inspection we found a prison that was improving from a low base, but that was also beginning to clarify and define more clearly its role and purpose. At this inspection we found that Norwich was still better than it has been historically, but that it was in need of a period of management stability and focus to provide impetus and the opportunity to realise planned improvements.

The prison appeared less safe than when we last inspected. Prisoner experiences during their first days after arrival were mixed and we were, for example, not assured that all first night risk assessments were properly followed up. Induction modules were too often missed and the induction of vulnerable prisoners was inadequate. Prisoner perceptions of safety on the prison's reception site were concerning, something that was particularly the case among vulnerable prisoners on A wing. We also observed limited supervision by staff on some wings. Prisoner perceptions of safety on the Local Discharge Unit (LDU) and Britannia House were much better.

The number of incidents of self-harm was high but we were concerned that support for those in crisis and day to day care was limited. Too many prisoners in self-harm crisis found themselves segregated or in special accommodation. Many of our previous recommendations concerning the issue of self-harm had not been implemented. High levels of use of force and special accommodation were evident and the segregation unit was poor. The situation for young prisoners had improved, however, and the outcomes they experienced were now comparable with adult prisoners.

The standard of accommodation was mixed across the three sites. Many cells and communal areas were poor, particularly on E wing and the LDU. Staff-prisoner relationships were reasonable, although often distant and somewhat passive. Work on diversity had improved although much more needed to be done. Health provision was improving, and mental health support was now good. Environmental conditions in the inpatient facility were, however, poor.

Prisoners' time out of cell remained low for many on the reception site, although it was considerably better on the LDU and at Britannia House. Unemployment was still too high – around 50% on the reception site – yet not all the regime activity places were fully utilised. Much of the work was mundane and provision was poor for vulnerable prisoners. Again the situation was better for LDU prisoners and very good for those held in the open Britannia House facility. There was evidence of improving quality in the provision of learning and skills and there were some encouraging and well developed plans to improve quantity, quality and organisation of purposeful activity. Our findings at this inspection, however, were that progress in this important area had been insufficient and too slow.

Resettlement work remained solid and well managed. Prisoners in scope for offender management were well supported, but custody planning for many short-term prisoners was lacking. Public protection arrangements were robust, and there was good provision in most of the reducing reoffending pathways. Access to offending behaviour work was, despite the clear need, limited.

Overall this is a critical report. Norwich is a difficult prison to manage and we were encouraged that the management team seemed to have a good grasp of the challenges they faced, although progress needed to be maintained and in some areas speeded up. Meaningful plans

were in place and there was optimism among managers that they could take the prison forward. We shared their optimism.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2012

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A local prison accommodating male adult and young adult category B, C, D prisoners.

Prison status

Public

Region

East of England

Number held

16.1.12: 766

Certified normal accommodation

623

Operational capacity

769

Date of last full inspection

3-12 February 2010

Brief history

HMP Norwich has occupied its current site overlooking the city of Norwich since 1887. The last remaining large Victorian prisoner wing was closed in August 2009, a new residential unit was opened and the adult and young adult prisoners were integrated.

Short description of the prison and residential units

HMP Norwich was split between three distinct sites, all located beside each other.

A, B, C, D, E and M wings were located on the reception site of the prison, as was the segregation unit.

A wing:	induction unit, first night centre, integrated drug treatment
B and C wings:	local prison accommodating category B and C prisoners
E wing:	sex offenders
M wing:	category C prisoners serving two years or less

F and G wings constituted the local discharge unit (LDU), which was located alongside L wing and the health care unit.

F and G wings:	local discharge unit (LDU) accommodating low risk category C prisoners from the East of England, serving 12 months or less
L wing:	elderly lifer unit

Britannia House:	resettlement unit accommodating category D prisoners
------------------	--

Health care unit
Segregation unit

Escort contractor

Serco

Health service commissioner and provider

Commissioner: NHS Norfolk and Waveney

Providers: Serco Health
Horizon Health

Learning and skills providers

A4E

Tribal

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

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

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

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

Safety prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- HP5 The Inspectorate conducts follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections may be announced or unannounced and are proportionate to risk. In full follow-up inspections inspectors conduct a new inspection of the establishment and also assess whether recommendations made at the previous inspection have been achieved. They also investigate areas of serious concern identified in the previous inspection, or matters of concern subsequently drawn to the attention of the Chief Inspector. Inspectors use the findings of prisoner surveys (where available), prisoner focus groups, research analysis of prison data and observation. This enables a reassessment of previous healthy prison assessments held by the Inspectorate on all establishments, and published in reports from 2004 onwards. Full follow-up reports are presented as full inspection reports with a new set of recommendations. Repeated recommendations are, however, indicated within the main report, and a list of recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved, is contained in the appendices.

Safety

- HP6 Reception was generally satisfactory but first night arrangements needed attention. There were still problems with induction, particularly for vulnerable prisoners. Formal violence reduction processes were robust, but many prisoners on the reception site felt unsafe. The incidence of violence had fallen but was still high. The number of open self-harm monitoring forms and incidents of self-harm were high and case management generally inadequate. Vulnerable prisoners had a poorer experience in many areas, but outcomes for young adults were now comparable to other prisoners. Security was well managed and drug testing results not excessive. Use of force had increased and governance was weak, and the use of special accommodation was very high and often unjustified. The segregation unit regime was poor. Support for drug dependent prisoners was improving. Outcomes for prisoners were now not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP7 At the last inspection in 2010, we found that Norwich was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 50 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, 25 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.
- HP8 There were some delays in prisoners arriving from courts. Serving prisoners provided good support at a local court to assist prisoners being moved to Norwich.
- HP9 Reception procedures for most prisoners took place on the reception site and were swift. Arrangements for vulnerable prisoners were satisfactory. The facilities in reception remained limited, and the holding rooms were austere. Reception staff were polite to prisoners and searching was carried out sensitively. The supervision of prisoners in the large holding room was limited.

- HP10 All new arrivals had a first night risk interview in private but some identified issues were not followed up. Not all prisoners got a shower and telephone call on their first night. Listeners were available in reception and on A wing which was the first night and induction unit. Induction had been revamped and was reasonable, but was delayed for some prisoners and some did not complete it. Induction for vulnerable prisoners was limited and underdeveloped. In our survey,¹ prisoners were negative about many aspects of their treatment during their first few days at the prison. The early days procedures for the local discharge unit (LDU) and Britannia House category D resettlement unit were satisfactory.
- HP11 Formal arrangements to deal with violence were good, and the collection of data on the number and nature of incidents was better than we usually see. The published violence reduction policy document was relevant, based on a proper analysis of the pattern of violence in the prison, and informed by frequent consultation with prisoners. Monitoring of the implementation of the policy at safer custody committee meetings was also very good. The number of violent incidents remained high but there had been a reduction in fights and assaults since the last inspection, and some evidence that recently introduced formal procedures had helped reduce incidents.
- HP12 Over a fifth of the prisoners we surveyed in the reception site said that they did not feel safe at the moment, and nearly half said they had felt unsafe at some time. Too many also said that they had been victimised by prisoners and staff. In contrast, prisoners on the LDU mainly felt safe. We were struck by the lack of staff supervision on reception site wings.
- HP13 The suicide prevention policy was well promoted. The analysis of data for information on patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was very good. The number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents was high, with as many as 40 cases or more. The number of incidents of self-harm was also high. The quality of ACCTs varied, but many were poor and most did not evidence consistently good standards of day-to-day care. Many prisoners on ACCTs had little to occupy them.
- HP14 Vulnerable prisoners had a poorer experience than others in a range of areas, and those on A wing felt less safe. Accommodation on E wing (vulnerable prisoner unit) was poor, and intimidation by other prisoners remained evident. Young adults were well integrated throughout the prison, most could participate in a normal regime, and the disruption and violence we found at the last inspection had reduced. In our

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

(Adapted from Towel et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

survey, however, young adults were still more negative than others across the range of questions.

- HP15 There was a proportionate approach to security, but the strip searching of some prisoners in the absence of intelligence was unnecessary. Intelligence was well managed and, except for suspicion drug testing, actions were responsive. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) was adequately managed and not excessive, and supply/reduction initiatives were reasonably well integrated.
- HP16 The administration of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was good, but prisoners had little faith in its fairness.
- HP17 The number of adjudications was high and, while mostly justified, some could have been better dealt with less formally. There was no quality assurance of records of hearings, but they were generally of a reasonable standard.
- HP18 The recorded use of force was high, and its governance was weak and required improvement. Planned interventions were not properly filmed or reviewed. Recorded use of special accommodation was very high, and sometimes appeared unnecessary, and many remained there for too long. We found evidence of further use that was not appropriately recorded or justified. Too many prisoners had their clothing removed inappropriately and were located in special accommodation while on self-harm monitoring.
- HP19 Use of segregation had reduced since the last inspection but was still high. Accommodation in the segregation unit was poor, as was the regime. The quality of documentation resulting from reviews required improvement, particularly to set prisoners meaningful targets. Too many prisoners were routinely held in the segregation unit on ACCT documents. The relaxed relationships between staff and prisoners were not reflected in individual records.
- HP20 There had been progress in ensuring that opiate-dependent prisoners had prompt access to comprehensive assessment and clinical support. Clinical and psychosocial services were of a good standard, and prisoners were positive about their care. Staffing had increased and services were more integrated, but further progress was needed.

Respect

- HP21 Standards in many cells were poor. Staff-prisoner relationships were generally reasonable but distant. Personal officer work was still limited. There had been good work to address diversity, but black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners continued to have poorer perceptions. Assistance for foreign national and disabled prisoners had improved, but more was needed. Faith provision was now good. Confidence in the complaints process had improved. Health care provision was in transition, but the quality of care had improved. The environment of the inpatient unit remained poor. Mental health services had developed, although some gaps remained. Food was adequate, although prisoners were unhappy with it. Outcomes for prisoners were still not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

HP22 At the last inspection in 2010, we found that Norwich was not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test. We made 94 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 50 of the recommendations had been achieved, nine had been partially achieved and 35 had not been achieved.

HP23 The standard of accommodation varied greatly. Conditions on the local discharge unit and the dormitories on E wing were particularly poor. Britannia House provided a reasonable environment. Outside areas were generally clean, but many communal facilities on both of the closed sites were grubby. Toilets were often very poor and dirty, and not all were screened. Some single cells were still used to hold two prisoners and were too small, as were the four-bed dormitories on E wing. Not all prisoners could shower every day. Staff response to cell bells was sometimes slow. Many prisoners had little confidence in the applications system, which was not quality assured or tracked.

HP24 In our survey, most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect and that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem, although minority groups were more negative. Some prisoners told us that staff were disinterested and unhelpful, although others were more positive. Our own observations were mixed and reflected what prisoners told us. The personal officer scheme remained limited, with many prisoners unsure who their personal officer was.

HP25 Provision for diversity had improved. A comprehensive equality policy was backed by specific policies for foreign nationals and older and younger prisoners, and there were detailed guidance and practical support for staff on its implementation. The equality action team addressed issues effectively through an equality action plan, although no external community groups were represented. The investigation of diversity complaints was good and replies to prisoners informative. However, there had been no recent independent quality assurance checks. An active group of trained prisoner equality representatives provided valuable support to other prisoners, particularly on the induction wing, but there was no formal consultation with minority groups of prisoners.

HP26 Our survey showed that black and minority ethnic prisoners remained less positive than white prisoners in a range of areas. However, those we spoke to individually and in our groups were generally positive about staff. Problems identified through ethnic monitoring data analysis had been adequately investigated and appropriate measures taken.

HP27 The provision of translated materials and use of telephone interpreting for foreign nationals were very good. Immigration matters were managed actively, although a high number of detainees were held beyond their sentence. There had been significant local efforts to move them on, but this remained unacceptable.

HP28 In our survey, prisoners with disabilities were also negative across a range of subjects, including safety. New arrivals with disabilities were now identified and a detailed database kept. Evacuation plans had been agreed where needed. Some limited accommodation had been adapted. Ongoing support for many of those with an identified disability was ad hoc. There was an active older prisoners group.

² This included two 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.
HMP Norwich

- HP29 A fully integrated chaplaincy played an active role in the prison, provided for all faiths, and offered pastoral support to prisoners. Faith facilities were adequate and there was a good range of religious study groups and other provision, although some clashed with other activities.
- HP30 There was a relatively low number of prisoner complaints. The standard of responses was generally good and quality assurance reasonably effective.
- HP31 There were insufficient legal services for prisoners and no trained legal services officers. Bail information provision appeared worse than at the last inspection.
- HP32 Prisoners were dissatisfied with some aspects of health care, particularly the appointments system, although it had improved since our last inspection. The environment in the main health care unit remained poor. Some other clinical facilities, such as day care, were of a high standard but underused. There was a reasonable range of primary care clinics and opportunities for the care of lifelong conditions. The waiting time to see a GP was short. Pharmacy and dental services were generally good, but some facilities were awaiting upgrade. The inpatient and older prisoner units offered good standards of care but inpatients did not have evening association. Mental health services were much improved but primary mental health care was still underdeveloped.
- HP33 The range and standard of food was reasonable but unpopular with prisoners. Prisoners could not yet dine out of their cells. The prison shop list was comprehensive, and the system generally worked well. Some new arrivals had to wait over a week for their first order, but they did have the opportunity to buy multiple reception packs.

Purposeful activity

- HP34 Time out of cell and access to association on the reception site remained poor for many prisoners. On the LDU, prisoners were unlocked for much of the day. Britannia House continued to provide good vocational opportunities for a small number of prisoners. Management of learning and skills had begun to improve, but unemployment remained too high with around half of prisoners on the reception site without anything to do. There were too few vocational training opportunities despite there being advanced plans to increase the number. Education provision had improved but more needed to be done, including for those with learning difficulties and non-English speakers. Punctuality was better, but not all the activity places were used. Access to the library had improved for most prisoners. PE remained impressive. Outcomes for prisoners had not yet improved sufficiently and were still poor against this healthy prison test.
- HP35 At the last inspection in 2010, we found that Norwich was performing poorly against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that just six of the recommendations had been achieved, nine had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.
- HP36 Time out of cell for prisoners in the LDU was good at over eight hours a day, but it was much less for many prisoners on the reception site. Some slippage to the regime and variations in the application of the core day added to the problems. Association

was limited to two periods a week for many prisoners, and those not fully employed could have as little as two hours out of cell on some days.

- HP37 The leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities had improved. A recent reorganisation had provided a strong impetus for the development of learning and skills, and there were already signs of a more coherent approach, but it was early days. Plans for increasing the range of vocational training and work activities were well advanced but there remained insufficient progress against our previous recommendations.
- HP38 Around half the prisoners on the reception site were unemployed. Most prisoners in the LDU were engaged in purposeful activities. Punctuality and attendance had improved, although not all places on the reception site were fully utilised and some work was mundane and repetitive, especially in the vulnerable prisoner unit.
- HP39 A large number of prisoners were employed on the wings, but the range of this work was not monitored. There remained too little provision for vulnerable prisoners. Revision to the education and vocational training provision included more short programmes that better met the needs of short term prisoners.
- HP40 The initial guidance and assessment of learning needs were good but more work was required to identify and support the needs of prisoners who were dyslexic and/or spoke English as an additional language. Achievement of qualifications was good in most areas, especially on short courses, PE and literacy and numeracy. Learners developed high level skills in some work areas, especially in printwork. However, the skills developed by prisoners not following an accredited qualification were rarely recognised or recorded.
- HP41 Teaching and learning were mostly good across both sites, with effective management of behaviour and good use of mentors. The ground floor accommodation for learning and skills in the LDU was a big improvement but it remained poor upstairs. Access to the library had increased for most, but not all, prisoners.
- HP42 The PE provision continued to be very good with increased staff offering a wide range of employment related qualifications across both sites. Significant investment had provided improvements to existing resources and a new gym on the reception site. The outdoor facilities in the LDU were very good and well used, but there were none on the reception site.

Resettlement

- HP43 The reducing reoffending strategy was reasonably comprehensive and resettlement work was now based on an up-to-date needs analysis, but there were some gaps in provision. Sentence planning for prisoners managed under offender management was good, but custody planning for those serving less than 12 months needed attention. Regular resettlement drop-in sessions were not yet fully embedded on the reception site. Some indeterminate-sentenced prisoners needed to be progressed more quickly, but public protection arrangements were good. Britannia House continued to provide excellent resettlement opportunities. Services across the resettlement pathways remained reasonable but there needed to be more focus on

those released from the reception site. Outcomes for prisoners were still reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

- HP44 At the last inspection in 2010, we found that Norwich was performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test. We made 41 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 20 of the recommendations had been achieved, nine had been partially achieved, 10 had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.
- HP45 The reducing reoffending strategy was reasonably comprehensive and objectives were broadly appropriate. Regular resettlement meetings and separate partnership meetings ensured a well-integrated approach to the management of resettlement, although work for those on short sentences or remand needed development. There had been a comprehensive resettlement analysis, but there were areas of need that were not being met.
- HP46 Around 60% of the population were subject to assessment through the offender assessment system (OASys) and most were up to date. Sentence plan targets were appropriately oriented to risk management and reduction, although staff outside the offender management unit (OMU) were rarely involved in sentence planning. For the quarter of prisoners in scope for offender management, support and engagement by offender supervisors was generally good, with appropriate links to community-based offender managers.
- HP47 All prisoners, including those not subject to offender management, had an initial needs assessment incorporating the resettlement pathways. This was limited and there was no structured follow-up support from personal officers or offender supervisors.
- HP48 Britannia House remained a very good resource. The number of prisoners working out of the prison on projects in the community was commendable. Although working out arrangements under release on temporary licence (ROTL) could be extended to the LDU, the numbers were low.
- HP49 Public protection arrangements were well organised and managed. Inter-departmental risk management and risk assessment meetings were comprehensive in their analysis. Arrangements and support for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were reasonable. Sentence progress and review arrangements were well managed, but while those early in their sentences were progressed reasonably quickly, there were significant delays for a few.
- HP50 Weekly resettlement drop-in sessions had recently been introduced on the reception site to improve resettlement work and replicate services available on the LDU. Links to and knowledge of resettlement provision was considerably better on the LDU than on the reception site, even though both sites released broadly the same number of prisoners. Preparation for release work needed to be improved.
- HP51 Support for prisoners to gain accommodation on release was reasonable, with the primary focus in the 12 weeks before discharge. In our survey, fewer respondents on the reception site than the comparator said they knew who to contact about accommodation, although responses were significantly better on the LDU.

- HP52 Despite the identification of need, there was minimal support for prisoners needing help with finances. Prisoners could open bank accounts before release and the older prisoner group had regular financial advice input, but no debt management advice available.
- HP53 Arrangements for transferring IDTS prisoners to other prisons were improving. There were positive links with local drug intervention programmes, and good programmes for prisoners with alcohol problems.
- HP54 Prisoners appreciated the regular children's visits. The visitors' centre offered a good and supportive service. The main visits hall remained a poor environment, with significant delays in visitors getting to sessions.
- HP55 Although the resettlement analysis had identified significant need for work on prisoners' attitudes and thinking skills, there was no structured course, other than for substance misuse, to address these issues and no individual work by offender supervisors. There had been considerable problems transferring some prisoners, especially sex offenders, to complete offending behaviour programmes elsewhere.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP56 Concern: Some vulnerable prisoners were still located on A wing where their regime was much poorer, and where they were subject to verbal abuse from other prisoners. The environment on E wing was poor, and the regime they received was still limited.

Recommendation: All vulnerable prisoners should be kept in a safe environment and be able to access a full regime. (Repeated recommendation HP49)

- HP57 Concern: The quality of case management for the high number of open ACCTs was varied; much of it was poor with little evidence of good day-to-day care. Many prisoners on an ACCT had little to occupy them, and too many were held in segregation or special accommodation.

Recommendation: Case management and review arrangements for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved.

- HP58 Concern: Use of force was high but oversight and management was poor. Use of special accommodation was very high, sometimes appeared unnecessary and often went on for too long

Recommendation: Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should only be held in the segregation unit, including special accommodation, when there are exceptional circumstances to justify this, and governance of use of force, particularly special accommodation, planned interventions and drawing and use of batons, should be improved.

- HP59 Concern: Many single cells were used for double occupancy, and the dormitories on E wing were inadequate.

Recommendation: Single cells should not be used for double occupancy, and the dormitories on E wing should not be used to house four prisoners.

HP60 Concern: Many prisoners on the reception site spent long periods in their cells, and around 50% were unemployed with only around two hours a day out of their cell. Slippage in the core day and regime added to the problem.

Recommendation: The time prisoners have out of cell should be improved, particularly for those on the reception site and unemployed, and the core day should be closely adhered to.

HP61 Concern: About half the prisoners on the reception site were unemployed and much of the work available was mundane, repetitive and did not provide a realistic experience of work. Some work, education and other regime activity places were not fully utilised.

Recommendation: The number and quality of activity places should be adequate to meet the identified needs of the population, and monitored to ensure they are fully utilised.

HP62 Concern: Sentence planning and care management for those not subject to formal offender management and, in particular, those serving short sentences was limited and need to improve. Meaningful targets needed to be set with the aim of reducing the risk of further harm or reoffending.

Recommendation: All prisoners, irrespective of their length of stay in custody, should have their resettlement needs fully assessed, access to appropriate services, and a regularly reviewed custody plan with specific targets for their resettlement needs.

Section 1: Safety

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

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Prisoners were escorted in dirty vans. Journey were usually short but stops were not offered on longer escorts. Escort staff were courteous and disembarkation was adequate. Some prisoners spent too long in court awaiting transfer. Serving prisoners were employed at court to assist new arrivals.
- 1.2 In our survey, only 65% of respondents, against the comparator of 76%, said that the escort van was clean. We saw some vans that were dirty and had graffiti. Most journey times were under two hours, but for those experiencing longer journeys, the prisoner escort records (PERs) did not indicate that a toilet stop had been given. Most prisoners arrived at the establishment before 7.30pm, and reception was open over lunch.
- 1.3 Escort staff were courteous to prisoners and in our survey 80% of respondents said they were treated well by escort staff. Prisoners were disembarked from escort vans quickly and were not normally handcuffed. Relevant documentation travelled with prisoners during escort, and prisoners were given advance notice of planned transfer.
- 1.4 PERs showed that some prisoners had spent up to six hours in the court cells awaiting transfer to the prison once they had been dealt with. Food and drinks were routinely offered to prisoners at court.
- 1.5 Two prisoners on release on temporary licence were assigned to the local court to assist prisoners due to be sent to the prison for the first time. Prisoners appreciated this initiative.

Recommendation

- 1.6 **Prisoners should not spend protracted time in court cells after they are dealt with by the courts, and should be escorted to the prison at the earliest opportunity.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.7 Escort vans should be clean and free from graffiti, and prisoners travelling long distances should be offered a toilet break.

Good practice

- 1.8 *The use of serving prisoners at local courts to reassure and help prisoners due to be transferred to the prison helped to settle prisoners during their first night in custody.*

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.9 Prisoners had generally poor perceptions of their early days in custody, although those in the local discharge unit were more positive. Reception was clean and the process swift but there was little to occupy prisoners and supervision was limited. Vulnerable new arrivals were safely processed. All new arrivals had a first night interview but issues were not followed up. Induction for most prisoners was reasonable but was ineffective for vulnerable prisoners.
- 1.10 The reception area was clean and had recently been refurbished but it remained small, and the four holding rooms had no natural light and were austere. The reception process for most prisoners was swift and less than two hours. In our survey, 76% of respondents, against the comparator of 58%, said that they were treated well in reception and 82%, against 73%, said they were searched respectfully. We observed reception staff who were courteous and friendly, and all the new arrivals we saw were offered a meal and a drink.
- 1.11 Information on the reception process was available in the holding rooms and a limited amount was translated into foreign languages. There was little to occupy prisoners in the holding room other than a television in one. Supervision of the holding rooms was limited.
- 1.12 In our survey, 68% of respondents, against the comparator of 81%, said they saw someone from health services in reception. There was a dedicated room for the health services staff and during the inspection we observed that a nurse saw all new arrivals. In our survey, only 24% of respondents said they had access to a Listener in reception. A Listener had recently been employed to work there.
- 1.13 There was a vulnerable prisoner strategy for reception, and vulnerable new arrivals were separated from mainstream prisoners and underwent reception individually.
- 1.14 First night risk interviews were carried out in private. We were assured that all new arrivals received the first night interview but there was no evidence that staff followed up identified issues, such as care for dependants.
- 1.15 Prisoner induction orderlies resided on the first night (A) wing and welcomed all new arrivals. Listeners also lived on A wing and were available for new arrivals.
- 1.16 In our survey, only 17% of respondents, against the comparator of 34%, said that they had a shower on their first night, and only 22%, against 58%, said they received a free telephone call. As a consequence, we were not assured that all new arrivals received a shower or telephone

call. The problem was compounded when prisoners were located on to the first night wing after 7.30pm.

- 1.17 Induction for most mainstream prisoners started the first working day after they arrived, but could take up to a week to start for some prisoners. Induction lasted one and half days and included a comprehensive electronic presentation facilitated by prisoners and staff in a suitable room. An induction tracking system highlighted that not every prisoner completed all the induction modules and some completed none at all. However, records showed that this had improved over the previous two months.
- 1.18 Induction for vulnerable prisoners was insufficient with many receiving no formal induction. There was an over-reliance on one prisoner to see newly arrived vulnerable prisoners and give them an induction talk.
- 1.19 Early days arrangements in the local discharge unit (LDU) and Britannia House resettlement unit were reasonable, and prisoners here were more positive about their experience.

Recommendations

- 1.20 **The prison should work with prisoners to understand their negative perceptions of the early days procedures reflected in our survey, and should ensure that new arrivals receive their basic entitlements and that their immediate needs are met.**
- 1.21 **Information about the reception process should be available in a range of languages.**
- 1.22 **Staff should routinely monitor prisoners in reception holding rooms.** (Repeated recommendation 1.35)
- 1.23 **The first night interview record should be expanded to evidence relevant referrals and follow up information.** (Repeated recommendation 1.40)
- 1.24 **All new arrivals should receive the full induction programme.** (Repeated recommendation HP47)

Housekeeping point

- 1.25 Reading materials for new arrivals should be available in reception.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.26 Formal arrangements to deal with violence were good and the collection of data on incidents was very good, as was monitoring of the implementation of the violence reduction policy. The

number of violent incidents remained high but there has been a reduction in fights and assaults. Prisoners' perceptions of their safety depended on their location, but those on the reception site and particularly vulnerable prisoners on A wing, were more likely to report feeling unsafe at some point during their time at Norwich. The environment and regime for vulnerable prisoners was poor. The use of part of the first night wing for vulnerable prisoners remained inappropriate and there was still intimidation by other prisoners on the wing. Young adults were better integrated than at the last inspection.

- 1.27 There had been a full review of the arrangements to reduce violence in early 2011, which had led to the publication of a new violence reduction policy document. It was relevant, based on a detailed analysis of the patterns of violence in the prison, and further informed by frequent consultation with prisoners through annual safety and routine exit surveys. It was further supported by other local policies and procedures, such as the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and security reporting systems. The priority given to arrangements to deal with the overall level of violence was good and had improved since the last inspection.
- 1.28 A well-constructed safer prison committee met monthly to monitor overall progress of both the violence reduction and suicide prevention strategies. Meetings were always well attended and minutes showed properly focused discussions on prisoner self-harm and suicide prevention, while other forms of violence were properly emphasised. Information provided by the nominated violence reduction coordinator about the number, type and location of violent incidents each month had also improved, and analysis of information to identify trends, patterns and problem areas was better than we usually see.
- 1.29 Formal arrangements to deal with bullying had also been reviewed and modified to produce a simple two-stage system to identify, monitor and change antisocial behaviour. This was based chiefly on IEP sanctions supported by regular reviews to monitor behavioural changes.
- 1.30 Allegations of bullying were treated seriously and investigated promptly, usually by residential senior officers. The quality of investigation into alleged incidents was generally good. Outcomes were recorded and consistently acted upon by residential officers, supported by the violence reduction coordinator. There was evidence that residential officers were confident in implementing the new formal procedures.
- 1.31 Staff entries in documentation were usually good, and behaviour improvement targets were reasonable and achievable. Governance arrangements were also good and management checks of documentation, usually by the violence reduction coordinator, were effective.
- 1.32 The number of violent incidents remained high at over 500 a year, but there had been a reduction of about 15% in the number of fights and assaults since the previous inspection. There was evidence that the new formal procedures were helping to further reduce numbers.
- 1.33 Prisoner perceptions about their safety were mixed. Most prisoners in the LDU said that they felt safe and had not been intimidated by staff or other prisoners, and in our survey, only 2% of respondents on the LDU said that they felt unsafe. However, on the reception site, over a fifth of respondents said that they did not feel safe at the moment and nearly half said that they felt unsafe at some time. Too many also said that they had been victimised by other prisoners (37% against the comparator of 21%) and staff (36% against 25%).
- 1.34 As at the last inspection, the vulnerable prisoner unit on E wing was predominately for sex offenders, and a few who felt generally at risk from other prisoners on mainstream units. Decisions to segregate these prisoners had been made appropriately, and the reasons were

carefully recorded. The daily regime had not changed. All vulnerable prisoners were offered mundane work every day and were usually out of their cells for most of the core day. They generally said that they felt safe. The environment remained poor. Communal areas were old and worn and many cells were dirty and cramped. The two four-person dormitories were particularly poor and their continued use inappropriate.

- 1.35 A wing continued to provide extra accommodation for vulnerable prisoners, and at the time of inspection, 32 vulnerable prisoners were accommodated there. They spent most of the day locked in their cells without access to purposeful activity or enough association. Intimidation by other prisoners on the wing remained evident (see main recommendation HP56).
- 1.36 Young adults were well integrated throughout the prison. A young adult policy document had been published, which focused staff attention on principles and managerial arrangements for young adults. They were able to participate equally in the prison regime, and the disproportionate level of disruption and violence we found at the last inspection had reduced to that equivalent to other prisoners. Staff responses to erratic behaviour were less reactive than we saw previously, and there were examples where residential officers dealt with angry young prisoners in a calm and caring way to good effect. In our survey, however, young adult respondents were more negative than adults across the range of questions about respectful treatment.

Recommendation

- 1.37 **The high level of violent incidents should be further reduced.**

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.38 The suicide prevention policy was well promoted. The analysis of data to provide information about patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was also good. The number of self-harm monitoring documents and actual self-harm were high. There were gaps in case management arrangements, and the quality of documentation indicated inadequate care of too many prisoners at risk.
- 1.39 A suicide prevention policy document had been published, based on an examination of local practices. Its content was reasonable with a particular focus on the needs of a local prison. Staff and prisoners were aware of its content.
- 1.40 Procedures and protocols described in the document were managed directly by a full-time safer custody manager. She was accountable for ensuring that procedures to manage prisoners at risk from self-harm were properly implemented, and was also a central point for advice and guidance for staff. In practice, much of her time was spent managing issues around deaths in custody. Sadly, there had been 11 deaths in custody since the previous inspection,

including two self-inflicted deaths. Staff we spoke to were not always sure where to go to if they needed advice about suicide prevention procedures.

- 1.41 The safer custody committee monitored the implementation of the strategy at well-attended monthly meetings. It used a wide range of information, provided by the custodial care manager, to help identify trends and patterns of behaviour by location, type, age, timing and peripheral circumstances of individual incidents.
- 1.42 The Listener scheme had been established but prisoners did not have access to them during the night. Prisoners had 24-hour access to the Samaritans through a direct line mobile telephone. There was no space for Listeners to see prisoners in private on E wing (vulnerable prisoner unit). Some Listeners we interviewed said that they did not feel adequately supported by staff and were not sure that their work was valued.
- 1.43 The number of prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents was high, with commonly as many as 40 active cases at a time. About three-quarters were for prisoners on the first night (A) wing. Generally there were gaps in the case management of prisoners at risk of self-harm.
- 1.44 Some ACCT documents showed meaningful care plans that reflected positive contact with prisoners and an awareness of ongoing issues. The majority, however, did not demonstrate consistently good standards of day-to-day care or active planning. Many records were lengthy and contained a multitude of entries, most of which were lacking in detail. Too many were generic, repetitive and only occasionally demonstrated good quality interaction (see main recommendation HP57). Many prisoners on an ACCT were not engaged in any formal education or work.

Recommendation

- 1.45 **Support for Listeners, including facilities for them to see prisoners as required and in decent surroundings, should be improved.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.46 A safeguarding strategy to meet the needs of prisoners at risk had been published, and staff generally were aware of their responsibilities.
- 1.47 A safeguarding strategy document published in 2011 set out the goals and objectives to inform policy to deal with the needs of prisoners at risk, including those who may have been in need of community care services because of mental or other disability, age or illness. Its content was relevant to a local prison, and had been informed by consultation with health care specialists

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

and other professional staff. It was further supported by policies and procedures such as the diversity policy, the Prison Service code of conduct for staff, violence reduction and health care policies.

- 1.48 Safeguarding screening procedures were effective. Assessments of prisoners' risk during their first few days were comprehensive and included cell sharing risk assessments, disability assessments and health care interviews, usually by a registered mental health nurse. Further assessments were carried out by health care professionals (see also paragraph 2.82).
- 1.49 Most staff we spoke to, although not fully aware of the policy, were focused on relevant issues and aware of their personal responsibility to protect prisoners at risk. In practice, prisoners at risk because of mental issues, including those related to age, were managed in health care, the older prisoner unit or through case management by mental health nurses on residential units.

Recommendation

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

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

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

- 1.51 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate. Dynamic security was well managed and mostly responsive. Mandatory drug testing arrangements were adequate. Drug supply and demand initiatives were reasonably well integrated.
- 1.52 Security arrangements were generally proportionate and the regime was not unnecessarily restrictive. The security team was focused and taking appropriate measures, in consultation with the safer custody staff.
- 1.53 Dynamic security was well managed and mostly responsive. The 2,500 security information reports (SIRs) submitted between July and December 2011 were processed efficiently and targeted searches were completed within time. Suspicion drug testing had only recently been reintroduced but was appropriately targeted. Seven out of 12 tests had been positive, which was a good start but required further development.
- 1.54 In our survey, only 8% respondents said it was easy to get alcohol in the prison, against the comparator of 15%. However, 9% said they had developed a problem with drugs while in the prison which was worse than at the last inspection, and 13% had developed a problem with diverted medication, which was significantly worse than comparator prisons.
- 1.55 Supply reduction initiatives were reasonably well integrated and mandatory drug testing (MDT) adequately managed. The average positive random MDT rate for the previous 10 months was

9.2% against a target of 9%. Prisoners were referred appropriately to the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs). The MDT suites were appropriately equipped, but the one on the LDU was small and a poor environment with no waiting area. Six dogs had been trained to detect a combination of drugs, alcohol and mobile telephones.

- 1.56 The security committee was reasonably well attended and supported by a comprehensive intelligence report. Appropriate security objectives were set and monitored.
- 1.57 While most security arrangements were proportionate, it was unnecessary that all prisoners were strip searched on reception, on entry to the segregation unit and 10% at the end of visits, regardless of any intelligence to support this.

Recommendations

- 1.58 **Strip searching of prisoners should only be intelligence-led or based on specific suspicion.**
- 1.59 **Drug testing facilities on the local discharge unit should be improved and should include a holding area.**
- 1.60 **Action decided in response to security information, especially information indicating the need for a drug test on the basis of suspicion, should be tracked and monitored to ensure it is carried through.** (Repeated recommendation 7.11)

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.61 The incentives and earned privileges scheme was poorly perceived by prisoners and needed review. Prisoners on the basic regime were managed appropriately.
- 1.62 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was administered thoroughly and backed by a quality assurance process. However, the policy document was unclear, with no statement of entitlement for each level. Prisoners told us that there was little advantage to being enhanced.
- 1.63 In our survey, only 37% of respondents, against the comparator of 49%, felt that they were treated fairly by the IEP scheme. Notices threatening immediate downgrade to the basic regime for relatively trivial rule infringements were inappropriate, and contributed to the perception that the IEP system was unfair.

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

- 1.64 A prisoner was required to show 12 weeks good behaviour to qualify for enhanced, but most waited longer because review dates were based on cell location rather than length of stay. This was too long in a local prison, particularly one holding young adults.
- 1.65 The behaviour of men on the basic regime was reviewed weekly at a case management meeting, to which the prisoner was invited.

Recommendations

- 1.66 **Reduction in IEP level should not be threatened or carried out on the basis of a single action, unless it meets criteria of seriousness clearly stated in the policy.** (Repeated recommendation 7.57)
- 1.67 **Prisoners on the standard level should be able to apply for the enhanced level sooner than 12 weeks after their arrival.** (Repeated recommendation 7.62)

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.68 Use of formal disciplinary procedures was high. Records of hearings were generally well completed but quality assurance required development. The use of force was high and its governance weak, and use of special accommodation concerning and not always necessary. Throughput of the segregation unit was high. The unit was adequate but the regime was poor and often inconsistent.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.69 Between July and December 2011, there had been 942 adjudications, which was high. Some cases could have been dealt with less formally. Adjudications were held in a suitable room. Prisoners were given sufficient time and information to prepare for their hearings, and received legal advice when requested. Records were mostly of a good standard but a small minority did not demonstrate sufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt. Punishments were broadly fair. Quality assurance procedures were not robust enough.
- 1.70 Despite the collation of a significant amount of information on adjudications that informed the reasonably well-attended quarterly adjudication and segregation meeting, there was limited analysis of data for trends or patterns.

Recommendations

- 1.71 **All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached, and the quality assurance of adjudication records should be improved.**

- 1.72 **Information collated for all disciplinary procedures, including use of force and segregation, should be analysed and used more effectively.**

The use of force

- 1.73 Recorded use of force remained high. However, some incidents were low level and many appeared to be de-escalated appropriately. Handcuffs were not routinely applied.
- 1.74 Documentation following use of force was generally well completed, but quality checking was insufficient. Planned interventions were not effectively recorded on film and were not reviewed.
- 1.75 Batons had been drawn or used on six occasions in 2011. Most use appeared justified and, although not routine, there was some additional scrutiny where there were concerns.
- 1.76 Use of special accommodation was very high with 36 recorded uses in 2011, and further evidence that it had been used on other occasions without adequate record. We were not assured that all uses were justified or necessary, and many prisoners spent excessive periods there. Two-thirds of prisoners had their clothing removed and replaced with anti-tear gowns, and about half of those located there were on ACCT documents, which was inappropriate.
- 1.77 There was no specific use of force committee. Although comprehensive information about use of force was collected, it was not well used to inform any meaningful trend or pattern analysis (see recommendation 1.72). Governance of use of force was weak and required improvement (see main recommendation HP58).

Segregation unit

- 1.78 Although still high, at 127 cases between July and December 2011, use of segregation was lower than at the last inspection and notably so for young adults. Comprehensive data on segregation was collated but was not used in any meaningful way (see recommendation 1.72). There had been some work to understand the high number of black and minority ethnic prisoners in segregation.
- 1.79 Communal areas were clean, but the unit was worn and many cells had graffiti and dirty, scaled toilets. The large exercise yard was stark. Special accommodation cells were grim.
- 1.80 Strip searching of new arrivals appeared routine and sometimes in the absence of appropriate risk assessment (see recommendation 1.58). Too many prisoners on ACCT documents were held in segregation with no justification of the exceptional circumstances to warrant this, and the prison was unfocused on this concern (see main recommendation HP58).
- 1.81 The regime in the unit was poor and often applied inconsistently. Daily access to showers, telephones and exercise were often curtailed. Other than a small library trolley, there was no purposeful activity to engage prisoners.
- 1.82 Multidisciplinary reviews took place as required but resulting documentation was often poorly completed and behaviour targets were too often perfunctory. Care or reintegration plans for the few longer term prisoners required development.
- 1.83 Relationships between staff and prisoners in the unit were reasonable. Although unlocking protocols had been relaxed since the last inspection, they remained risk averse and excessive

at times. Constructive engagement was not reflected in staff entries in the daily history sheets or case notes.

Recommendations

- 1.84 **The environment and regime in the segregation unit should be improved.**
- 1.85 **The unlock levels in the segregation unit should be decided through a clear and proportionate assessment based on the individual prisoner's evidenced risk.** (Repeated recommendation 7.44)
- 1.86 **Segregation review documentation and care/reintegration plans should be completed thoroughly, include meaningful targets and daily history sheets should better reflect constructive engagement between staff and prisoners.**

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.87 There was a draft alcohol and drug strategy. Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services were well managed, as were clinical services, although staff shortages had affected their integration. The building skills for recovery programme had received a very positive audit, and prisoners considered that drug services were good. Compact-based drug testing procedures were not consistent. Prisoners had no access to peer support groups.
- 1.88 Prisoners who required integrated drug treatment (IDTS) were located on A wing. Clinical and psychosocial services delivered a good standard of care and were appreciated by prisoners but, until recently, had lacked integration and joint working. Drug services were provided by Phoenix Futures at the time of the inspection, but were being retendered to a new provider. Clinical services were provided by Serco Health and Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust. In our survey, 81% of respondents said that the support they had received for their drug and alcohol problems was helpful. We received positive comments from prisoners, with most verbal complaints about access to primary care health services.
- 1.89 The drug strategy was being updated in a combined drug and alcohol strategy, but the annual developmental objectives or action plan was yet to be completed. We observed good leadership from the newly appointed clinical lead and CARAT manager. There had been a CARATs needs assessment and there was an A wing integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) clinical action plan. There were currently no joint action plans to enhance integration. A wide range of clinical protocols and associated policies and procedures were being updated.
- 1.90 Opiate-dependent prisoners had prompt access to clinical support, first night prescribing and comprehensive assessment on weekdays, but there were problems in accessing medical cover and prompt prescribing for prisoners admitted over the weekend. Staffing of the clinical substance misuse service had improved and there were initiatives to provide more wing-based services, including access to primary care nursing and medical services. Dual diagnosis

services were being developed. Joint working had improved and clinical and CARAT teams worked in a more integrated way than previously. There were 13-week reviews of progress but five- and 14-day reviews were not yet conducted. There were plans for greater joint working with groups.

- 1.91 The performance of the CARAT service has improved since the last inspection. All referred prisoners, including those with primary alcohol problems, were seen promptly. There were 313 prisoners on the active caseload, with 70 waiting to be seen and 60 triaged or suspended. There were 43 young adult clients. The CARAT manager monitored targets well. Prisoners had access to one-to-one work and the full range of IDTS modules. Primary problem alcohol users could undertake the Norwich alcohol programme and the A2Z programme. However, in our survey only 42% of respondents said they had received help or support for their alcohol problem, against the comparator of 56%.
- 1.92 The building skills for recovery programme was being piloted, with additional sessions tailored to prisoner need. The programme had received very positive audit feedback for the past two years. Prisoners were currently unable to access Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Gambling Anonymous (GA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA) groups.
- 1.93 There were 300 drug testing compacts, with a clear distinction between voluntary and incentive-based compacts. However, prisoners were not always supervised during urine testing. Not all the testing rooms were suitably clean, and the toilet in the A wing testing area was broken.

Recommendations

- 1.94 **The drug and alcohol strategy should contain an action plan for all key aspects of drug services, and there should be action to improve integrated working between services.**
- 1.95 **Opiate-dependent users should have prompt access to medical services at weekends.**
- 1.96 **All compact-based drug sampling should be undertaken under supervision, and testing facilities should be clean and compliant with infection control procedures.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.97 Prisoners should have access to Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous and Gambling Anonymous services.

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 The quality of cells varied significantly across the site, but many were poor and some areas were not sufficiently clean. Toilets in double cells were inadequately screened. Staff response times to cell bells were poor. The application system was not quality assured.
- 2.2 The condition of accommodation varied greatly. Many cells on B and C wings were in a poor state of repair, and this was also evident on the local discharge unit (F and G wings). Makeshift curtains and screens were commonplace, and some furniture was damaged. There were no lockable lockers. Many doubled cells could not hold two sets of furniture and were inappropriate for two prisoners. The dormitories on E wing were poor and unsuitable for the number of occupants. Accommodation on A and M wings was better, and while Britannia House was old, the accommodation was in a good state of repair.
- 2.3 The condition of showers, laundries, toilets and sluice areas across the prison was frequently poor, with accumulated dirt, mould and litter. Cell toilets were stained and inadequately screened. There was a new washing machine on E wing but no dryer. Outside areas were generally litter-free.
- 2.4 Our survey and observations indicated that, as at the previous inspection, some prisoners, particularly on the reception site, were unable to shower each day.
- 2.5 The safer custody team made a monthly survey of response times to cell call bells, mostly on A wing. This showed some alarming delays, confirming the poor responses in our survey, particularly from younger respondents and those with disabilities. Although the monitoring process was encouraging, there was no evidence of an improvement in performance in the six months of data we reviewed.
- 2.6 Association facilities across the site were reasonable, although access was restricted during domestic periods.
- 2.7 In our survey, 67% of respondents, against the comparator of 82%, said they did not always receive clean sheets every week, with even poorer responses from black and minority ethnic prisoners. There were some written and verbal complaints about kit change, which was also raised in our group discussions. In general, the quality of kit was satisfactory, although larger sizes were in short supply. Unconvicted and enhanced prisoners were allowed to wear their own clothes.

- 2.8 In our survey, 62% of respondents, against the comparator of 56%, felt that applications were dealt with fairly, but they were much less positive about response times. Younger and disabled prisoners reported particular difficulties but vulnerable prisoners were more positive. The process was not quality assured, and a tracking system had been developed but not yet implemented. Notice boards were generally up to date and informative, but there was limited material in foreign languages.
- 2.9 Although prisoners complained of delays in receiving their post, the bulk of mail was processed on the day of arrival. The number of telephones was generally appropriate, but the limited unlock regime restricted access for workers on some days. On F and G wings, some telephones lacked privacy, and there were not enough telephones.
- 2.10 In our survey, respondents, particularly vulnerable prisoners, said that they had difficulty accessing their stored property. We observed property applications being processed and the reception staff said that there were no current delays.

Recommendations

- 2.11 **Cells and other prisoner areas should be clean and in a good state of repair.**
- 2.12 **Cell call bells should be responded to promptly.**
- 2.13 **Toilets in shared cells should be appropriately screened or separated.** (Repeated recommendation 2.17)
- 2.14 **All prisoners should be able to shower every day.** (Repeated recommendation 2.23)
- 2.15 **Applications should be dealt with promptly and wing managers should carry out random quality checks monthly.** (Repeated recommendation 3.47)
- 2.16 **Telephones on F and G wings should be private, with one telephone per 20 prisoners when wings are unlocked.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.17 All prisoners should receive a full kit change every week.

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.

- 2.18 The quality of staff-prisoner relationships was varied. Most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect, although minority groups had poorer perceptions and our own observations were mixed. Staff case history notes indicated a balanced understanding of individual custodial behaviour, and preferred names were often used. Many prisoners were unaware of their personal officer but for those who did the scheme provided a reasonable service.

- 2.19 Prisoners gave conflicting views of their relationship with staff – some described them as disinterested and others as engaged. We observed some dismissive staff, although we also saw staff interacting well with prisoners. During association, we observed staff who were distant and not engaged with prisoners.
- 2.20 In our survey, 81% of respondents, against the comparator of 70%, said that most staff treated them with respect, and 77%, against the comparator of 71%, said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. Black and minority ethnic, foreign national and young adult respondents were less favourable, and the prison was not focused on the reasons for such perceptions.
- 2.21 Relationships on the vulnerable prisoner wings were reasonable. In our survey, 89% of vulnerable prisoner respondents said that staff treated them with respect, and 100% said that there was a member of staff that they could turn to.
- 2.22 Entries in electronic case history notes indicated that staff were aware of prisoners' needs and encouraged them to take responsibility for their actions. Prison staff we spoke to had a good understanding of individual prisoner's custodial behaviour, but were less focused on their resettlement needs. Prisoners were consulted through well-attended and meaningful wing forums.
- 2.23 In our survey, only 41% of respondents, against the comparator of 46%, said they had a personal officer, but of those with a personal officer, 73% said that they were helpful, which was better than the comparator and the previous inspection. Many prisoners in the reception prison were unaware of who their personal officer was, but prisoners in the local discharge unit and Britannia House were more responsive.

Recommendations

- 2.24 **The prison should analyse the reason for poorer perceptions of staff-prisoner relationships among young adults and black and minority ethnic prisoners, and on particular wings, and take appropriate steps.** (Repeated recommendation 2.30)
- 2.25 **The personal officer scheme should be fully implemented.** (Repeated recommendation 2.34)

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.26 Provision for diversity had improved but some areas required further development. The equality action team only monitored race. The investigation of diversity complaints was good, although there had been no recent independent checks. Trained prisoner equality

representatives provided valuable support to other prisoners, but there were no support groups for prisoners from minority groups. We observed reasonable relationships between black and minority ethnic prisoners and staff. There was little formal support for Gypsies and Travellers. There was a clear foreign national prisoner policy and good provision of translated material and telephone interpreting services. There was a high number of immigration detainees held beyond the end of their sentences. Prisoners with disabilities were identified on reception and evacuation plans agreed where required, but there were few physical adaptations. Provision for older prisoners was good on L wing but required further development elsewhere. The older prisoners group was well attended. Provision for gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners was underdeveloped.

Strategic management

- 2.27 Attention to diversity had improved since our last inspection. The equality policy covered all aspects of diversity, and there were separate policies relating to older, young and foreign national prisoners. An internal equality website provided significant information for all staff. A recent equality fair had enabled many prisoners to access organisations providing information and advice about equality issues. Provision for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners, older prisoners and those with disabilities required further development, and some services were stretched.
- 2.28 The equality action team met monthly but its monitoring of diversity was limited to race equality. No external community groups were represented.
- 2.29 There had been 67 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) submitted in the previous eight months. They had been well investigated by wing managers and showed that action had been taken to address racist and other discriminatory behaviour. The equality officer carried out quality assurance. External scrutiny from Norfolk and Norwich Race Equality Council had lapsed since August 2011. Equality impact assessments were completed and reviewed according to priority.
- 2.30 A group of prisoner equality representatives had been trained in a wide range of equality and other prison matters. They provided a valuable service to prisoners, particularly during induction, and said that they felt valued and supported. There were no support or consultation groups or forums for any minority groups apart from older prisoners.

Recommendation

- 2.31 **Provision under all areas of diversity, including disability, older prisoners and sexual orientation, should be fully developed and all aspects of diversity should be monitored.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.32 Race equality was managed on a day-to-day basis by the equality officer. Black and minority ethnic prisoners accounted for about a fifth of the prisoner population. In our survey, they were negative about feeling safe and respectful treatment by staff, but those we spoke to in groups and individually were generally positive about staff and told us that they felt safe. We observed reasonable relationships between staff and black and minority ethnic prisoners, and the prisoner equality representatives provided good support. Few displays promoted different cultures or race.

- 2.33 The equality action team considered ethnic monitoring across a broad range of areas, and we found good investigation of areas that had been out of range, such as adjudications and segregation, and measures put in place to address identified issues. This was further supported by the completion and review of equality impact assessments, with their recommendations included in the equality action plan.
- 2.34 Our survey showed that 6% of respondents identified as being from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background but there was little formal support for this group, although a Traveller prisoner representative had recently been appointed.
- 2.35 There were 80 foreign national prisoners at the time of our inspection, 15 of whom were immigration detainees held beyond the end of their sentence. The foreign national policy clearly outlined provision at Norwich and had been translated into several languages. Other translated material, such as phrase books, the prisoner handbook and induction information, were given to new arrivals by the prisoner representatives. Telephone interpreting services were used more frequently than we usually see, especially in reception, induction and health care.
- 2.36 The foreign national coordinator and two trained foreign national clerks liaised regularly with the UK Border Agency (UKBA). The coordinator was not trained but provided a good service within limited time. The team had set up valuable links with the local enforcement office, which had agreed to provide an advice surgery and actively dealt with detainees' cases and progressed them with the criminal case division. Head office UKBA staff attended the prison once a month to see prisoners. There was clear evidence that prisoners' monthly updates were meaningful.
- 2.37 Some immigration detainees waited long periods for transfer to immigration removal centres (IRCs), with one over 18 months beyond the end of his sentence. The coordinator and clerks made significant efforts to have detainees transferred. This was evidenced by the transfer of six detainees to an IRC during our inspection.
- 2.38 There was some monitoring of the prisoner population by religion, particularly in DIRFs and access to religious services, but little else. There was no staff training on religious awareness and no interventions to challenge religious discrimination.
- 2.39 The disability liaison officer (DLO) identified all prisoners who reported a disability on their arrival or during their stay at Norwich. She had a comprehensive database that was available to all staff. Tribal staff assessed prisoners with educational needs and health care staff those with medical needs. The DLO was not able to meet all prisoners with disabilities and so not all had care plans. Personal emergency and evacuation plans had been developed for those who needed them, and staff on all wings could easily identify those who required assistance in an emergency.
- 2.40 There were two specifically adapted cells on A wing, although the lowered light switches by the beds did not work. Prisoners on L wing were provided with appropriate aids and had care plans. Some telephones had been lowered on B and C wings and one prisoner had a bell in his cell to call staff in an emergency. Beyond this, few other adaptations or appliances had been provided. The DLO had recently started to provide an advocacy service during adjudications to prisoners with learning difficulties. There was no paid carer scheme.
- 2.41 Prisoners with disabilities who were unemployed were not always unlocked during the core day. Some were not paid the full disability rate of pay if they accessed some activities, leaving them worse off financially than if they did nothing.

- 2.42 Older prisoners resident on L wing were well provided for, but those on other wings had less support. Prisoners aged 50 or over could attend a weekly 'out and about' group run by Age UK, but attendees were not paid, which was inappropriate. Age UK also provided an advice and support service on finance and accommodation and brought in specialist volunteers when required, and also followed up prisoners on release to evaluate their accommodation and financial circumstances. Additional regime provision included over-50s gym sessions.
- 2.43 The equality strategy did not contain information about internal and external support for prisoners who were gay or transgender. Advice and support had been provided to some prisoners but provision generally required development. Prisoners could not confidentially report that they were gay, bisexual or transgender, and equality staff had no statistics on these prisoners.

Recommendations

- 2.44 **The prison should investigate the poor perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners in our survey.**
- 2.45 **NOMS should continue to work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that prisoners held solely under immigration powers are transferred to an immigration removal centre on completion of their sentence.**
- 2.46 **There should be a formal carer/mentor scheme for prisoners with disabilities and older prisoners who require assistance.**
- 2.47 **Prisoners unfit for work due to a disability should be unlocked during the day and provided with appropriate regime activities and equitable pay.**
- 2.48 **Gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners should be provided with information on the internal and external support available.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.49 The prison should provide displays that reflect the cultural and racial mix in the prison.

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.

- 2.50 A fully integrated chaplaincy played an active role in the prison and provided pastoral and worship support for all faiths. Faith facilities were adequate for the population, but prisoners with mobility problems could not easily access the main chapel. Prisoners were favourable about their access to faith leaders, although were less positive about respect for their religious beliefs. There was a good range of religious study groups and other provision, but some clashed with other activities.

- 2.51 The recently increased chaplaincy had a well-publicised programme. The team worked well together to cover generic pastoral duties, and there was provision for all faiths across the prison.
- 2.52 Faith facilities were adequate for the prisoner population. The multi-faith rooms were used for some activities and for Muslim prayers. Prisoners with restricted mobility could not easily access the main chapel on the reception site as it was upstairs. Those in segregation did not often attend corporate worship, and chaplaincy staff were not included in review boards to assess individual risk.
- 2.53 The chaplaincy provided a range of activities, such as prayer and discussion groups, although some of these clashed with other activities and not all prisoners could attend them.
- 2.54 The chaplaincy was integrated into the daily life of the prison and represented at key meetings. Chaplains made daily visits to the segregation unit and attended ACCT reviews. The team visited all new arrivals and was closely involved in providing family support following any death in custody and supporting prisoners following periods of illness and palliative care. There was a formal prison visitors scheme for prisoners who did not receive visits. A large number of volunteers worked with the chaplaincy, and prisoners were advised of local faith organisations on release.
- 2.55 In our survey, respondents, particularly black and minority ethnic prisoners, were favourable about their access to faith leaders but were generally less positive about their religious beliefs being respected (see also recommendation 2.44).

Recommendations

- 2.56 **Prisoners with mobility problems should be able to participate in corporate worship.**
(Repeated recommendation 3.83)
- 2.57 **Chaplains should be involved in reviews of prisoners in the segregation unit to assess their suitability to attend corporate worship.**

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.

- 2.58 Complaints were managed efficiently, there was reasonably effective quality assurance and responses were generally appropriate.
- 2.59 Complaint forms were freely accessible and information on complaints was available in a variety of languages. Between July and December 2011, only 661 complaints were submitted, which was low. The responses to complaints that we sampled were normally personally addressed, polite, timely and answered the issues raised. Quality assurance measures were good.

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.

- 2.60 Legal services remained poor, apart from the addition of fax machines on wings to facilitate contact with legal representatives.
- 2.61 There were still no trained legal services officers. Bail information services were delivered through the offender management unit (OMU), although provision was inconsistent and often poor. This was reflected in our survey.
- 2.62 There was limited information for prisoners and staff were generally unable to offer any advice or signposting to services. However, the introduction of fax machines on the wings to allow prisoners to communicate with their legal representatives was a positive initiative. Adequate legal reference materials were available in the library but were not widely publicised.
- 2.63 In our survey, only 50% of respondents, against the comparator of 59%, said it was easy to attend legal visits, although the provision did not appear to be oversubscribed.

Recommendation

- 2.64 **Legal services should be sufficient to meet the needs of prisoners.**

Good practice

- 2.65 *Fax machines had been installed on residential wings to help prisoners contact their legal representatives.*

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.

- 2.66 Prisoners were dissatisfied with some aspects of health care, particularly the appointments system, although health services had improved since our last inspection. Service commissioning and provider arrangements were overly complex and in transition. The standard of clinical facilities and treatment rooms ranged from high to very poor. There was a reasonable range of primary care clinics and opportunities for the care of lifelong conditions, but no routine screening for learning disability. Waiting times for appointments were short but non-attendance rates were too high. Pharmacy and dental services were generally good. The inpatient unit and older prisoner unit offered good standards of care but in dated, and often,

very poor environments. Mental health services were much improved but primary mental health care was underdeveloped.

Governance arrangements

- 2.67 Prisoners told us of their dissatisfaction with some aspects of health care, particularly the appointments system, although services had improved since our last inspection. In our survey, vulnerable prisoners had poorer views of the health services, although we did not observe any discrimination.
- 2.68 Health services were informed by an up-to-date health needs assessment, and there was an effective partnership board and a focused prison health development plan. NHS Norfolk and Waveney commissioned Serco to provide primary health services. Serco directly supplied some services but subcontracted to two other providers for others. Secondary mental health services were provided by Partnerships in Care. The arrangements were needlessly complex and this situation was being addressed.
- 2.69 Clinical governance arrangements were robust. A governance group met regularly and received a variety of detailed reports about trends, complaints and incidents. The prison health performance and quality indicators were used to assess progress. There was feedback from the patients' forum.
- 2.70 Staffing had improved since our last visit with an increase in registered mental health nurses (RMNs). Full-time GPs had been appointed with only one locum remaining. Registration checking of health care professionals was up to date, and training and clinical supervision were offered as appropriate and recorded.
- 2.71 Staff had good access to evidence-base sources and care planning was based on National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidance. Clinical audit was in line with the provider's schedule and included monthly sampling of clinical records. There was an extensive range of policy and procedural guidance, including policies for infection control, communicable disease management and information sharing.
- 2.72 There were health centres on the reception and local discharge unit (LDU) sites, treatment rooms on several wings, a day care centre on the reception site, and an inpatient unit and older prisoner residential unit on the LDU site. Waiting rooms in the health centre were stark with wooden benches. Cells in the inpatient unit had been decorated since our last visit. However, the inpatient and older prisoner units looked worn and dated. Some inpatient cells were quite poor. Most clinical rooms were adequate, although some work surfaces did not comply with infection control standards. E wing treatment room required complete refurbishment. Cleanliness was good and there were regular cleaning schedules. The day care centre was an exceptional resource that was very underused.
- 2.73 Resuscitation equipment, including automated external defibrillators, was sited strategically around the prison and checked regularly. Daily living and mobility aids were available to patients. A senior nurse was responsible for ensuring appropriate care for older prisoners – 89 prisoners were over 50 at the time of our visit.
- 2.74 An information leaflet for new arrivals was well laid out but had no pictorial element and could have been difficult for prisoners with poor literacy. It was available in foreign languages on request.

- 2.75 Health care received an average of six complaints a week, mostly on medication prescribing and supply. The responses we sampled were timely and offered apologies where appropriate.
- 2.76 Wing based Well Man Clinics were run by gym staff and health trainers (prisoners). There had been three successful multiagency health promotion events in 2011.

Recommendation

- 2.77 **All clinical rooms should comply with current infection control standards.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.78 Health care waiting rooms should have more comfortable seating.
- 2.79 All cells in the inpatient facility should be kept clean and, where needed, refurbished.
- 2.80 Health care information material should be accessible to prisoners with poor literacy.
- 2.81 Primary health care and health promotion information should be available in the health waiting rooms.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.82 All new arrivals received a comprehensive health screen. The needs analysis suggested that not all prisoners with mental health problems were detected at this stage, despite the use of the relevant assessment. New arrivals were offered a secondary screen within three days, although 30% had failed to attend. Prisoners were followed up and offered subsequent appointments. Screening for learning disability was available but not routinely used. An admission pack checklist was used to ensure that the GP had been contacted, information sharing consent gained and other appropriate action taken.
- 2.83 Applications for health care appointments had pictorial elements to assist those with reading difficulties. There had been a sluggish response to applications recently and so prisoners had a poor view of the system. When we tested it, we did not receive an acknowledgement of our application within 48 hours (compared with a test complaint we posted that was acknowledged within 24 hours). Wing-based health care staff were due to be in place by May 2012, and this would address the problem by allowing prisoners daily access to nurses to make appointments.
- 2.84 There was a reasonable range of primary care clinics, including nurse practitioner clinics. There was a weekly clinic for patients with lifelong conditions, and care plans were used on SystemOne (the electronic patient record), although not all had been reviewed at the set time. The waiting time to see a GP was two days or less, which was good, and GPs were available every day except Sunday. The failure to attend rate for all clinics was high at 12%, although this was a decrease from 50% in mid-2011. At least two nurses were on site at all times, so use of the out of hours medical services was infrequent.
- 2.85 There was an extensive range of clinics to assist patients with blood borne virus testing and care, including those run by visiting hospital specialists. Young adult prisoners had access to

chlamydia testing and meningitis C vaccine (although no vaccine had been used in the past year).

- 2.86 SystmOne was used and medical record systems complied with the Data Protection Act. However, we discovered some medical records and X-rays in two decommissioned rooms, which breached patient confidentiality.
- 2.87 The inpatient unit had 23 beds, which were on the certified normal accommodation (CNA), and prisoners without clinical need sometimes occupied beds. Agreed plans to remove 10 beds from the CNA for sole clinical use had not yet been implemented. Despite the often poor environment, inpatients had good standards of individual care, although there was no evening association or timetabled educational support (see recommendations 3.4 and 3.13).
- 2.88 The 15-bed older prisoner unit had changed its function since our last inspection and was now used by prisoners from Norfolk and Suffolk only. The standard of care was good.
- 2.89 Prisoners had good access to secondary health care services at NHS facilities in Norwich, including treatment for hepatitis C. Fewer than one in 70 appointments were cancelled for security reasons.

Recommendation

- 2.90 **Clinical records should be stored in compliance with the Data Protection Act and used in accordance with the Caldicott principles on the use and confidentiality of personal health information.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.91 The non-uptake of meningitis C vaccine should be subject to clinical audit.

Pharmacy

- 2.92 There was a full-time pharmacist, and prisoners had direct access to pharmacy technicians who administered medicines. There was an in-possession policy and risk assessment, and 35% of prisoners had medicines in possession. There were out of hours arrangements, although these were not covered in a policy or protocol.
- 2.93 We found a case where medication did not appear to have been administered in accordance with the prescriber's instructions; an investigation into this commenced immediately. There were standard operating procedures, although the special sick policy had not been reviewed since March 2009. There was a local prescribing formulary, which appeared to be used. Pharmacy staff were unaware of the prison's patient group directions (PGDs).
- 2.94 Systems for handling medicines safely and securely and stock management had improved but we found some loose tablets in medicine cupboards in B2 and E wings. The routine use of Henley bags had been phased out but we found some bags containing medication dated 2009 on E wing. Reference books in some treatment rooms were significantly out of date. Refrigerator temperatures were regularly monitored but no action had been taken when they were outside the acceptable range.

Housekeeping points

- 2.95 The medicines and therapeutics committee should formally adopt an out of hours policy, regularly review the special sick policy to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied, and ensure that all pharmacy staff are aware of all policies and procedures related to medicines prescribing, management and administration.
- 2.96 Medication should be stored in an orderly manner, and pharmacy staff should visit the treatment areas frequently to check and remove out-of-date stock and incorrectly prepared or labelled items.
- 2.97 Out-of-date pharmacy reference books should be discarded and replaced by the current editions.
- 2.98 Maximum and minimum drug fridge temperatures should be recorded daily to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2-8°C range. Corrective action should be taken if necessary, and this should be monitored by pharmacy staff.

Dentistry

- 2.99 The dental service was equivalent to that in the community. Although prisoners complained about access to the dentist, waiting lists were short and the average wait for routine treatment was five weeks. Prisoners with dental pain were seen within a few days. Dental sessions were held on both the reception and LDU sites, and a dentist or therapist was available as required. Prisoners could not follow oral health promotion advice as they were not permitted access to dental floss or inter-dental brushes.
- 2.100 The surgeries were of a good standard but neither had decontamination facilities. Both were due to be modernised and brought up to standard. We were told that the primary care trust had audited the service in the last year.

Housekeeping point

- 2.101 Prisoners should be permitted to have clinically advised dental health products in possession.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.102 Mental health services had much improved with a revised stepped offender mental health pathway, which clarified roles and increased staffing. Over a third of uniformed officers have been trained in mental health awareness in the last year, which was a high figure.
- 2.103 Primary mental health care remained insufficiently developed, although improvements were in hand. A new primary mental team had been formed and RMNs had been recruited to offer wing-based services. Guided self-help, counselling and one-to-one solution-based approaches were available to patients, but there was no group support, group therapy or extended therapeutic day capacity. We saw no therapeutic activity in the day care centre. More integrated primary and secondary mental health services were due to be offered, with inputs from the community IAPT (improving access to psychological therapies) team in the day care centre from April 2012.

- 2.104 Secondary mental health services were provided by Partnerships in Care, and there were good links with primary mental health through weekly multidisciplinary and multi-departmental meetings to consider referrals and treatment strategies. Patient care was informed by a consultant forensic psychiatrist and a clinical psychologist, and delivered by experienced forensic nurses. The care programme approach (CPA) was used effectively to ensure continuity of care for patients. A quarter of Mental Health Act transfers were not completed within target, although local transfers were usually efficient.

Recommendation

- 2.105 **Group support, group therapy or therapeutic day services should be available to prisoners who need additional support for emotional, behavioural and common mental health problems, and the day care centre should be fully used for therapeutic purposes.**

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.

- 2.106 The range and standard of food were reasonable, although unpopular with prisoners. Breakfast packs were issued to prisoners the previous evening. Prisoners could not dine out of their cells. Kitchens were worn and grubby, and some hotplates were not clean.
- 2.107 The quality of food we tasted was reasonable and of the correct temperature, and menus generally met the needs of different diets, including vegetarian, vegan, and halal. Halal food was stored and served separately from other foods. Despite this, prisoners continued to be negative about the food, and in our survey, only 22% of respondents said it was good.
- 2.108 Prisoners selected lunch and dinner from a four-week rolling menu that offered a reasonable variety of healthy options, and daily portions of fruit and vegetables. A light lunch of sandwiches or soup was offered every day and, although adequate, it would have been reasonable to offer prisoners both. Meal times were adequately spaced, but breakfast packs were issued to prisoners in the evening. Prisoners were currently unable to eat their meals out of their cells, although this option was due to be introduced.
- 2.109 The kitchens in the reception site and the LDU were old and worn, flooring needed repair and many areas were grubby. On E wing, food was served in the middle of the landing from an old and dirty bain-marie, and serving utensils were washed after use in a small sink in the landing toilet. The catering manager or a member of her team carried out and recorded regular checks of serveries during meal times.
- 2.110 All staff and prisoners employed in the preparation and serving of food had received basic hygiene and food handling training. As at the previous inspection, prisoners working in the kitchen were not able to gain national vocational qualifications (NVQs).
- 2.111 There was a regular meeting with servery workers, a twice yearly food survey and prisoner representatives met the catering manager at formal consultation meetings. There were food comments books on all residential units, which were readily accessible to prisoners.

Recommendations

- 2.112 **The main kitchens and wing serveries, including the provision for serving meals and washing utensils on E wing, should be clean and functional.**
- 2.113 **Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are to be eaten.** (Repeated recommendation 8.18)
- 2.114 **Prisoners should be offered the opportunity to dine out of cell.** (Repeated recommendation 8.20)

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.115 The standard shop contract operated satisfactorily, and a reasonable range of goods was available, but some new arrivals had to wait over a week for their first order.
- 2.116 In our survey, respondents said that the range of goods available in the prison shop was reasonable. The standard DHL prison shop contract generally worked well, but the shop list was only available in English. Prison staff delivered orders to prisoners at their cell doors.
- 2.117 Some new arrivals had to wait up to 13 days for their first order, although they had the opportunity to buy multiple reception packs. An advance of earnings was available to prisoners who could not afford to buy packs.
- 2.118 The system for making orders (including hobby items) from catalogues was well used, and free. However, prisoners reported that there were often considerable delays and communication issues, although there were plans to issue a spreadsheet to wing staff to track the progress of their orders.
- 2.119 Consultation about the shop through the prisoner forum was becoming more meaningful.

Recommendation

- 2.120 **All prisoners, including new arrivals, should have weekly access to the prison shop.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.121 The prison should progress its plans for wing staff to track the progress of prisoner catalogue purchases.

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.⁵

- 3.1 Time out of cell for prisoners in the LDU was good at over eight hours a day, but was poor for many in the reception site. Prisoners held in Britannia House had unrestricted time out of cell. The actual experience of individual prisoners varied across the prison, as did the application of the core day. Association was limited to two periods a week for many prisoners, and those not fully employed could have as little as just over two hours a day out of cell.
- 3.2 The published core day indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve about nine hours a day out of cell on Monday to Thursday and about 6.5 hours on Fridays, Saturday and Sunday. In practice, however, time out of cell at the reception site was much less for a significant number who did not work or attend education. We estimated that unemployed prisoners could get only about 2.5 hours a day if attending daily exercise and association. However, time out of cell for prisoners in the local discharge unit (LDU) was good at about eight or nine hours a day, and it was unrestricted for those on Britannia House.
- 3.3 Overall, the prison reported that the average time that prisoners spent out of their cells was over eight hours a day. This was only consistent with an overgenerous interpretation of the core day based on most prisoners being unlocked as scheduled, and the inclusion of prisoners in the LDU. We found that on most wings prisoners received only about four hours evening association per week over two days, and sometimes less for vulnerable prisoners on A6 landing. There was also regime slippage caused by the late unlocking of prisoners on A, B and C wings. At a roll check during the morning of the core day, for example, we found about 40% of the population locked in their cells – and during the afternoon this rose to just under 50% (see main recommendation HP60).

Recommendation

- 3.4 **Prisoners should have evening association on four evenings a week.** (Repeated recommendation HP55)

⁵ 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.

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 Recent restructuring and reorganisation had resulted in improved management of learning and skills and work activities. Too many prisoners remained unemployed, with around half on the reception site not participating in meaningful work, but on the LDU about 80% were engaged in activities. Too much work was mundane and repetitive, especially for vulnerable prisoners, and not all available places were used. Punctuality had improved but attendance remained poor in education and the contract workshops. Staff often interrupted sessions to take prisoners to appointments. Education provision had improved with the introduction of short courses for those in the prison for short periods. Achievement of accredited qualifications was good. The provision of learning and skills for vulnerable prisoners was very poor. The library provided access for most prisoners, except those on M wing who were employed. Book stock loss was very high.

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.6 The leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities had improved, and there were closer links with regimes with developments focused on the reduction of reoffending.
- 3.7 Managers had used the prison's thorough training needs analysis, linked to labour market information, to improve vocational training and work activities. Plans to develop a new vocational training centre were well advanced, and there were additional training areas and contract work opportunities. The strategic direction for development was clear, although not included in a formal statement, and action plans were not always linked or sufficiently prioritised.
- 3.8 Although there had been improvements, progress to address our previous recommendations had been slow and insufficient. Some quality assurance arrangements had improved. The quality improvement group had been re-established and was effective. The self-assessment report for 2010/11 was largely descriptive, with insufficient evidence to support judgements and some areas for improvement not identified, although the procedure was being revised. The observation of teaching and learning in education was good, but activities in work and vocational training were not yet observed to improve the provision.
- 3.9 Too many prisoners were unemployed and the management of data was weak. Data were collected to identify the places allocated to activities, but the prison failed to monitor full-time and part-time attendance clearly. The data we analysed showed that, on average, one-third of prisoners were not engaged in purposeful activities (around half on the reception site and 20% in the LDU). On many occasions the print shop was less than 60% occupied (see main recommendation HP60).

Provision of activities

- 3.10 The provision and number of activity places remained a key area for improvement, particularly on the reception site. Contract print work provided good quality work on the reception site, but had been limited by reductions in external contracts. On average, attendance at this workshop was approximately 60%. Purposeful activities for vulnerable prisoners were very poor and they were offered inadequate education, with opportunities limited to one or two individual half-hour sessions in literacy, numeracy and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL). There were still no learning and skills and work activities in the inpatient or segregation units. The position was somewhat better for those prisoners held on the LDU, and those in Britannia House were well served with a range of purposeful activities, including opportunities to work in the community.
- 3.11 Vocational training was insufficient across both sites, but particularly poor on the reception site. There were well-advanced plans to increase the provision and low number of places on the reception site but this had not significantly improved since the last inspection. Education provision had improved with the implementation of short programmes, which better met the needs of prisoners in the prison for a short time. Accredited painting and decorating and kitchen skills programmes had been successfully introduced in the LDU but some waiting lists were too long. The prison was unaware of the range and time that prisoners spent on activities in the wings. There was good use of work in the house and gardens in Britannia House for prisoners waiting for security clearance, and all activity places there were fully and well utilised.
- 3.12 The labour allocation system had recently changed. Allocation to jobs was sometimes based on requests by prisoners and agreement by staff, rather than as a direct result of the labour allocation process. The new system was seeking to address this issue. Waiting lists were too high for education and training programmes and insufficient programmes were offered, although the education contract was maximised. Prisoners' pay did not disadvantage those wishing to access learning and skills and most jobs offered similar pay rates. However, pay for prisoners beyond retirement age and who chose not to work was poor at £5 per week.

Recommendations

- 3.13 **All prisoners, including those in the inpatient and segregation units, should be provided with and participate in high quality purposeful activities.**
- 3.14 **Learners' time should be better planned to reduce interruptions and disruptions to their activities.**
- 3.15 **The prison should increase basic retirement pay for those beyond retirement age who choose not to work.**

Quality of provision

- 3.16 Prisoners received good initial guidance about the vocational training and education programmes available. The use of initial assessment in literacy and numeracy was good. However, although there was a new initial assessment to identify support needs for prisoners with English as an additional language, this information was not used sufficiently across the prison. Teaching and learning were mostly good, with particularly good management of behaviour in sessions and effective use of prisoners as peer mentors. Seventeen mentors had been trained for the Toe-by-Toe reading scheme, but there were only seven learners with little

promotion of the scheme from wing officers. There was insufficient expertise to support dyslexic learners.

- 3.17 Resources for printwork were of a very high commercial standard and a few prisoners successfully followed an accredited qualification at level 1. Prison instructional officers provided good support and assessment. Resources for education varied considerably. Learning areas on the reception site were bright, spacious and welcoming. The downstairs rooms in the LDU were large and inviting, but those upstairs required considerable refurbishment. Prisoners in Britannia House could take part in good quality training with a range of external providers.
- 3.18 Careers information and advice was provided by Tribal staff, who were the contracted provider. This was good at induction and most prisoners were given support before release. However, many prisoners, particularly those on longer sentences, received insufficient support during their sentence. Tribal did not provide information and advice on career progression or job search for prisoners in Britannia House.

Recommendations

- 3.19 **The prison should improve the quality of careers advice, education, vocational training and work for vulnerable prisoners.**
- 3.20 **Initial assessments of the English language skills of prisoners who speak English as an additional language and those with dyslexia should be used to provide appropriate support throughout the prison.**
- 3.21 **The prison should refurbish the upstairs education rooms in the local discharge unit.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.22 The introduction of short programmes of learning had been particularly successful. Achievements of qualifications were good in most areas, and most learners stayed on programmes and completed them. There was little use of distance learning or Open University provision. New arrivals who had already started a programme were supported to continue it. Intermediate and higher level learning opportunities for those serving longer sentences were inadequately promoted. Skills developed by prisoners not undertaking accredited qualifications in areas such as the print shop and external work placements were rarely recognised and recorded.

Recommendation

- 3.23 **Prisoners' development of non-accredited skills should be recognised and recorded.**

Library

- 3.24 The library was provided by Norfolk County Council. There had been a strong commitment to improving the library following a realistic and accurate evaluation of the service.
- 3.25 Prisoner access to the library had increased at the three libraries in the reception unit, the LDU and B and C wings, and satellite libraries on E, H and L wings and the segregation unit.

However, prisoners on M wing allocated to work still did not have sufficient opportunity to use the library. The libraries were fully staffed and each had one orderly, with plans for them to be trained in customer care. New arrivals did not receive a full induction to the library.

- 3.26 The quality of the stock had increased, but book loss was very high at 16% in 2011. A new computerised system to record and track loans had not been introduced until December 2011 and was still not fully operational.
- 3.27 The library had insufficient links with learning and skills and work activities staff to ensure the provision of sufficient reference material. The computers for prisoners were too old to handle modern multi-media resources.

Recommendations

- 3.28 **All prisoners should have good access to the library and receive a full induction to the service.**
- 3.29 **There should be better links between the library and learning and skills and work staff to ensure the provision of appropriate up-to-date material, and computers for prisoners in the libraries should be upgraded.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.30 Library book loss should be significantly reduced.

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

3.31 The physical education and healthy living provision continued to be impressive, and staffing levels and resources had improved. Very good relationships with prison staff and external agencies had led to a well-planned and delivered health screening programme for prisoners. There were additional facilities on the reception site, and good developments to link relevant qualifications to employment opportunities. Access to PE for most prisoners remained good, but was insufficient for those fully employed during the day.

3.32 Physical education and healthy living provision continued to be high quality and supported by a significant increase in staff since the last inspection. There was good provision for prisoners with drug dependence and health issues, with effective links with health care. Trained PE staff and prisoners, who are trained as Health Trainers, provided an innovative health screening programme for prisoners in conjunction with nurse practitioners. External links with NHS funded training of prisoners to deliver the programme facilitated by Horizon Health. Two PE staff had been allocated to developing community links, and there had been some work placement and employment opportunities with a national fitness and leisure organisation for prisoners in Britannia House.

- 3.33 Staffing had increased significantly, and PE was offered daily, in the evenings and at weekends. However, access to PE was limited for prisoners who were fully employed. A good range of qualifications was offered and achievements were high across all programmes.
- 3.34 Significant investment had improved the PE resources in the LDU but there were no privacy screens in the showers, toilets were inadequate and no drinking water was available. A new gym with showers had been built on the reception site, although the showers lacked proper ventilation. Outside facilities were well used in the LDU, but there were none on the reception site.

Recommendations

- 3.35 **The prison should install privacy screens in the showers and improve the toilet facilities for the gym on the local discharge unit.**
- 3.36 **The prison should plan outdoor PE facilities on the reception site.**

Housekeeping points

- 3.37 Fresh drinking water should be provided for prisoners in the PE provision in the LDU.
- 3.38 The extraction and ventilation facilities in the gym showers on the reception site should be improved.

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 A comprehensive needs analysis underpinned the resettlement strategy but identified significant shortfalls in provision, primarily to address offending behaviour. Prisoners on the LDU continued to have better access to resettlement services and generally believed staff were more supportive in relation to release, although both sides of the prison released broadly the same number of prisoners. Prisoners at Britannia House were even more positive.
- 4.2 The resettlement strategy, updated in April 2011, was comprehensive and detailed with appropriate links to regional and national developments and policies. The policy covered all key aspects of resettlement, including each pathway and offender management. A detailed action plan underpinned the policy with identified targets and development objectives. Although the bimonthly resettlement strategy group monitored progress, some developments and objectives were out of date.
- 4.3 The resettlement strategy group covered a broadly appropriate range of issues, and a separate bimonthly pathways and partnerships group ensured generally good links between the work of pathway providers.
- 4.4 The needs analysis was comprehensive and detailed. It was based on OASys (offender assessment system) data for prisoners serving over 12 months (approximately 60% of the population), along with a questionnaire and focus group that included remand prisoners and those serving less than 12 months. The analysis had identified some significant gaps in the provision available, particularly work addressing offending behaviour. In the questionnaire, over 63% of respondents said they had not attended any offending behaviour courses, and the OASys analysis indicated many prisoners with significant need for work on their attitudes and thinking. There was, however, provision for prisoners with substance misuse problems, including dedicated individual support, via the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARATs), and group work to address both alcohol and drug problems.
- 4.5 Overall resettlement provision and support remained better for prisoners on the local discharge unit (LDU) than on the reception site, even though both sites released similar numbers of prisoners each month. In our survey, significantly fewer respondents than the comparator said that a member of staff had helped them prepare for release, but with significant differences between the LDU (18%) and the reception site (7%). Prisoners on the LDU consistently reported a better understanding of and access to resettlement provision than those on the reception site. On Britannia House (category D), 67% of respondents said that a member of staff had helped them prepare for release, more than twice the category D comparator of 31%.

- 4.6 A good range of community-based partner agencies offered post-release support or work experience through release on temporary licence (ROTL). There were two resettlement officers, one based primarily in the community and the other in the prison, who were both well known across the establishment.

Recommendation

- 4.7 **The resettlement strategy meeting and policy should ensure that all prisoners, particularly those who do not transfer to the local discharge unit (LDU), have equitable and consistent access to resettlement services.** (Repeated recommendation 9.18)

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8 Although all prisoners were subject to an initial assessment against resettlement pathways, the information collected was limited, targets set vague and there was no ongoing monitoring of those on remand or short sentences. Work for prisoners subject to offender management was generally good, although external communication for low and medium risk prisoners needed improvement. Transfers to prisons able to provide offending behaviour work needed improving. Public protection arrangements were good, and work with indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was generally appropriate.
- 4.9 All new arrivals had some form of needs assessment. Tribal staff completed an evaluation of training and education needs that also considered wider resettlement need under each pathway and made referrals where appropriate. In practice, this process was very limited as Tribal focused on education and training and had little detailed knowledge about other pathways, and the assessment was based on self-disclosure with no wider evaluation. A plan was drawn up after the assessment, which focused on education and training targets with only referrals mentioned under the pathway work. Although copies of the plan were forwarded to the offender management unit (OMU), prisoners on remand and serving less than 12 months (40% of the population) had no contact with OMU, and no one else had responsibility to support them in meeting any identified resettlement objectives (see main recommendation HP62).
- 4.10 OMU staff included a combination of probation officers, probation service officers and psychology assistants. A part-time senior probation officer undertook casework management reviews and supervision of probation staff, and the head of offender management did the same for psychology staff. Staff demonstrated a good understanding of offender assessment and risk management.
- 4.11 Only around one quarter (195) of prisoners were formally in scope for offender management, although a further 35% (272) were serving over 12 months and were also subject to OASys assessment and post-release supervision. In-scope prisoners were generally well managed with regular, usually monthly, contact. Communication with offender managers was good and feedback about the level and quality of engagement was positive. Communication about out-

of-scope prisoners, however, was less positive, and some offender managers felt that they had not received sufficient information from OMU before the prisoner's release. At the time of the inspection, 94% of all OASys assessments were up to date.

- 4.12 Sentence planning arrangements were variable, with inconsistent contributions from departments and sentence planning meetings rarely attended by staff other than the offender supervisor and offender manager; personal officers rarely made contributions. Sentence planning meetings for out-of-scope prisoners were usually just between the offender supervisor and prisoner to agree targets. Where offender managers did contribute to meetings, facilities at the prison were limited, and there were no teleconferencing facilities. Despite these problems, the sentence planning targets we saw were generally appropriate. Targets and evaluations of need for prisoners subject to OASys but not offender management were not routinely forwarded to identified offender managers.
- 4.13 Britannia House offered a positive opportunity for the 42 prisoners there to develop employment skills and experience before release. They usually had at least six months still to serve when they entered the category D facility. Around 40 prisoners at a time worked outside the prison and were subject to ROTL, most from Britannia House, although prisoners on the LDU could also have accessed such provision, subject to risk assessment. One LDU prisoner was working out at the time of the inspection, although there were sufficient work placements for around 70 prisoners.
- 4.14 There were difficulties in moving prisoners with identified sentence planning targets that could not be achieved at Norwich to alternative establishments – especially sex offenders and some indeterminate-sentenced prisoners, even though offender supervisors assessed the needs of the former reasonably quickly. There was a monthly meeting to prioritise prisoners for transfer, mostly for security purposes. The number of prisoners who moved varied considerably but had averaged around 15 to 18 a week in the previous month. We found prisoners who had been waiting more than 10 months for a progressive move.

Recommendations

- 4.15 **All staff and departments that have contact with prisoners, especially high and very high risk offenders, should be actively involved in their sentence planning.**
- 4.16 **Information sharing and communication between offender supervisors and offender managers should be improved, especially for out-of-scope prisoners, with quality assurance to ensure consistency.**
- 4.17 **The number of prisoners subject to release on temporary licence and working out of the prison should be extended to include more of those in the local discharge unit.**
- 4.18 **Prisoners who are unable to address their offending behaviour at Norwich should be moved to an appropriate establishment with minimum delay, and the prison should monitor prisoners released without completing offending behaviour work to establish and address the extent of the problem.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.19 Appropriate facilities, including teleconferencing, should be available for all sentence planning meetings.

Public protection

- 4.20 Public protection arrangements were well organised and managed, with monthly strategic meetings, fortnightly inter-departmental risk management team (IDRMT) meetings and a risk assessment group (RAG). All cases were given appropriate focus and meetings looked at information in detail. Offender supervisors maintained responsibility for their cases and attended IDRMT or RAG meetings as required. At the time of the inspection, the prison held six multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level three prisoners and 31 level two. A further 151 prisoners were MAPPA nominals (targeted for legitimate security reasons). There were appropriate arrangements to manage the 87 prisoners assessed as a risk to children and 96 subject to harassment monitoring.

Categorisation

- 4.21 Arrangements for recategorisation were appropriate and prisoners were automatically reviewed. In the previous six months, 22 of 90 prisoners reviewed (24%) had been successfully recategorised to D. Similarly, the prison automatically started the process for assessing prisoners for home detention curfew (HDC) and generally managed it appropriately. Although around 65% of prisoners considered were successful in achieving HDC, prisoners continued to be transferred while the process was under way.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.22 At the time of the inspection, there were 39 prisoners serving life sentences and a further 32 on an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP). All indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were allocated to one of the probation staff in the OMU. Contact was frequent and oriented to risk assessment and progression. Where necessary, MARAP and multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel (MALRAP) meetings were undertaken, and all were up to date at the time of the inspection. The prison identified prisoners on remand likely to receive an indeterminate sentence and offered support and guidance.

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.

- 4.23 Reintegration planning varied across the two prison sites, although it was good on the LDU. Access for prisoners on the reception site was significantly worse in most areas. Pathway work overall was generally reasonable, although more debt management support was needed. Support for visitors was good, but entry to visits was slow and needed improvement.
- 4.24 Arrangements for reintegration planning on the LDU were generally good, and prisoners here could see relevant resettlement services and departments with relative ease. There were also weekly drop-in clinics where prisoners could see providers. In the previous few weeks, similar arrangements had been put into place on the reception site but attendance had been poor. In our survey, significantly fewer respondents on the reception site knew who to speak to about

accommodation, education, benefits and employment. However, support for problem drug and alcohol users was consistently available on both sites.

- 4.25 Tribal staff undertook exit interviews and assessments approximately eight to 12 weeks before release and, where issues were still identified as barriers to effective resettlement, could make referrals to pathways. However, these pre-release assessments were limited and still did not include effective follow-up support or structured pre-release plans.

Recommendations

- 4.26 **All sentenced prisoners should have a structured pre-release meeting with input from relevant departments, which reviews their sentence/custody plan and identifies key post-release targets that are forwarded to offender managers, where appropriate.**
- 4.27 **The prison should expand the range of resettlement pathways provision to meet the needs of prisoners, including debt management work and parenting courses.**

Accommodation

- 4.28 Accommodation support was provided by Nacro with two full-time workers in post. The resettlement strategy group minutes and the results of needs analysis focus groups indicated consistent problems with the level of provision. Many prisoners complained that they had received little support or follow up to initial assessments. These problems appeared to have been resolved, although there were plans to increase the support available.
- 4.29 Prisoners were seen during their induction to identify and pursue any issues about maintaining previous tenancies or debt-related housing problems, and also in the last 12 months before release to find accommodation. Nacro helped approximately 10% of prisoners released each month to find accommodation. In our survey, 22% of respondents on the reception site said they had experienced problems with accommodation when they first arrived at Norwich. In the previous three months, 2.5% of released prisoners went to temporary accommodation and 4% had no fix accommodation.

Education, training and employment

- 4.30 There were insufficient vocational training opportunities to meet prisoners' resettlement needs, although the qualifications offered in PE provided real support for employment and prisoners were able to reach level 3 in appropriate and relevant skills (see also main recommendation HP61).
- 4.31 The previous contract with the Foundation Training Company for pre-release programmes had ceased and there was no longer any formal structured pre-release provision. Experienced staff from external agencies, such as Nacro and Move on East, provided one-to-one support for dealing with disclosure, interview techniques and writing CVs. The 'virtual campus' providing job search support was in its early stages.
- 4.32 The Britannia House resettlement unit was an excellent facility, well managed and very successful in providing ROTL for job search and training, community placements and employment. In particular the Chapelfield project and 'Making Ground' project with May

Gurney had provided a wide and relevant range of opportunities to meet prisoners' resettlement needs.

Health care

- 4.33 Nurses identified prisoners due for release and offered them pre-discharge health checks and planning. Discharge summaries were provided for their GP, and take-home medication and harm-minimisation packs were available. Prisoners on the LDU were often released before health care staff came on duty and left the prison without their medications, but this would be rectified when a revised staffing roster was introduced. There was a palliative and end-of-life care policy, and there were advance directives and regular gold standard framework meetings. Palliative care was of a high standard. Partnerships in Care staff acted as case managers to ensure coordinated transfer of care for patients subject to the care programme approach who were being released.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.34 The prison had led a review of IDTS services across all Eastern region prisons. Subsequent action resulted in improved transfer of prisoners requiring substance misuse support to other prisons in the area. There were good links with local drug intervention programme teams and discharge planning was adequate. Prisoners received information on harm minimisation from nursing and CARAT staff from reception through to release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.35 Provision under the finance benefit and debt pathway was underdeveloped. The prison's needs analysis had identified over 51% of the population with 'some or significant' issues with their financial situation. Despite this, there was no longer any debt management provision on either site. Prisoners could open a bank account and there was a three-week basic budgeting course, although attendance at this was low with only three prisoners on the programme during the inspection.

Recommendation

- 4.36 **There should be adequate support for prisoners with a finance, benefit or debt problem.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.37 The visitors' centre was run by the Ormiston Trust and open before and after visits sessions. Its impressive support included an accredited crèche where workers took children part-way through visits sessions to allow prisoners to have time with their family and partner separately. This provision mitigated the very limited play facilities in the visits halls. The Ormiston Trust had established good community links and provided appropriate access and information to families visiting the establishment. There was also a good range of information for families visiting prison for the first time
- 4.38 'Baby bonding' and Storybook Dads were also available. Ormiston provided and facilitated children's visits on both the reception site and LDU weekly on weekdays and once a month at weekends. Sessions were open to all prisoners with children, subject to security risk

assessments but regardless of their IEP status. However, the prison no longer ran any parenting courses for prisoners and/or their partners.

- 4.39 There was reasonable access to the visits telephone booking line and no significant delays. Visits could be booked by email, but this service was rarely used. During the inspection, a visit could be booked for the following day on the LDU and in three days' time in the main visits hall.
- 4.40 There was still a significant problem of delays for visitors in getting to the visits hall. The process of managing visitors through the main prison gate was slow, and there were often delays while prison vans were managed through the same area. We saw some visitors not able to get to the visits hall until almost an hour after the session had started, and we were told that this problem was not unusual.
- 4.41 Up until shortly before our inspection, prisoners were held in one of three small holding rooms in the visits area to await their visit, which many prisoners complained about and felt to be inappropriate. During the inspection, prisoners waited in the main visits hall. We were told that this had caused some problems with abuse shouted at vulnerable prisoners waiting for their visit, but we saw no direct evidence of this.
- 4.42 The main visits hall was large enough to accommodate up to 39 families, but was austere and could be very noisy when full. Both visitors and prisoners could use toilet facilities during visits. All prisoners had to wear bibs during visits, which was disproportionate.

Recommendation

- 4.43 **All visitors should be able to take their visits in time to benefit from the whole session, and in a relaxed and calm environment.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.44 The only accredited programme was the building skills for recovery drug programme (see paragraph 1.92). Further non-accredited programmes included the Norwich alcohol course and the A2Z motivational enhancement programme, but while both programmes were beneficial neither addressed offending behaviour. The prison's need analysis had identified significant gaps in provision, but these remained. It was not possible to identify the number of prisoners released from Norwich who had not engaged in any work to address their offending behaviour but, given the problems of transferring prisoners to appropriate establishments and from offender management feedback on recently released prisoners, it appeared to be significant. Offender supervisors did not regularly or consistently engage in structured one-to-one work to address offending behaviour to compensate for the limitations of programmes (see recommendation 4.18).

Section 5: Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 5.1 All vulnerable prisoners should be kept in a safe environment and be able to access a full regime. (HP56, repeated recommendation HP49)
 - 5.2 Case management and review arrangements for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved. (HP57)
 - 5.3 Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should only be held in the segregation unit, including special accommodation, when there are exceptional circumstances to justify this, and governance of use of force, particularly special accommodation, planned interventions and drawing and use of batons, should be improved. (HP58)
 - 5.4 Single cells should not be used for double occupancy, and the dormitories on E wing should not be used to house four prisoners. (HP59)
 - 5.5 The time prisoners have out of cell should be improved, particularly for those on the reception site and unemployed, and the core day should be closely adhered to. (HP60)
 - 5.6 The number and quality of activity places should be adequate to meet the identified needs of the population, and monitored to ensure they are fully utilised. (HP61)
 - 5.7 All prisoners, irrespective of their length of stay in custody, should have their resettlement needs fully assessed, access to appropriate services, and a regularly reviewed custody plan with specific targets for their resettlement needs. (HP62)

Recommendation

To NOMS

-
- 5.8 NOMS should continue to work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that prisoners held solely under immigration powers are transferred to an immigration removal centre on completion of their sentence. (2.45)

Recommendation

To Prisoner Escort and Custody Services (PECS)

-
- 5.9 Prisoners should not spend protracted time in court cells after they are dealt with by the courts, and should be escorted to the prison at the earliest opportunity. (1.6)

First days in custody

- 5.10 The prison should work with prisoners to understand their negative perceptions of the early days procedures reflected in our survey, and should ensure that new arrivals receive their basic entitlements and that their immediate needs are met. (1.20)
- 5.11 Information about the reception process should be available in a range of languages. (1.21)
- 5.12 Staff should routinely monitor prisoners in reception holding rooms. (1.22, repeated recommendation 1.35)
- 5.13 The first night interview record should be expanded to evidence relevant referrals and follow up information. (1.23, repeated recommendation 1.40)
- 5.14 All new arrivals should receive the full induction programme. (1.24, repeated recommendation HP47)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.15 The high level of violent incidents should be further reduced. (1.37)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.16 Support for Listeners, including facilities for them to see prisoners as required and in decent surroundings, should be improved. (1.45)

Safeguarding

- 5.17 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.50)

Security and rules

- 5.18 Strip searching of prisoners should only be intelligence-led or based on specific suspicion. (1.58)
- 5.19 Drug testing facilities on the local discharge unit should be improved and should include a holding area. (1.59)
- 5.20 Action decided in response to security information, especially information indicating the need for a drug test on the basis of suspicion, should be tracked and monitored to ensure it is carried through. (1.60, repeated recommendation 7.11)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.21 Reduction in IEP level should not be threatened or carried out on the basis of a single action, unless it meets criteria of seriousness clearly stated in the policy. (1.66, repeated recommendation 7.57)
- 5.22 Prisoners on the standard level should be able to apply for the enhanced level sooner than 12 weeks after their arrival. (1.67, repeated recommendation 7.62)

Discipline

- 5.23 All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached, and the quality assurance of adjudication records should be improved. (1.71)
- 5.24 Information collated for all disciplinary procedures, including use of force and segregation, should be analysed and used more effectively. (1.72)
- 5.25 The environment and regime in the segregation unit should be improved. (1.84)
- 5.26 The unlock levels in the segregation unit should be decided through a clear and proportionate assessment based on the individual prisoner's evidenced risk. (1.85, repeated recommendation 7.44)
- 5.27 Segregation review documentation and care/reintegration plans should be completed thoroughly, include meaningful targets and daily history sheets should better reflect constructive engagement between staff and prisoners. (1.86)

Substance use

- 5.28 The drug and alcohol strategy should contain an action plan for all key aspects of drug services, and there should be action to improve integrated working between services. (1.94)
- 5.29 Opiate-dependent users should have prompt access to medical services at weekends. (1.95)
- 5.30 All compact-based drug sampling should be undertaken under supervision, and testing facilities should be clean and compliant with infection control procedures. (1.96)

Residential units

- 5.31 Cells and other prisoner areas should be clean and in a good state of repair. (2.11)
- 5.32 Cell call bells should be responded to promptly. (2.12)
- 5.33 Toilets in shared cells should be appropriately screened or separated. (2.13, repeated recommendation 2.17)
- 5.34 All prisoners should be able to shower every day. (2.14, repeated recommendation 2.23)
- 5.35 Applications should be dealt with promptly and wing managers should carry out random quality checks monthly. (2.15, repeated recommendation 3.47)

- 5.36 Telephones on F and G wings should be private, with one telephone per 20 prisoners when wings are unlocked. (2.16)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.37 The prison should analyse the reason for poorer perceptions of staff-prisoner relationships among young adults and black and minority ethnic prisoners, and on particular wings, and take appropriate steps. (2.24, repeated recommendation 2.30)
- 5.38 The personal officer scheme should be fully implemented. (2.25, repeated recommendation 2.34)

Equality and diversity

- 5.39 Provision under all areas of diversity, including disability, older prisoners and sexual orientation, should be fully developed and all aspects of diversity should be monitored. (2.31)
- 5.40 The prison should investigate the poor perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners in our survey. (2.44)
- 5.41 There should be a formal carer/mentor scheme for prisoners with disabilities and older prisoners who require assistance. (2.46)
- 5.42 Prisoners unfit for work due to a disability should be unlocked during the day and provided with appropriate regime activities and equitable pay. (2.47)
- 5.43 Gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners should be provided with information on the internal and external support available. (2.48)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.44 Prisoners with mobility problems should be able to participate in corporate worship. (2.56, repeated recommendation 3.83)
- 5.45 Chaplains should be involved in reviews of prisoners in the segregation unit to assess their suitability to attend corporate worship. (2.57)

Legal rights

- 5.46 Legal services should be sufficient to meet the needs of prisoners. (2.64)

Health services

- 5.47 All clinical rooms should comply with current infection control standards. (2.77)
- 5.48 Clinical records should be stored in compliance with the Data Protection Act and used in accordance with the Caldicott principles on the use and confidentiality of personal health information. (2.90)

- 5.49 Group support, group therapy or therapeutic day services should be available to prisoners who need additional support for emotional, behavioural and common mental health problems, and the day care centre should be fully used for therapeutic purposes. (2.105)

Catering

- 5.50 The main kitchens and wing serveries, including the provision for serving meals and washing utensils on E wing, should be clean and functional. (2.112)
- 5.51 Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are to be eaten. (2.113, repeated recommendation 8.18)
- 5.52 Prisoners should be offered the opportunity to dine out of cell. (2.114, repeated recommendation 8.20)

Purchases

- 5.53 All prisoners, including new arrivals, should have weekly access to the prison shop. (2.120)

Time out of cell

- 5.54 Prisoners should have evening association on four evenings a week. (3.4, repeated recommendation HP55)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.55 All prisoners, including those in the inpatient and segregation units, should be provided with and participate in high quality purposeful activities. (3.13)
- 5.56 Learners' time should be better planned to reduce interruptions and disruptions to their activities. (3.14)
- 5.57 The prison should increase basic retirement pay for those beyond retirement age who choose not to work. (3.15)
- 5.58 The prison should improve the quality of careers advice, education, vocational training and work for vulnerable prisoners. (3.19)
- 5.59 Initial assessments of the English language skills of prisoners who speak English as an additional language and those with dyslexia should be used to provide appropriate support throughout the prison. (3.20)
- 5.60 The prison should refurbish the upstairs education rooms in the local discharge unit. (3.21)
- 5.61 Prisoners' development of non-accredited skills should be recognised and recorded. (3.23)
- 5.62 All prisoners should have good access to the library and receive a full induction to the service. (3.28)

- 5.63 There should be better links between the library and learning and skills and work staff to ensure the provision of appropriate up-to-date material, and computers for prisoners in the libraries should be upgraded. (3.29)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.64 The prison should install privacy screens in the showers and improve the toilet facilities for the gym on the local discharge unit. (3.35)
- 5.65 The prison should plan outdoor PE facilities on the reception site. (3.36)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.66 The resettlement strategy meeting and policy should ensure that all prisoners, particularly those who do not transfer to the local discharge unit (LDU), have equitable and consistent access to resettlement services. (4.7, repeated recommendation 9.18)

Offender management and planning

- 5.67 All staff and departments that have contact with prisoners, especially high and very high risk offenders, should be actively involved in their sentence planning. (4.15)
- 5.68 Information sharing and communication between offender supervisors and offender managers should be improved, especially for out-of-scope prisoners, with quality assurance to ensure consistency. (4.16)
- 5.69 The number of prisoners subject to release on temporary licence and working out of the prison should be extended to include more of those in the local discharge unit. (4.17)
- 5.70 Prisoners who are unable to address their offending behaviour at Norwich should be moved to an appropriate establishment with minimum delay, and the prison should monitor prisoners released without completing offending behaviour work to establish and address the extent of the problem. (4.18)

Reintegration planning

- 5.71 All sentenced prisoners should have a structured pre-release meeting with input from relevant departments, which reviews their sentence/custody plan and identifies key post-release targets that are forwarded to offender managers, where appropriate. (4.26)
- 5.72 The prison should expand the range of resettlement pathways provision to meet the needs of prisoners, including debt management work and parenting courses. (4.27)
- 5.73 There should be adequate support for prisoners with a finance, benefit or debt problem. (4.36)
- 5.74 All visitors should be able to take their visits in time to benefit from the whole session, and in a relaxed and calm environment. (4.43)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escort and transfers

To PECS

- 5.75 Escort vans should be clean and free from graffiti, and prisoners travelling long distances should be offered a toilet break. (1.7)

First days in custody

- 5.76 Reading materials for new arrivals should be available in reception. (1.25)

Substance use

- 5.77 Prisoners should have access to Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous and Gambling Anonymous services. (1.97)

Residential units

- 5.78 All prisoners should receive a full kit change every week. (2.17)

Equality and diversity

- 5.79 The prison should provide displays that reflect the cultural and racial mix in the prison. (2.49)

Health services

- 5.80 Health care waiting rooms should have more comfortable seating. (2.78)
- 5.81 All cells in the inpatient facility should be kept clean and, where needed, refurbished. (2.79)
- 5.82 Health care information material should be accessible to prisoners with poor literacy. (2.80)
- 5.83 Primary health care and health promotion information should be available in the health waiting rooms. (2.81)
- 5.84 The non-uptake of meningitis C vaccine should be subject to clinical audit. (2.91)
- 5.85 The medicines and therapeutics committee should formally adopt an out of hours policy, regularly review the special sick policy to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied, and ensure that all pharmacy staff are aware of all policies and procedures related to medicines prescribing, management and administration. (2.95)
- 5.86 Medication should be stored in an orderly manner, and pharmacy staff should visit the treatment areas frequently to check and remove out-of-date stock and incorrectly prepared or labelled items. (2.96)
- 5.87 Out-of-date pharmacy reference books should be discarded and replaced by the current editions. (2.97)

- 5.88 Maximum and minimum drug fridge temperatures should be recorded daily to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2-8°C range. Corrective action should be taken if necessary, and this should be monitored by pharmacy staff. (2.98)
- 5.89 Prisoners should be permitted to have clinically advised dental health products in possession. (2.101)

Purchases

- 5.90 The prison should progress its plans for wing staff to track the progress of prisoner catalogue purchases. (2.121)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.91 Library book loss should be significantly reduced. (3.30)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.92 Fresh drinking water should be provided for prisoners in the PE provision in the LDU. (3.37)
- 5.93 The extraction and ventilation facilities in the gym showers on the reception site should be improved. (3.38)

Offender management and planning

- 5.94 Appropriate facilities, including teleconferencing, should be available for all sentence planning meetings. (4.19)

Examples of good practice

- 5.95 The use of serving prisoners at local courts to reassure and help prisoners due to be transferred to the prison helped to settle prisoners during their first night in custody. (1.8)
- 5.96 Fax machines had been installed on residential wings to help prisoners contact their legal representatives. (2.65)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Michael Skidmore	Researcher
Chloe Flint	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Helen Carter	Substance use inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Deborah Hyland	Pharmacist
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted team leader
Karen Adriaanse	Ofsted inspector
Sandra Summers	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety	
Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.	
<p>At the last inspection, in 2010, reception procedures were generally satisfactory but the environment was poor. First night procedures were carried out in reception. Newly arrived vulnerable prisoners were held in segregation or on A5 landing. We were not assured that all prisoners, in particular vulnerable prisoners received induction. Violence reduction and self-harm procedures had been given a high priority and were generally effective, but the volume of monitoring documents affected the quality of case management. The segregation regime was limited but access to amenities was reasonable and risk assessment and unlock protocols required clarification. Use of force was significant, but there was some evidence that it was reducing. Prisoners, including those on the vulnerable prisoners unit, felt safe. Integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) procedures were good and continuing to develop. We found that outcomes for prisoners in Norwich were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.</p>	
Main recommendations	
All new arrivals should receive the full induction programme. (HP47)	Not achieved. (Recommendation repeated, 1.24)
All new arrivals should have a first night interview on a dedicated first night centre to assess and address any immediate needs. (HP48)	Partially achieved.
All vulnerable prisoners should be kept in a safe environment and be able to access a full regime. (HP49)	Not achieved. (Recommendation repeated, HP56)
Recommendations	
Prisoners should be given advance notice of planned transfers, unless there are well-evidenced security reasons not to do so. (1.9)	Achieved
Reception should remain open every lunchtime. (1.10)	Achieved
Prisoners should arrive at the prison before 7.30pm. (1.11)	Achieved
Prisoners should be given written information at court about Norwich in a language they understand. (1.12)	Achieved

All staff working in reception should be appropriately trained. (1.33)	Achieved
All reception and first night interviews should take place in private. (1.38)	Achieved
A trained Listener should be available at all times in reception when there are new arrivals. (1.39)	Achieved
The induction session should use a range of media. (1.42)	Achieved
The effectiveness of anti-bullying interventions should be evaluated. (3.13)	Achieved
There should be a needs assessment of the young adult population, and a strategy should be developed for their overall management. (3.39)	Achieved
Monthly security reports should track trends and patterns over a 12-month period, and decisions and objectives should reflect such analysis. (7.8)	Achieved
Adjudicating governors should check that the prisoner understands the process and can read the papers. (7.34)	Achieved
Managers should monitor and analyse the number of adjudications on young adults. (7.35)	Achieved
There should be an overarching behaviour management strategy showing the relation between incentives and earned privileges, disciplinary, anti-bullying and similar policies. (7.36)	Achieved
The showers in the segregation unit should be refurbished or replaced. (7.41)	Achieved
Prisoners should never be located in the segregation unit solely because no cell is available on normal location. (7.42)	Achieved
Any restrictions in regime access in the segregation unit should be justified as part of an individual care or risk management plan, and should never include restrictions on telephone calls to family or friends (7.60)	Achieved
The reception area should be refurbished to ensure it is welcoming and fit for purpose. (1.34)	Partially achieved
Information about the reception process should be displayed prominently and widely throughout reception and should be available in a range of languages. (1.37)	Partially achieved
The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy should state clearly the grounds and process for an IEP review, and managers should specifically monitor adherence to these aspects of the policy. (7.56)	Partially achieved
Prisoners to be strip searched in visits should be selected in a systematic and/or random manner that minimises the exercise of discretion by staff. (7.10)	Partially achieved
Incidents of use of force should be systematically reviewed, in detail and with	Partially achieved

analysis by age, ethnicity and other key categories, at a regular policy meeting attended by senior management. (7.39)	
There should be a thorough analysis of the issues causing an over representation of young, black and minority ethnic and the location of at risk prisoners in the segregation unit, leading to a strategy for managing these groups more effectively in the residential units. (7.43)	Partially achieved
Staff should routinely monitor prisoners in holding rooms. (1.35)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.22)
Prisoners should have access to material to keep them occupied while in holding rooms. (1.36)	Not achieved
The first night interview record should be expanded to evidence relevant referrals and follow up information. (1.40)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.23)
All prisoners should be able to have a telephone call and a shower on their day of arrival. (1.41)	Not achieved
There should be a separate induction programme for vulnerable prisoners. (1.43)	Not achieved
Senior managers should examine the number of and reason for assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents being opened to ensure that they are used appropriately, and ensure that there are sufficient staff resources and support to deal with those cases. (3.30)	Not achieved
Day care support should be available for prisoners at risk of self-harm. (3.31)	Not achieved
Case management and support plans for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved. (3.32)	Not achieved
Care planning should be improved, and case reviews should be attended by a range of staff who know the prisoner. (3.33)	Not achieved
All prisoners should have 24-hour access to Listeners. (3.34)	Not achieved
There should be a properly equipped Listener suite on E wing. (3.35)	Not achieved
Prisoners should only be strip searched on admission to the segregation unit when there is evidence to justify the decision. (7.9)	Not achieved
Action decided in response to security information, especially information indicating the need for a drug test on the basis of suspicion, should be tracked and monitored to ensure it is carried through. (7.11)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.60)
All suspicion tests under mandatory drug testing (MDT) should be completed within an appropriate timescale. (3.102)	Not achieved
Drug testing facilities on the local discharge unit should include holding	Not achieved

facilities. (3.103)	
Reduction in IEP level should not be threatened or carried out on the basis of a single action, unless it meets criteria of seriousness clearly stated in the policy (7.57)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.66)
Prisoners on the standard level should be able to apply for the enhanced level sooner than 12 weeks after their arrival (7.62)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.67)
The record of every incident of use of force (including live recording if available) should include a written assessment from a senior manager. (7.37)	Not achieved
All planned interventions involving use of force should be filmed. (7.38)	Not achieved
Prisoners should be removed from special accommodation as soon as their behaviour ceases to be violent or refractory. (7.40)	Not achieved
The unlock levels in the segregation unit should be decided through a clear and proportionate assessment based on the individual prisoner's evidenced risk. (7.44)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 1.85)
In-cell education materials, and if possible professional educational support, should be available to segregated prisoners. (7.45)	Not achieved
All compact-based drug sampling should be undertaken under supervision. (9.93)	Not achieved
The application of the IEP scheme to prisoners on the older prisoner unit should be scrapped unless it has a genuine purpose in that context (7.61)	No longer relevant

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2010, the environment in the main prison was good except for E wing, which was poor, and the grounds, which were littered. The limitations of the LDU were mitigated by a reasonable unlock regime, but cells were too small and facilities were inadequate. Staff-prisoner relationships were reasonable, but young and black and minority ethnic prisoners had poorer perceptions. Personal officer work was limited. Race equality work was prioritised, and there was some work on disability, but black and minority ethnic prisoners still had negative perceptions of their experience. Work on other strands of diversity, including foreign nationals and older prisoners, was underdeveloped. The food was satisfactory but repetitive, and better consultation with prisoners was needed. Prisoners had limited confidence in the handling of applications and complaints. Health care provision was complex and the inpatient regime limited, although the quality of care was improving. Mental health care was inadequate to meet need and access to health services needed to be better organised. We found that outcomes for prisoners in Norwich were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations	
Single cells should not be used for double occupancy, especially on the local discharge unit. (HP50)	Not achieved.
Each strand of diversity should be covered by an up-to-date policy and action plan. (HP51)	Achieved.
Recommendations	
External areas across the establishment should be kept clean and there should be appropriate regular management checks (2.18)	Achieved
Prisoners should be given clear instructions about what constitutes an emergency for using cell bells, and how non-emergency issues are managed when they are locked in their cells (2.19)	Achieved
Prisoners should not be charged double for their television in a shared cell, and charges should be commensurate with other establishments (2.20)	Achieved
Prisoners should receive their mail within 24 hours of its delivery to the prison. (2.21)	Achieved
There should be a multidisciplinary diversity committee that meets at least bimonthly and manages all strands of diversity, including race equality, foreign nationals, disability, age, religion, gender and sexual orientation. (4.5)	Achieved
The prison should undertake equality impact assessments of its policies and functions covering all strands of diversity. (4.6)	Achieved
The race equality action team (REAT) should determine the local areas to be covered by ethnic monitoring to inform its understanding of race equality at Norwich. (4.21)	Achieved
Where ethnic monitoring indicates that the representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners is significantly or consistently out of range, the race equality action team should investigate thoroughly and take action to address issues identified. (4.22)	Achieved
All incidents of racist language or conduct should be challenged. (4.23)	Achieved
The prison should work with the UKBA to ensure that monthly reviews of foreign nationals held under detention orders are meaningful and chart any progress in the case or indicate why progress has not been made. (4.40)	Achieved
The foreign national policy and other important information should be accurate and available in a range of languages. (4.42)	Achieved
All foreign national prisoners should be given a copy of the foreign national prisoner handbook in their own language. (4.43)	Achieved

The prison should have a log of prisoners with disabilities. (4.55)	Achieved
Staff should be aware of the identity and location of all prisoners who need help in an emergency, and all prisoners who require such help should have a personal emergency evacuation plan. (4.61)	Achieved
There should be an older prisoner forum where older prisoners can share their experiences and discuss their concerns. (4.70)	Achieved
Retirement pay should be consistent across the prison. (4.71)	Achieved
A coordinating chaplain should be appointed as a matter of urgency. (3.80)	Achieved
The chaplaincy should have sufficient resources to provide pastoral support for prisoners, and attend segregation reviews and ACCT reviews where their presence would be beneficial. (3.81)	Achieved
There should be a Muslim chaplain to lead Friday prayers on the local discharge unit (LDU). (3.82)	Achieved
The multi-faith room in the main prison should be relocated or refurbished and equipped with facilities to enable Muslim prisoners to wash before prayers. Pending such facilities, Muslim prisoners should be able to wash on their residential units before attending Friday prayers. (3.84)	Achieved
Information on the complaints process should be freely available on every wing and in a range of languages and formats. (3.48)	Achieved
There should be a quality assurance system to monitor all aspects of the complaints system, including the timeliness and the quality of responses. (3.49)	Achieved
Legal mail should not be tampered with unnecessarily or opened inappropriately by staff. (3.64)	Achieved
All NHS policies should be up to date. (5.62)	Achieved
There should be a lead nurse, of sufficient seniority, with responsibility for all older prisoners at the establishment. (5.64)	Achieved
Each patient should have one contemporaneous record of clinical care and interventions. (5.65)	Achieved
Meningitis C vaccinations should be offered to young men. (5.66)	Achieved
The partnership board and NHS Norfolk should investigate the delays in the application and appointments systems to ensure that all prisoners have equity of access to care. (5.67)	Achieved
All prisoners should be able to see an optician within a reasonable period. (5.68)	Achieved

The health trainers' scheme should be closely aligned with health services. (5.69)	Achieved
All medication should be securely stored. (5.70)	Achieved
The controlled drugs cabinet key should be kept under sufficient security. (5.73)	Achieved
Prisoners should have the minimum number of prescription charts. Steps should be taken to lessen the risk of medications being missed or duplicated or the chart being illegal. (5.75)	Achieved
The dental waiting lists should be computerised. (5.77)	Achieved
There should be one dental waiting list per surgery. (5.78)	Achieved
A hygienist or therapist should be employed to facilitate reduction of the waiting lists for the main prison dental surgery and input oral health education. (5.79)	Achieved
The skill mix on the inpatient unit should be appropriate to meet the needs of the population. (5.81)	Achieved
The GP service should be reviewed, with a view to making permanent appointments to ensure continuity of care. (5.83)	Achieved
Uniformed staff should have the appropriate training to recognise and take appropriate action for prisoners with mental health problems. (5.85)	Achieved
No prisoner should have his IEP level reduced when he is segregated, unless through a normal IEP review board (7.58)	Achieved
The IEP scheme should not contain elements specifically for the segregation unit, nor should that unit have its own IEP arrangements (7.59)	Achieved
All prisoners working in catering services should be appropriately trained. (8.11)	Achieved
Menus should offer healthy, varied and balanced choices that allow prisoners to choose five portions of fresh fruit and vegetables each day. (8.13)	Achieved
Medical diets should be catered for within reasonable timescales, and provision for prisoners with diabetes should be improved. (8.14)	Achieved
There should be improved management of catering standards to ensure that temperatures, cleaning schedules and daily checks of food are completed. (8.16)	Achieved
Staff and managers should ensure that food for E wing prisoners is not contaminated and be able to offer consistent assurance to prisoners. (8.17)	Achieved

Lunch should be served between noon and 1.30pm and dinner between 5pm and 6.30pm. (8.19)	Achieved
Prisoners should be more widely consulted about catering services. (8.21)	Achieved
The collection of shop order forms should be re-organised to minimise the chance of staff misplacing forms (8.28)	Achieved
Prisoners on E wing should have access to their own laundry facilities (2.22)	Partially achieved
The personal officer scheme should be fully implemented. (2.34)	Partially achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.25)
The immigration clerk and foreign national coordinator should receive training for their roles. (4.41)	Partially achieved
All prisoners with disabilities should have care plans outlining their specific needs and how these will be met. Arrangements should be multidisciplinary and involve all departments engaging in work related to that person's disability. (4.58)	Partially achieved
The policy on sexual orientation should incorporate strategies for preventing and dealing with discrimination, and provide information on the internal and external support available for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners. (4.76)	Partially achieved
Loose tablets and tablet foils do not satisfy labelling requirements and should not be present in stock. (5.71)	Partially achieved
Unused patient-specific medication should be promptly disposed of and not returned to stock or used for other patients. (5.72)	Partially achieved
The routine use of Henley bags should be phased out. Medication written up as not in possession should be dispensed to individual patients in conventional containers or original manufacturers' packs, and administered by nurses at the appropriate treatment times. (5.74)	Partially achieved
Prisoners should have access to a full range of primary mental health services, including talking therapies. (5.82)	Partially achieved
Toilets in shared cells should be appropriately screened or separated (2.17)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.13)
All prisoners should be able to shower every day (2.23)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.14)
The prison should analyse the reason for poorer perceptions of staff-prisoner relationships among young adults and black and minority ethnic prisoners, and on particular wings, and take appropriate steps. (2.30)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.24)

Applications should be dealt with promptly and wing managers should carry out random quality checks monthly. (3.47)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.15)
The prison should hold regular focus groups with prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and respond to the issues raised. (4.24)	Not achieved
There should be displays in all areas of the prison that reflect the cultural and racial diversity of the population. (4.25)	Not achieved
NOMS should work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that prisoners held solely under immigration powers are transferred to an immigration removal centre on completion of their sentence or given a detailed explanation of the reasons this is not possible. (4.39).	Not achieved
The foreign national coordinator should have sufficient time allocated to carry out the role. (4.44)	Not achieved
The prison should monitor and analyse the treatment of prisoners by religion and rectify any inequalities. (4.29)	Not achieved
The prison should investigate why black and minority ethnic prisoners are less likely than white prisoners to feel that their religious beliefs are respected. (4.30)	Not achieved
The prison should monitor and analyse equality of treatment by disability and take action to rectify any inequalities. (4.56)	Not achieved
The disability liaison officer should be allocated sufficient time to carry out the role. (4.57)	Not achieved
There should be a forum where prisoners with disabilities can meet together and discuss their concerns. (4.59)	Not achieved
There should be a carer/mentor scheme for prisoners with disabilities. (4.60)	Not achieved
Prisoners who are unfit for work due to a disability should be unlocked during the day and provided with appropriate regime activities. (4.62)	Not achieved
The prison should monitor and analyse equality of treatment by age and take action to rectify any inequalities. (4.68)	Not achieved
There should be a formal carers scheme for older prisoners who require it. (4.69)	Not achieved
Prisoners with mobility problems should be able to participate in corporate worship. (3.83)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.56)
Prisoners in the segregation unit should be able to attend corporate worship, unless an individual risk assessment indicates otherwise. (3.85)	Not achieved

Trained legal services officers should be detailed daily to see all new prisoners. (3.59)	Not achieved
All eligible prisoners should be followed up by the bail information staff. (3.60)	Not achieved
Prisoners should be able to contact their solicitors or legal representatives by telephone. (3.61)	Not achieved
There should be a needs analysis of legal visits and the provision amended if appropriate. (3.62)	Not achieved
Staff should signpost prisoners to services to help them to understand their sentence, and should offer assistance to prisoners who cannot read or write. (3.63)	Not achieved
The library should stock appropriate legal reference materials, and prisoners should have adequate access to this. (3.65)	Not achieved
Prisoners should be cared for in health care conditions that maintain decency, privacy and dignity and have appropriate infection control. This should include the reception clinical rooms, waiting rooms, the dental surgeries and inpatient facilities. (5.63).	Not achieved
A washer/disinfector should be installed in the main prison dental surgery, and proposals for compliance with best practice should be in place. (5.76)	Not achieved
Inpatient beds should not be included in the certified normal accommodation. (5.80)	Not achieved
There should be day services for prisoners who need additional therapeutic support for mental health problems. (5.84)	Not achieved
The flooring in the LDU kitchen should be replaced. (8.10)	Not achieved
Prisoners working in the kitchen should be able to work towards a national vocational qualification. (8.12)	Not achieved
The bain-marie on E wing should be replaced with a more appropriate servery. (8.15)	Not achieved
Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are to be eaten. (8.18)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.113)
Prisoners should be offered the opportunity to dine out of cell. (8.20)	Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, 2.114)

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2010, the education curriculum was narrow and the quality of teaching variable. Management of learning and skills was weak and none of the concerns identified at our last in section had been addressed. Achievements for those who completed courses were reasonable, but punctuality and attendance were poor. Vocational training was very limited and low level. The number and quality of activity places was inadequate, with about a third of prisoners recorded as unemployed. PE provision was impressive, despite the limited facilities, and access was good. Time out of cell and access to association were generally poor, especially in the main prison where we found half the population locked in cell during the working day. On the local discharge unit, prisoners were unlocked for much of the day. The small number of prisoners on Britannia House had an open regime with good access to work, training and activity. We found that outcomes for prisoners in Norwich were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Prisoners should have evening association on four evenings a week. (HP55)	Not achieved. (Recommendation repeated, 3.4)
Leadership and management of learning and skills should be improved, and quality assurance mechanisms should be in place to improve standards of teaching and learning. (HP52)	Partially achieved.
There should be additional vocational training places, based on a needs analysis. (HP53)	Partially achieved.
All prisoners should have access to meaningful and purposeful activity, and existing spaces should be fully used. (HP54)	Not achieved.

Recommendations

The cancellation of exercise should be properly authorised in accordance with reasonable published criteria. (6.49)	Achieved
The planned painting and decorating course should be introduced as a matter of urgency. (6.23)	Achieved
The prison should make reasonable adjustments to ensure that prisoners who do not speak English are able to work. (6.26)	Achieved
Community and employer links should be further developed to secure PE related work placements, employment and training on release. (6.37)	Achieved
PE facilities in the LDU should be improved. (6.38)	Achieved
There should be sufficient showers in all gyms for prisoners who wish to	Achieved

shower after sessions. (6.39)	
There should be a general unlock each morning with access to domestic time. (6.48)	Partially achieved
The education curriculum should be further developed to meet the needs of the whole prison population. (6.22)	Partially achieved
The prison and the education provider should establish and use accurate data systems to monitor and manage learning and skills and work provision. (6.24)	Partially achieved
Initial assessment of support needs and provision for English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) should be improved to meet the needs of all prisoners requiring support. (6.25)	Partially achieved
Punctuality at workshops and classes should be improved, and the hours allocated for education should be used fully and efficiently. (6.27)	Partially achieved
The education accommodation in the local discharge unit (LDU) should be improved. (6.28)	Partially achieved
All prisoners should have access to library resources. (6.29)	Partially achieved
There should be an increase in time out of cell available to prisoners in the main prison. (6.46)	Not achieved
The requirements of the published core day should be fully adhered to. (6.47)	Not achieved
The association room on the local discharge unit should be refurbished and re-equipped. (6.50)	Not achieved
The library stock should be improved to meet the needs of the population, including more material in foreign languages. (6.30)	Not achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2010, there had been some progress in the prison's approach to resettlement, despite weak governance structures and no recent needs analysis. The introduction of the LDU had begun to address the needs of local prisoners. Britannia House continued to provide a good quality resettlement service. Offender management arrangements were good, and there was custody planning for prisoners on the LDU. There was no sentence planning and limited resettlement provision for most prisoners in the main prison. The case management of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was satisfactory, but service provision was less well developed. Services across most of the resettlement pathways were reasonable. We found that outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations	
The prison's resettlement strategy should be linked to the regional strategy, and should recognise and make provision for meeting the needs of all prisoners from the time of reception. (HP56)	Achieved
Recommendations	
The resettlement strategy should be underpinned by a clear action plan with development milestones, and progress should be monitored by the resettlement strategy meeting. (9.15)	Achieved
The resettlement strategy should be informed by a comprehensive annual needs analysis of all prisoners, and should include an evaluation of the needs of minority groups. (9.16)	Achieved
The resettlement strategy meeting should be convened in accordance with the published timetable. (9.17)	Achieved
Prisoners transferred to Britannia House should be serving long enough sentences to benefit from the full regime. (9.20)	Achieved
There should be frequent management checks of offender management unit (OMU) databases to provide assurance that they are accurate and that all eligible prisoners are identified. (9.49)	Achieved
Community-based offender managers should forward notes of sentence planning meetings to the prison in a timely manner. (9.51)	Achieved
The needs of potential life-sentenced prisoners should be monitored and reviewed while they are remanded. (9.55)	Achieved
More staff in regular contact with life-sentenced prisoners should be lifer trained, particularly health care staff working on L wing. (9.57)	Achieved
All prisoners should have their initial housing needs identified during induction, and those with specific needs should have access to accommodation support services. (9.74)	Achieved
All prisoners should be offered the opportunity to open a bank account before release. (9.81)	Achieved
All prisoners should be able to access money management courses. (9.82)	Achieved
There should be a full range of counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) interventions based on prisoners' specific needs. (9.92)	Achieved
Managers should take further measures to improve access to visits booking, and monitor outcomes. (9.106)	Achieved

Baby changing facilities should be provided in the visits areas. (9.107)	Achieved
All prisoners convicted of a sex offence should have their treatment needs assessed at the earliest opportunity. (9.121)	Achieved
The resettlement strategy meeting and policy should ensure that all prisoners, particularly those who do not transfer to the local discharge unit (LDU), have equitable and consistent access to resettlement services. (9.18)	Partially achieved (Recommendation repeated, 4.7)
All services that support reintegration planning should be widely promoted to prisoners. (9.19)	Partially achieved
All prisoners should have an initial assessment of their resettlement needs across all resettlement pathways. (9.45)	Partially achieved
All prisoners should attend a pre-discharge review board eight weeks before release to review their custody/sentence plan objectives and ensure appropriate resettlement arrangements are in place to review their custody/sentence plan objectives. (9.48)	Partially achieved
Facilities for life-sentenced prisoners should be extended to include regular forums and other support. (9.56)	Partially achieved
All prisoners should have their housing needs assessed in advance of their release to ensure that accommodation in the community is settled. Where it is not, they should be given specialist help and support. (9.75)	Partially achieved
There should be a structured plan to manage the demand for clinical provision for substance misuse. (3.99)	Partially achieved
Clinical substance misuse and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services should improve joint work and provide fully integrated care. (3.100)	Partially achieved
Integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) groupwork should be delivered to an agreed schedule and jointly between CARATs and substance misuse workers. (3.101)	Partially achieved
All short-term and unconvicted prisoners should have a custody plan. (9.46)	Not achieved
Targets set in short-term intervention plans should be specific, measurable and time bound. (9.47)	Not achieved
There should be designated, properly equipped facilities for sentence planning boards. (9.50)	Not achieved
Formal multidisciplinary sentence planning boards should be held for all eligible prisoners following offender assessment system (OASys) assessments or reviews. (9.52)	Not achieved
The role of personal officers in offender management and sentence planning	Not achieved

work should be agreed and monitored. (9.53)	
Prisoners should not be transferred while home detention curfew assessments are under way. (9.54)	Not achieved
All prisoners should be given information and assistance to access health and social services on release, and support in accessing services if required (9.79)	Not achieved
The role of the debt and legal advice service should be clarified and clearly advertised with information about how to access it. (9.80)	Not achieved
Managers should take further measures to improve access to visits booking, and monitor outcomes. (9.106)	Not achieved
The flooring of the main site visits hall should be renewed. (9.108)	Achieved
Prisoners should be able to access programmes needed to address their risk of reoffending and risk factors while at Norwich. (9.120)	Not achieved
The St Giles Trust housing support project should be better utilised to meet the needs of prisoners released to the locality. (9.76)	No longer relevant
All prisoners should have access to resettlement services delivered by the FTC, including the pre-release course. (9.77)	No longer relevant

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	63	441	66.4
Recall	18	115	17.52
Remand	11	105	15.28
Detainees	-	6	0.79
Total	92	667	100 (759)

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	21	165	24.51
Less than 6 months	7	63	9.22
6 months to less than 12 months	8	46	7.11
12 months to less than 2 years	21	106	16.73
2 years to less than 3 years	21	67	11.59
3 years to less than 4 years	7	54	8.04
4 years to less than 10 years	5	85	11.86
10 years and over (not life)	-	27	3.56
ISPP	-	18	2.37
Life	2	36	5.01
Total	92	667	100 (759)

Age	Number of prisoners	%
<i>Minimum age: 18</i>		
Under 21 years	92	12.12
21 years to 29 years	270	35.57
30 years to 39 years	186	24.51
40 years to 49 years	122	16.07
50 years to 59 years	51	6.72
60 years to 69 years	24	3.16
70 plus years: <i>maximum age=92</i>	14	1.84
Total	759	100

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	80	587	87.88
Foreign Nationals	10	74	11.07
Not stated	2	6	1.05
Total	92	667	100 (759)

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	5	23	3.69
Uncategorised sentenced	18	148	21.87
Cat B	-	41	5.4
Cat C	-	388	51.12
Cat D	-	61	8.04
Others	69	6	9.88
Total	92	667	100 (759)

Ethnicity	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
<i>White</i>			
British	69	519	77.47
Irish	2	5	0.92
Other white	3	51	7.11

<i>Total</i>	74	575	85.51 (649)
<i>Mixed</i>			
White and black Caribbean	1	7	1.05
White and black African	1	3	0.53
White and Asian	1	1	0.26
Other mixed	2	5	0.92
<i>Total</i>	5	16	2.77 (21)
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>			
Indian	1	1	0.26
Bangladeshi	-	1	0.13
Other Asian	1	13	1.84
<i>Total</i>	2	15	2.24 (17)
<i>Black or black British</i>			
Caribbean	3	27	3.95
African	5	12	2.24
Other black	1	12	1.71
<i>Total</i>	9	51	7.91 (60)
Other ethnic group	-	1	0.26
<i>Total</i>	0	1	0.13 (1)
Not stated	2	9	1.45
<i>Total</i>	2	9	1.45 (11)
Total	92	667	100 (759)

Religion	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	-	2	0.26
Church of England	10	147	20.69
Roman Catholic	17	112	16.99
Other Christian denominations	8	73	10.67
Muslim	9	39	6.32
Sikh	-	2	0.26
Hindu	-	2	0.26
Buddhist	-	16	2.11
Other	5	53	7.64
No religion	43	221	34.78
Total	92	667	100 (759)

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of staff	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	22	2.9	150	19.76
1 month to 3 months	30	3.95	190	25.03
3 months to 6 months	22	2.9	146	19.24
6 months to 1 year	12	1.58	109	14.36
1 year to 2 years	6	0.79	46	6.06
2 years to 4 years	-	-	14	1.84
4 years or more	-	-	12	1.58
Total	92	12.12	667	87.88

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

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

At the time of the survey on 10 January 2012, the prisoner population at HMP Norwich was 709. The sample size was 203. Overall, this represented 29% of the prisoner population.

Britannia House, a resettlement unit at HMP Norwich with a discrete open prison function, was sampled separately. This unit held 42 prisoners and all were offered a survey.

Selecting the sample

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

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. Two respondents were interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

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

Response rates

On the main site, 173 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 24% of the prison population. The response rate was 85%. In addition to the eight respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 10 questionnaires were not returned and 12 were returned blank.

At Britannia House, 27 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 64% of the population of this unit and, as all prisoners received a survey, this was also the response rate. Eleven questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current main site survey responses in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 37 local prisons since 2006.
- The current survey responses in 2012 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Norwich in 2010.
- The Britannia House survey responses in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in open prisons. The comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys in 13 open prisons since 2007.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those aged 21 and under and those over 21.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be veterans (ex-armed services) and those who do not.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the vulnerable prisoner wings (E and a landing on A) and the rest of the establishment.

In all the above documents, statistical significance is used to indicate whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are

significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

Summary

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

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

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

Summary of prisoner survey results – Closed

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	25	(15%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	56	(33%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	40	(23%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	25	(15%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	14	(8%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	8	(5%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	99	(58%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	22	(13%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	21	(12%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	26	(15%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	49	(30%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	22	(13%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	14	(9%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	22	(13%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	26	(16%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	12	(7%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	8	(5%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	6	(4%)
	<i>Life</i>	5	(3%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	<i>Yes</i>	19	(11%)
	<i>No</i>	149	(89%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	164	(99%)
	<i>No</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	165	(98%)
	<i>No</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	129	(75%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>White - other</i>	14	(8%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> ..	10	(6%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	4	(2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	5	(3%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	0	(0%)

<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Arab</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> ...	0 (0%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)		

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

Yes	10 (6%)
No	155 (94%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	57 (35%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	42 (26%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	34 (21%)	<i>Muslim</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Protestant</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Sikh</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Other</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	6 (4%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	163 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	1 (1%)

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

Yes	41 (24%)
No	131 (76%)

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

Yes	16 (10%)
No	149 (90%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	56 (33%)
No	114 (67%)

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

Yes	82 (49%)
No	86 (51%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	125 (73%)
Yes	13 (8%)
No	25 (15%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (5%)

Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	125 (73%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	38 (22%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (5%)

Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	108 (65%)
	No	49 (29%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	135 (80%)
	No	30 (18%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than two hours	125 (74%)
	Yes	5 (3%)
	No	38 (22%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	56 (33%)
	Well	81 (47%)
	Neither	26 (15%)
	Badly	4 (2%)
	Very badly	2 (1%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	116 (69%)
	Yes, I received written information	5 (3%)
	No, I was not told anything	39 (23%)
	Don't remember	8 (5%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	139 (82%)
	No	23 (14%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	105 (63%)
	2 hours or longer	53 (32%)
	Don't remember	9 (5%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	135 (82%)
	No	23 (14%)
	Don't remember	6 (4%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well	56 (33%)
	Well	74 (43%)
	Neither	27 (16%)
	Badly	7 (4%)
	Very badly	4 (2%)

Don't remember 3 (2%)

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

<i>Loss of property</i>	20 (12%)	<i>Physical health</i>	36 (21%)
<i>Housing problems</i>	29 (17%)	<i>Mental health</i>	36 (21%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	15 (9%)
<i>Contacting family</i>	36 (21%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>	50 (29%)
<i>Childcare</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Other</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Money worries</i>	33 (19%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	54 (32%)
<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	32 (19%)		

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

Yes 43 (26%)
No 69 (42%)
Did not have any problems..... 54 (33%)

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

<i>Tobacco</i>	136 (80%)
<i>A shower</i>	28 (16%)
<i>A free telephone call</i>	37 (22%)
<i>Something to eat</i>	130 (76%)
<i>PIN phone credit</i>	118 (69%)
<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	85 (50%)
<i>Did not receive anything</i>	3 (2%)

Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Chaplain</i>	65 (39%)
<i>Someone from health services</i>	112 (67%)
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	40 (24%)
<i>Prison shop/canteen</i>	29 (17%)
<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	35 (21%)

Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	54 (34%)
<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	61 (39%)
<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	43 (27%)
<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	41 (26%)
<i>Health services</i>	62 (39%)
<i>Chaplaincy</i>	58 (37%)
<i>Not offered any information</i>	52 (33%)

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

Yes 126 (74%)
No 36 (21%)
Don't remember 8 (5%)

Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course..... 46 (27%)

<i>Within the first week</i>	62 (37%)
<i>More than a week</i>	40 (24%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	21 (12%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?

<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	46 (28%)
<i>Yes</i>	56 (34%)
<i>No</i>	45 (27%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	17 (10%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?

<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	32 (19%)
<i>Within the first week</i>	50 (30%)
<i>More than a week</i>	65 (39%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	18 (11%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	15 (9%)	56 (34%)	25 (15%)	27 (16%)	21 (13%)	22 (13%)
<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	21 (14%)	55 (36%)	28 (18%)	12 (8%)	9 (6%)	28 (18%)
<i>Get bail information?</i>	7 (5%)	18 (12%)	21 (14%)	27 (18%)	20 (13%)	59 (39%)

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

<i>Not had any letters</i>	17 (10%)
<i>Yes</i>	64 (38%)
<i>No</i>	88 (52%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	39 (24%)
<i>No</i>	30 (18%)
<i>Don't know</i>	94 (58%)

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

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	88 (51%)	82 (48%)	1 (1%)
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	136 (80%)	31 (18%)	2 (1%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	111 (67%)	47 (28%)	7 (4%)
<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	114 (68%)	48 (29%)	6 (4%)
<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	55 (33%)	92 (55%)	20 (12%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	101 (60%)	65 (39%)	2 (1%)

If you need to, can you normally get your stored property? 34 (20%) 77 (46%) 56 (34%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	Very good	4 (2%)	
	Good	33 (19%)	
	Neither	44 (26%)	
	Bad	53 (31%)	
	Very bad	36 (21%)	
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?		
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/don't know</i>	6 (4%)	
	Yes	82 (49%)	
	No	80 (48%)	
Q4.7	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	Yes	80 (48%)	
	No	23 (14%)	
	Don't know/N/A	65 (39%)	
Q4.8	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	Yes	103 (61%)	
	No	16 (9%)	
	Don't know/N/A	50 (30%)	
Q4.9	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?		
	Yes	92 (55%)	
	No	26 (15%)	
	Don't know	50 (30%)	
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	34 (21%)	
	Very easy	32 (20%)	
	Easy	33 (20%)	
	Neither	18 (11%)	
	Difficult	18 (11%)	
	Very difficult	8 (5%)	
	Don't know	21 (13%)	

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes	138 (83%)		
	No	23 (14%)		
	Don't know	5 (3%)		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	14 (10%)	81 (56%)	50 (34%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	14 (10%)	61 (41%)	72 (49%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?
 Yes 79 (51%)
 No 25 (16%)
 Don't know 50 (32%)

Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints:
 (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	78 (48%)	30 (18%)	55 (34%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	78 (50%)	25 (16%)	53 (34%)

Q5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?
 Yes 23 (15%)
 No 129 (85%)

Q5.6 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?

<i>Don't know who they are</i>	70 (45%)
Very easy	12 (8%)
Easy	23 (15%)
Neither	19 (12%)
Difficult	26 (17%)
Very difficult	6 (4%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	27 (16%)
Yes	60 (37%)
No	54 (33%)
Don't know	23 (14%)

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>	27 (17%)
Yes	74 (47%)
No	44 (28%)
Don't know	14 (9%)

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

Yes	15 (9%)
No	153 (91%)

Q6.4 If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?

<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	132 (81%)
Very well	5 (3%)
Well	8 (5%)
Neither	9 (6%)
Badly	4 (2%)
Very badly	5 (3%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	133 (81%)
	No	32 (19%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	122 (77%)
	No	37 (23%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	64 (40%)
	No	96 (60%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	6 (4%)
	Never	29 (18%)
	Rarely	43 (27%)
	Some of the time	42 (26%)
	Most of the time	26 (16%)
	All of the time	15 (9%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	97 (59%)
	In the first week	27 (16%)
	More than a week	25 (15%)
	Don't remember	16 (10%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	97 (62%)
	Very helpful	23 (15%)
	Helpful	20 (13%)
	Neither	8 (5%)
	Not very helpful	3 (2%)
	Not at all helpful	5 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	66 (40%)
	No	100 (60%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	24 (15%)
	No	135 (85%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	100 (63%)
	Everywhere	18 (11%)
	Segregation unit	5 (3%)
	Association areas	20 (13%)
	Reception area	6 (4%)
	At the gym	5 (3%)
	At meal times	10 (6%)
	At health services	5 (3%)
	Visits area	9 (6%)
	In wing showers	17 (11%)
	In gym showers	8 (5%)
	In corridors/stairwells	9 (6%)

<i>In an exercise yard</i>	17 (11%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	16 (10%)
<i>At work</i>	3 (2%)	<i>In your cell</i>	11 (7%)
<i>During movement</i>	15 (9%)	<i>At religious services</i>	3 (2%)
<i>At education</i>	4 (3%)		

Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?

Yes	48 (29%)
No	119 (71%)

Q8.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	24 (14%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	20 (12%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Medication</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Debt</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Drugs</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You were new here</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	7 (4%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	53 (32%)
No	113 (68%)

Q8.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	20 (12%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	19 (11%)
<i>Medication</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Debt</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	6 (4%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You were new here</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	6 (4%)

Gang related issues 5 (3%)

Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?
Not been victimised 99 (63%)
 Yes 15 (10%)
 No 42 (27%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	12 (7%)	12 (7%)	32 (20%)	30 (19%)	53 (33%)	23 (14%)
The nurse	10 (6%)	17 (11%)	45 (29%)	29 (19%)	37 (24%)	18 (12%)
The dentist	30 (20%)	3 (2%)	6 (4%)	11 (7%)	38 (25%)	65 (42%)

Q9.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	19 (12%)	22 (13%)	40 (25%)	34 (21%)	29 (18%)	19 (12%)
The nurse	16 (10%)	29 (18%)	57 (36%)	27 (17%)	17 (11%)	11 (7%)
The dentist	55 (36%)	9 (6%)	28 (18%)	22 (14%)	17 (11%)	23 (15%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Very good</i>	17 (10%)
<i>Good</i>	40 (25%)
<i>Neither</i>	25 (15%)
<i>Bad</i>	47 (29%)
<i>Very bad</i>	23 (14%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	98 (59%)
No	69 (41%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	69 (42%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	37 (23%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	26 (16%)
<i>No</i>	32 (20%)

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

Yes	63 (38%)
No	101 (62%)

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

<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	101 (63%)
Yes	30 (19%)
No	29 (18%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

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

Yes	54 (33%)
No	112 (67%)

Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	41 (25%)
	No	125 (75%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	22 (13%)
	Easy	22 (13%)
	Neither	12 (7%)
	Difficult	14 (8%)
	Very difficult	6 (4%)
	Don't know	89 (54%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	8 (5%)
	Easy	5 (3%)
	Neither	12 (7%)
	Difficult	13 (8%)
	Very difficult	25 (16%)
	Don't know	98 (61%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	15 (9%)
	No	150 (91%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	21 (13%)
	No	138 (87%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not /do not have a drug problem</i>	101 (64%)
	Yes	27 (17%)
	No	31 (19%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not /do not have an alcohol problem</i>	125 (77%)
	Yes	16 (10%)
	No	22 (13%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	122 (77%)
	Yes	30 (19%)
	No	7 (4%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>
						<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	18 (11%)	15 (9%)	29 (18%)	19 (12%)	50 (32%)
						27 (17%)

Vocational or skills training	41 (28%)	13 (9%)	24 (16%)	18 (12%)	24 (16%)	28 (19%)
Education (including basic skills)	19 (12%)	23 (15%)	52 (34%)	23 (15%)	20 (13%)	16 (10%)
Offending behaviour programmes	52 (35%)	9 (6%)	21 (14%)	14 (9%)	27 (18%)	26 (17%)

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

Not involved in any of these	58 (36%)
Prison job	67 (41%)
Vocational or skills training	14 (9%)
Education (including basic skills).....	53 (33%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	10 (6%)

Q11.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	36 (26%)	46 (33%)	42 (30%)	17 (12%)
Vocational or skills training	49 (41%)	32 (27%)	22 (18%)	17 (14%)
Education (including basic skills)	39 (27%)	55 (39%)	32 (23%)	16 (11%)
Offending behaviour programmes	55 (47%)	30 (25%)	18 (15%)	15 (13%)

Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?

Don't want to go	21 (13%)
<i>Never</i>	34 (21%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	32 (20%)
<i>About once a week</i>	48 (29%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	28 (17%)

Q11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

Don't use it	55 (35%)
Yes	30 (19%)
No	73 (46%)

Q11.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

Don't want to go	30 (18%)
<i>0</i>	37 (22%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	42 (25%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	55 (33%)
<i>More than 5</i>	1 (1%)

Q11.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

Don't want to go	33 (20%)
<i>0</i>	27 (16%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	42 (25%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	38 (23%)
<i>More than 5</i>	25 (15%)

Q11.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?

Don't want to go	6 (4%)
<i>0</i>	4 (2%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	52 (32%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	91 (55%)

More than 5 11 (7%)

Q11.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

Less than 2 hours	36 (22%)
2 to less than 4 hours	36 (22%)
4 to less than 6 hours	23 (14%)
6 to less than 8 hours	29 (18%)
8 to less than 10 hours	16 (10%)
10 hours or more	12 (7%)
Don't know	10 (6%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?

Yes	52 (33%)
No	108 (68%)

Q12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?

Yes	70 (44%)
No	89 (56%)

Q12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?

Yes	47 (29%)
No	116 (71%)

Q12.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?

<i>I don't get visits</i>	18 (11%)
Very easy	21 (13%)
Easy	30 (19%)
Neither	9 (6%)
Difficult	42 (26%)
Very difficult	32 (20%)
Don't know	8 (5%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?

Not sentenced	49 (30%)
Yes	61 (38%)
No	52 (32%)

Q13.2 What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison?

Not sentenced/NA	101 (62%)
No contact	25 (15%)
Letter	14 (9%)
Phone	8 (5%)
Visit	24 (15%)

Q13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?

Yes	40 (26%)
No	116 (74%)

Q13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	49 (30%)
Yes	45 (27%)
No	71 (43%)

Q13.5 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	120 (75%)
<i>Very involved</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Involved</i>	17 (11%)
<i>Neither</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Not very involved</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Not at all involved</i>	4 (2%)

Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	120 (76%)
<i>Nobody</i>	21 (13%)
<i>Offender supervisor</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Offender manager</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Staff from other departments</i>	6 (4%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	120 (75%)
Yes	19 (12%)
No	15 (9%)
<i>Don't know</i>	7 (4%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets elsewhere?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	120 (75%)
<i>Yes, in another prison</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Yes, in the community</i>	6 (4%)
<i>No plans</i>	17 (11%)
<i>Don't know</i>	11 (7%)

Q13.9 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes	6 (4%)
No	75 (49%)
<i>Don't know</i>	73 (47%)

Q13.10 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

Yes	16 (10%)
No	141 (90%)

Q13.11 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	33 (23%)	28 (19%)	85 (58%)
Accommodation	40 (27%)	37 (25%)	71 (48%)
Benefits	34 (23%)	39 (27%)	72 (50%)
Finances	36 (26%)	24 (18%)	77 (56%)
Education	37 (26%)	35 (25%)	69 (49%)

Drugs and alcohol	42 (30%)	48 (34%)	52 (37%)
-------------------	----------	----------	----------

Q13.12 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	49 (31%)
Yes	54 (34%)
No	57 (36%)

Summary of prisoner survey results – Open

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	2	(7%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	5	(19%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	5	(19%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	9	(33%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	3	(11%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	3	(11%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?		
	<i>Yes</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>No</i>	26	(100%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	1	(4%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	3	(11%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	3	(11%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	16	(59%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	2	(7%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Life</i>	2	(7%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	<i>Yes</i>	2	(7%)
	<i>No</i>	25	(93%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	27	(100%)
	<i>No</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	23	(100%)
	<i>No</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	24	(89%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	2	(7%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	1	(4%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Arab</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0	(0%)

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?		
	Yes	0 (0%)	
	No	23 (100%)	
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None	7 (26%)	Hindu..... 0 (0%)
	Church of England	9 (33%)	Jewish..... 0 (0%)
	Catholic.....	8 (30%)	Muslim
	Protestant.....	0 (0%)	Sikh
	Other Christian denomination	0 (0%)	Other..... 2 (7%)
	Buddhist	0 (0%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/straight	27 (100%)	
	Homosexual/gay	0 (0%)	
	Bisexual.....	0 (0%)	
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	1 (4%)	
	No	26 (96%)	
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	Yes	1 (4%)	
	No	25 (96%)	
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes	14 (52%)	
	No	13 (48%)	
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes	14 (52%)	
	No	13 (48%)	

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	18 (72%)	
	Yes	5 (20%)	
	No	2 (8%)	
	Don't remember	0 (0%)	
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	Less than 2 hours	18 (69%)	
	2 hours or longer.....	7 (27%)	
	Don't remember	1 (4%)	
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?		
	Yes	23 (88%)	
	No	3 (12%)	
	Don't remember	0 (0%)	
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	18 (69%)	

Yes	1 (4%)
No	6 (23%)
Don't remember	1 (4%)

Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?

Very well	11 (42%)
Well	9 (35%)
Neither	5 (19%)
Badly	1 (4%)
Very badly	0 (0%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

Q2.7 Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Yes, someone told me	26 (96%)
Yes, I received written information	2 (7%)
No, I was not told anything	0 (0%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?

Yes	27 (100%)
No	0 (0%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?

Less than 2 hours	20 (77%)
2 hours or longer	5 (19%)
Don't remember	1 (4%)

Q3.2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?

Yes	22 (96%)
No	1 (4%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?

Very well	11 (42%)
Well	13 (50%)
Neither	1 (4%)
Badly	0 (0%)
Very badly	1 (4%)
Don't remember	0 (0%)

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

Loss of property	1 (4%)	Physical health	1 (4%)
Housing problems	3 (12%)	Mental health	1 (4%)
Contacting employers	1 (4%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	0 (0%)
Contacting family	5 (19%)	Getting phone numbers	5 (19%)
Childcare	1 (4%)	Other	0 (0%)
Money worries	5 (19%)	Did not have any problems	16 (62%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal	1 (4%)		

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	5 (19%)
	No	5 (19%)
	Did not have any problems	16 (62%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco	10 (42%)
	A shower	9 (38%)
	A free telephone call	13 (54%)
	Something to eat	20 (83%)
	PIN phone credit	12 (50%)
	Toiletries/basic items	13 (54%)
	Did not receive anything	4 (17%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain	16 (67%)
	Someone from health services	12 (50%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	13 (54%)
	Prison shop/canteen	10 (42%)
	Did not have access to any of these	5 (21%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you	16 (67%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	8 (33%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	11 (46%)
	Your entitlement to visits	11 (46%)
	Health services	12 (50%)
	Chaplaincy	11 (46%)
	Not offered any information	5 (21%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	25 (93%)
	No	2 (7%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	5 (21%)
	Within the first week	16 (67%)
	More than a week	1 (4%)
	Don't remember	2 (8%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	5 (23%)
	Yes	12 (55%)
	No	3 (14%)
	Don't remember	2 (9%)

Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	9 (43%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	8 (38%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	4 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:					
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
						<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	15 (56%)	5 (19%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	0 (0%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	10 (42%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)
						4 (17%)

Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?	
	<i>Not had any letters</i>	3 (11%)
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (26%)
	<i>No</i>	17 (63%)

Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (38%)
	<i>No</i>	4 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (46%)

Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:			
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	25 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	13 (62%)	7 (33%)	1 (5%)
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	21 (84%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	20 (80%)	5 (20%)	0 (0%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?	
	<i>Very good</i>	6 (23%)
	<i>Good</i>	14 (54%)
	<i>Neither</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Bad</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	1 (4%)

Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/don't know</i>	4 (15%)
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (58%)
	<i>No</i>	7 (27%)

Q4.7	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	15 (58%)
	No	0 (0%)
	Don't know/N/A	11 (42%)
Q4.8	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	17 (65%)
	No	1 (4%)
	Don't know/N/A	8 (31%)
Q4.9	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	
	Yes	16 (67%)
	No	2 (8%)
	Don't know	6 (25%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	7 (26%)
	Very easy	10 (37%)
	Easy	3 (11%)
	Neither	2 (7%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	0 (0%)
	Don't know	5 (19%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes	24 (89%)		
	No	3 (11%)		
	Don't know	0 (0%)		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications: (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	4 (18%)	13 (59%)	5 (23%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	4 (15%)	13 (50%)	9 (35%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints: (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	13 (57%)	6 (26%)	4 (17%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	13 (57%)	7 (30%)	3 (13%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes	5 (20%)		
	No	20 (80%)		

Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	4 (17%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	8 (33%)
	<i>Easy</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i>	5 (21%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	3 (13%)

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	25 (93%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (7%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	26 (96%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (4%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (52%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (48%)
Q6.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Never</i>	2 (9%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	5 (22%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	7 (30%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	6 (26%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	2 (9%)
Q6.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	8 (33%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	10 (42%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	4 (17%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (8%)
Q6.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i>	8 (36%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	4 (18%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	9 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i>	1 (5%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	0 (0%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	25 (96%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	1 (4%)

No 25 (96%)

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

<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	25 (100%)	<i>At meal times</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Everywhere</i>	0 (0%)	<i>At health services</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Association areas</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Visits area</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Reception area</i>	0 (0%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At the gym</i>	0 (0%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	0 (0%)
<i>In an exercise yard</i>	0 (0%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At work</i>	0 (0%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	0 (0%)
<i>During movement</i>	0 (0%)	<i>In your cell</i>	0 (0%)
<i>At education</i>	0 (0%)	<i>At religious services</i>	0 (0%)

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

Yes 1 (4%)
 No 25 (96%)

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

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

Q7.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes 3 (12%)
 No 22 (88%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	2 (8%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	2 (8%)
<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (4%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (4%)

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

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

Not been victimised	21 (84%)
Yes	0 (0%)
No	4 (16%)

Section 8: Health services

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

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	2 (9%)	9 (39%)	8 (35%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (9%)
The nurse	2 (9%)	8 (36%)	9 (41%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
The dentist	3 (13%)	8 (35%)	6 (26%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	5 (22%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	6 (27%)	6 (27%)	6 (27%)	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
The nurse	5 (24%)	8 (38%)	4 (19%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
The dentist	6 (27%)	7 (32%)	3 (14%)	2 (9%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)

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

Not been	4 (21%)
Very good	8 (42%)
Good	4 (21%)
Neither	0 (0%)
Bad	1 (5%)
Very bad	2 (11%)

Q8.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	7 (27%)
No	19 (73%)

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

Not taking medication	19 (73%)
Yes, all my meds	7 (27%)
Yes, some of my meds	0 (0%)
No	0 (0%)

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

Yes	0 (0%)
No	26 (100%)

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)

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	26 (100%)
--	-----------

Yes	0 (0%)
No	0 (0%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	2 (8%)
	No	24 (92%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	1 (4%)
	No	25 (96%)
Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	2 (8%)
	Easy	2 (8%)
	Neither	1 (4%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	1 (4%)
	Don't know	18 (75%)
Q9.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	1 (4%)
	Easy	2 (9%)
	Neither	1 (4%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	2 (9%)
	Don't know	17 (74%)
Q9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	25 (100%)
Q9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	24 (100%)
Q9.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not /do not have a drug problem</i>	23 (92%)
	Yes	2 (8%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q9.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	<i>Did not /do not have an alcohol problem</i>	25 (96%)
	Yes	1 (4%)
	No	0 (0%)
Q9.9	Was the support or help you received while in this prison helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	22 (88%)
	Yes	3 (12%)
	No	0 (0%)

Section 10: Activities

Q10.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>
						<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	3 (13%)	8 (35%)	6 (26%)	3 (13%)	3 (13%)
	Vocational or skills training	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)
	Education (including basic skills)	5 (22%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	3 (13%)	3 (13%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	6 (26%)	2 (9%)	6 (26%)	4 (17%)	2 (9%)
						3 (13%)
Q10.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)					
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					8 (44%)
	Prison job					10 (56%)
	Vocational or skills training					0 (0%)
	Education (including basic skills).....					0 (0%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....					0 (0%)
Q10.4	How often do you usually go to the library?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					1 (4%)
	<i>Never</i>					3 (12%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					4 (16%)
	<i>About once a week</i>					7 (28%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>					10 (40%)
Q10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?					
	<i>Don't use it</i>					4 (19%)
	<i>Yes</i>					16 (76%)
	<i>No</i>					1 (5%)
Q10.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					1 (4%)
	<i>0</i>					2 (8%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>					4 (16%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>					17 (68%)
	<i>More than 5</i>					1 (4%)
Q10.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					0 (0%)
	<i>0</i>					2 (9%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>					1 (4%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>					11 (48%)
	<i>More than 5</i>					9 (39%)
Q10.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					0 (0%)
	<i>0</i>					1 (6%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>					1 (6%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>					4 (22%)
	<i>More than 5</i>					12 (67%)

Q10.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	2 (13%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	10 (67%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (7%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (88%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (13%)
Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	6 (23%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (77%)
Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	25 (96%)
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	5 (19%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	10 (38%)
	<i>Easy</i>	5 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i>	1 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	3 (12%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Yes</i>	24 (92%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (8%)
Q12.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/NA</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>No contact</i>	2 (8%)
	<i>Letter</i>	10 (38%)
	<i>Phone</i>	17 (65%)
	<i>Visit</i>	14 (54%)
Q12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (56%)
	<i>No</i>	11 (44%)

Q12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?			
	Yes		23 (88%)	
	No		3 (12%)	
Q12.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	Do not have a sentence plan		3 (12%)	
	<i>Very involved</i>		17 (65%)	
	<i>Involved</i>		1 (4%)	
	<i>Neither</i>		0 (0%)	
	<i>Not very involved</i>		3 (12%)	
	<i>Not at all involved</i>		2 (8%)	
Q12.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Do not have a sentence plan		3 (12%)	
	<i>Nobody</i>		9 (35%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>		8 (31%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i>		10 (38%)	
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>		4 (15%)	
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>		4 (15%)	
Q12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	Do not have a sentence plan		3 (13%)	
	Yes		20 (83%)	
	No		1 (4%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		0 (0%)	
Q12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets elsewhere?			
	Do not have a sentence plan		3 (13%)	
	<i>Yes, in another prison</i>		2 (8%)	
	<i>Yes, in the community</i>		9 (38%)	
	<i>No plans</i>		9 (38%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		1 (4%)	
Q12.9	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes		0 (0%)	
	No		14 (56%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>		11 (44%)	
Q12.10	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes		16 (67%)	
	No		8 (33%)	
Q12.11	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
		Do not need help	Yes	No
	Employment	5 (20%)	16 (64%)	4 (16%)
	Accommodation	7 (28%)	7 (28%)	11 (44%)
	Benefits	7 (28%)	8 (32%)	10 (40%)
	Finances	5 (20%)	10 (40%)	10 (40%)
	Education	9 (38%)	9 (38%)	6 (25%)
	Drugs and alcohol	12 (52%)	6 (26%)	5 (22%)

Q12.12 Have you been provided with information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Resettlement day release	23 (92%)	2 (8%)
Resettlement overnight release	22 (96%)	1 (4%)

Q12.13 Have you had access to the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Resettlement day release	19 (79%)	5 (21%)
Resettlement overnight release	18 (82%)	4 (18%)
Special purpose leave	12 (60%)	8 (40%)

Q12.14 Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release:

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here	19 (76%)	6 (24%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc.)	17 (68%)	8 (32%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	22 (88%)	3 (12%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	6 (26%)	17 (74%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	18 (72%)	7 (28%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	17 (74%)	6 (26%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Norwich 2012

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

Key to tables

		HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		173	5345	173	172
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	15%	6%	15%	17%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	71%	66%	71%	70%
1.3	Are you on recall?	13%	10%	13%	11%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	22%	19%	22%	21%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	4%	3%	4%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11%	12%	11%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	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)?	16%	26%	16%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	6%	5%	6%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	11%	5%	6%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	24%	19%	24%	28%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	6%	10%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	29%	33%	29%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	49%	54%	49%	53%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.3	Was the van clean?	65%	76%	65%	
2.4	Did you feel safe?	80%	81%	80%	
2.2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	22%	18%	22%	26%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.1	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	28%	47%	28%	
2.5	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	2%	11%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	65%	80%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	69%	70%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	3%	5%	3%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	82%	81%	82%	82%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	63%	63%	63%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	73%	82%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	58%	76%	68%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	68%	76%	68%	71%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	14%	12%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	17%	25%	17%	28%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	8%	2%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	21%	36%	21%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	8%	3%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	19%	23%	19%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	19%	22%	19%	17%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	21%	15%	21%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	21%	18%	21%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	9%	9%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	29%	31%	29%	31%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	38%	47%	38%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	80%	86%	80%	83%
3.6	A shower?	17%	34%	17%	27%
3.6	A free telephone call?	22%	58%	22%	44%
3.6	Something to eat?	77%	80%	77%	71%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	69%	36%	69%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	50%	76%	50%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	39%	62%	39%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	68%	81%	68%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	24%	53%	24%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	18%	14%	18%	14%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	34%	47%	34%	44%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	39%	47%	39%	47%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	27%	38%	27%	36%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	26%	45%	26%	44%
3.8	Health services?	39%	51%	39%	50%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	37%	48%	37%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	72%	74%	78%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	73%	77%	73%	66%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	48%	59%	48%	54%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	81%	70%	81%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:					
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	41%	43%	43%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	50%	59%	50%	51%
4.1	Get bail information?	17%	24%	17%	26%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	38%	40%	38%	38%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	24%	40%	24%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	52%	52%	52%	53%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	81%	81%	81%	81%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	67%	82%	67%	71%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	68%	63%	68%	70%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	38%	33%	35%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	61%	64%	60%	64%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	20%	28%	20%	21%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22%	24%	22%	27%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	49%	46%	49%	27%
4.7	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	55%	48%	50%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	61%	55%	61%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	55%	59%	55%	53%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	40%	48%	40%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	80%	83%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	62%	56%	62%	55%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	46%	47%	46%	32%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	51%	64%	51%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	35%	30%	35%	33%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	32%	34%	32%	23%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	14%	15%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	23%	22%	23%	24%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	37%	49%	37%	41%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	47%	44%	47%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	7%	9%	9%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	42%	62%	42%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	70%	81%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	77%	71%	77%	72%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	40%	45%	40%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	26%	17%	26%	16%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	41%	46%	41%	34%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	73%	63%	73%	62%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010	
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	41%	40%	34%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	17%	15%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	29%	21%	29%	15%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	11%	14%	4%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	6%	7%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	16%	12%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	5%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	4%	5%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	4%	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	4%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	6%	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	5%	6%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	4%	4%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	32%	25%	32%	26%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	12%	12%	12%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%	5%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	9%	12%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	7%	6%	7%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	0%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	5%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	6%	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	27%	34%	27%	40%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	27%	27%	27%	40%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	40%	53%	40%	48%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	6%	10%	6%	15%
	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?	43%	44%	43%	60%
9.2	The nurse?	61%	58%	61%	62%
9.2	The dentist?	37%	32%	37%	40%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	38%	40%	38%	49%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	59%	50%	59%	54%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	66%	67%	66%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	38%	34%	38%	39%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	51%	41%	51%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	33%	36%	33%	36%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	25%	26%	25%	28%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	29%	27%	28%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	8%	15%	8%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	9%	9%	9%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	13%	8%	13%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	47%	49%	47%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	42%	56%	42%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	81%	78%	81%	75%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	28%	48%	28%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	25%	35%	25%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	49%	45%	49%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	24%	20%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	41%	44%	41%	40%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	9%	10%	9%	9%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	33%	27%	33%	30%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	6%	7%	6%	2%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	74%	69%	74%	67%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	44%	42%	44%	35%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	59%	54%	59%	58%
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?	45%	50%	45%	54%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	73%	65%	73%	70%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	53%	59%	53%	58%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	53%	51%	53%	48%
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?	48%	48%	48%	39%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	37%	47%	62%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	19%	36%	19%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	34%	31%	34%	37%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	38%	38%	38%	24%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	7%	51%	7%	8%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	7%	9%	7%	10%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	33%	35%	33%	36%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	44%	46%	44%	72%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	29%	33%	29%	26%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	32%	38%	32%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Norwich 2012	HMP Norwich 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release				
For those who are sentenced:				
13.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	54%	55%	54%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2 No contact?	41%	48%	41%	
13.2 Contact by letter?	23%	19%	23%	
13.2 Contact by phone?	13%	11%	13%	
13.2 Contact by visit?	39%	36%	39%	
13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	26%	25%	26%	
For those who are sentenced:				
13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?	39%	41%	39%	43%
For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5 Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	63%	57%	63%	72%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6 Nobody?	55%	53%	55%	
13.6 Offender supervisor?	19%	36%	19%	
13.6 Offender manager?	19%	31%	19%	
13.6 Named/ personal officer?	5%	25%	5%	
13.6 Staff from other departments?	16%	19%	16%	
For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	46%	64%	46%	66%
13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison/in the community?	30%	46%	30%	
13.9 Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	4%	4%	
13.10 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	10%	15%	10%	11%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
13.11 Employment?	25%	34%	25%	
13.11 Accommodation?	34%	47%	34%	
13.11 Benefits?	35%	53%	35%	
13.12 Finances?	24%	34%	24%	
13.13 Education?	34%	41%	34%	
13.14 Drugs and alcohol?	48%	53%	48%	
For those who are sentenced:				
13.12 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	49%	47%	49%	45%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Norwich 2012 (Open)

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 Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		27	1436
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	7%	1%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%	10%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	5%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	5%	26%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	5%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	51%	51%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	51%	54%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.3	Was the van clean?		
2.4	Did you feel safe?	88%	
2.2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	27%	44%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.1	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	73%	
2.5	Were you offered a toilet break?	15%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	76%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	96%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	7%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	100%	93%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	76%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	95%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	93%	74%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	38%	45%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	5%	8%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	12%	13%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	5%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	19%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	5%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	19%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	5%	8%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	5%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	5%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	19%	13%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	50%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	42%	79%
3.6	A shower?	37%	61%
3.6	A free telephone call?	54%	51%
3.6	Something to eat?	84%	75%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	50%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	54%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	67%	36%
3.7	Someone from health services?	50%	84%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	54%	18%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	42%	17%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	67%	59%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	33%	46%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	46%	51%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	46%	56%
3.8	Health services?	50%	64%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	46%	51%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	93%	91%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	79%	67%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	70%	71%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	58%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	74%	60%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	71%	51%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	26%	28%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	38%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	62%	87%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?		
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	85%	78%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	80%	53%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	76%	35%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	57%	50%
4.7	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	57%	58%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	61%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	67%	55%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	49%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	88%	
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	72%	73%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	60%	69%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?		
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	63%	36%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	69%	47%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	42%	41%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff			
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	93%	71%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	96%	73%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	51%	
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	35%	17%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	67%	65%
	For those with a personal officer:		
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	91%	73%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

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

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 7: Safety continued			
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	13%	16%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	6%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	0%	23%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Health services			
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	73%	59%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	77%	77%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	61%	29%
	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?	76%	72%
8.2	The nurse?	76%	77%
8.2	The dentist?	62%	57%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	79%	66%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	27%	41%
	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%	
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	0%	13%
	For those who have problems:		
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?		
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol			
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	7%	9%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	5%	8%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	16%	33%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%	
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	3%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	
	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%	
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
9.9	Was the support helpful?	100%	84%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 10: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
10.1	A prison job?	61%	
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	39%	
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	39%	
10.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	35%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
10.2	A prison job?	55%	76%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	0%	21%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	0%	30%
10.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	0%	9%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?		
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?		
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?		
	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?		
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?		
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?		
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?		
	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?		
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	68%	58%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	77%	
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	73%	56%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	87%	73%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	66%	88%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	67%	46%
SECTION 11: Friends and family			
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	87%	52%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	24%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	5%	12%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	57%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Norwich 2012	Open prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 12: Preparation for release			
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	93%	
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:		
12.2	No contact?	8%	
12.2	Contact by letter?	42%	
12.2	Contact by phone?	71%	
12.2	Contact by visit?	58%	
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	55%	
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	88%	70%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	78%	71%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
12.6	nobody?	39%	
12.6	Offender supervisor?	35%	
12.6	Offender manager?	43%	
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	17%	
12.6	Staff from other departments?	17%	
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	94%	83%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison/in the community?	53%	
12.9	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	
12.10	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	67%	31%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
12.11	Employment?	81%	
12.11	Accommodation?	38%	
12.11	Benefits?	45%	
12.11	Finances?	50%	
12.11	Education?	58%	
12.11	Drugs and alcohol?	56%	
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	93%	
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	95%	
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	79%	
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	83%	
12.13	Special purpose leave?	59%	
	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?	75%	21%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	68%	25%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	88%	80%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	27%	18%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	73%	42%
12.14	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	73%	59%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Norwich 2012 - Local discharge unit vs reception unit

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		Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A,B,C and E wings
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse			
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details			
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference			
Number of completed questionnaires returned		47	108
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	24%	13%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	58%
1.3	Are you on recall?	16%	13%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	48%	13%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	5%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	18%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	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)?	15%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	4%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	26%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	11%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	28%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	56%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.3	Was the van clean?	67%	63%
2.4	Did you feel safe?	86%	80%
2.2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	15%	22%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.1	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	24%	25%
2.5	Were you offered a toilet break?	0%	11%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	61%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	2%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	80%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A, B, C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	64%	62%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	76%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	59%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	4%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	20%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	9%	26%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	23%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%	26%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	13%	26%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	10%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	31%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	30%	39%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	76%	83%
3.6	A shower?	20%	15%
3.6	A free telephone call?	27%	18%
3.6	Something to eat?	73%	77%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	78%	68%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	42%	52%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A,B,C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	40%	41%
3.7	Someone from health services?	56%	77%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	27%	24%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	16%	17%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	45%	30%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	38%	40%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	29%	28%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	29%	27%
3.8	Health services?	33%	41%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	33%	41%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	71%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	80%	72%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	61%	40%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	93%	81%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	25%	47%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	38%	54%
4.1	Get bail information?	15%	18%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	18%	45%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	14%	30%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	53%	45%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	73%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	68%	65%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	73%	62%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25%	32%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	58%	61%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	31%	12%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	19%	23%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	48%
4.7	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	49%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59%	62%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	53%	55%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	43%	39%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A, B, C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	84%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	68%	58%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	44%	46%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	56%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	39%	38%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	43%	29%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	5%	19%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	14%	23%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	43%	31%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	52%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	12%
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?	100%	42%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	76%	75%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	26%	40%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	16%	24%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	56%	34%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	73%	67%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A, B, C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	27%	49%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	2%	22%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	9%	37%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	0%	21%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	10%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	2%	17%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	7%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A, B, C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	25%	36%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	15%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	8%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	16%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	5%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	0%	33%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A,B,C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	18%	30%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	35%	42%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	12%	3%
	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?	47%	43%
9.2	The nurse?	55%	62%
9.2	The dentist?	48%	30%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	40%	37%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	29%	70%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	93%	63%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	29%	45%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	46%	56%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	21%	40%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	21%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	37%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	10%	8%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	13%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	18%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	36%	51%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	50%	38%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	72%	82%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A,B,C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	44%	21%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	50%	16%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	70%	44%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	30%	16%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	50%	35%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	12%	7%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	50%	29%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	9%	5%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	79%	72%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	60%	38%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	76%	53%
	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?	63%	38%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	92%	65%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	69%	45%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	67%	49%
	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?	62%	39%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42%	51%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	29%	17%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	53%	26%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	16%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	2%	6%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	15%	5%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	43%	25%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	48%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27%	30%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	35%	31%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Local discharge unit - F and G wings	Reception unit - A,B,C and E wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	46%	60%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	58%	33%
13.2	Contact by letter?	21%	20%
13.2	Contact by phone?	15%	8%
13.2	Contact by visit?	15%	50%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	17%	26%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	40%	33%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	62%	66%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	nobody?	54%	61%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	15%	22%
13.6	Offender manager?	8%	22%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	15%	0%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	15%	5%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	74%	27%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison/in the community?	26%	28%
13.9	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	2%	5%
13.10	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	7%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
13.11	Employment?	41%	20%
13.11	Accommodation?	52%	27%
13.11	Benefits?	52%	27%
13.12	Finances?	40%	17%
13.13	Education?	50%	29%
13.14	Drugs and alcohol?	48%	47%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.12	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	67%	41%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and nationality) HMP Norwich 2012

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		27	146	19	149
1.3	Are you sentenced?	58%	74%	55%	73%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	28%	8%		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	88%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	87%	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)?			37%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	6%	6%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	3%	21%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	26%	15%	25%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	10%	19%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	38%	32%	47%	30%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	81%	79%	73%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	54%	72%	56%	72%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	83%	77%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	77%	80%	76%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	78%	66%	68%	68%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	46%	71%	55%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	73%	68%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	89%	70%	84%	73%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	46%	42%	50%	41%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	37%	54%	47%	51%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	69%	83%	80%	81%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	38%	32%	42%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	26%	21%	32%	21%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	50%	55%	47%
4.7	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	46%	56%	46%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	73%	59%	70%	60%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	52%	55%	42%	58%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	64%	87%	61%	86%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	62%	50%	53%	52%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	16%	40%	11%	40%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	33%	49%	32%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	16%	8%	22%	8%
7.1	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	63%	84%	72%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	65%	78%	59%	79%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	28%	25%	12%	28%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	37%	42%	39%	41%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	48%	38%	34%	40%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	26%	13%	17%	15%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	36%	28%	16%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	8%	13%	5%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	1%	5%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	5%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	8%	2%	5%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national 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				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	40%	30%	17%	32%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	12%	11%	0%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	12%	1%	11%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	32%	26%	17%	28%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	48%	38%	44%	40%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	52%	60%	45%	61%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	37%	39%	28%	40%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	20%	28%	0%	31%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	37%	42%	23%	44%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	4%	9%	17%	8%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	35%	41%	31%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	7%	6%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48%	46%	41%	48%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	56%	30%	59%	31%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	60%	34%	34%	39%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	4%	7%	11%	5%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	0%	9%	0%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	52%	43%	36%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	37%	27%	30%	29%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (disability and age - under 21, over 50) HMP Norwich 2012

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Young adults under the age of 21		Prisoners aged 21 and over		Prisoners aged 50 and over		Prisoners under 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												
Number of completed questionnaires returned		41	131	25	146	25	146	25	146	25	146	25	146
1.3	Are you sentenced?	76%	70%	75%	71%	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	13%	16%	11%	16%	11%	16%	11%	16%	11%	16%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	100%	99%	100%	99%	96%	99%	96%	99%	96%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%	96%	99%	96%	99%	96%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	10%	18%	24%	14%	4%	18%	4%	18%	4%	18%	4%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	5%	9%	6%	4%	7%	4%	7%	4%	7%	4%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	5%	8%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			25%	24%	28%	23%	28%	23%	28%	23%	28%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	13%	9%	0%	11%	36%	5%	36%	5%	36%	5%	36%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	31%	34%	39%	32%	24%	35%	24%	35%	24%	35%	24%	35%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	79%	80%	79%	84%	79%	84%	79%	84%	79%	84%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	66%	70%	70%	70%	72%	69%	72%	69%	72%	69%	72%	69%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	81%	78%	84%	92%	81%	92%	81%	92%	81%	92%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	88%	72%	67%	77%	88%	74%	88%	74%	88%	74%	88%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	98%	59%	63%	69%	68%	68%	68%	68%	68%	68%	68%	68%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	77%	64%	65%	68%	72%	66%	72%	66%	72%	66%	72%	66%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	61%	78%	74%	74%	88%	72%	88%	72%	88%	72%	88%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	66%	75%	78%	72%	60%	75%	60%	75%	60%	75%	60%	75%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	42%	43%	22%	47%	63%	40%	63%	40%	63%	40%	63%	40%

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	Young adults under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under 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?	51%	51%	46%	53%	72%	49%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	70%	84%	88%	80%	76%	82%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	23%	36%	13%	36%	54%	30%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	23%	16%	23%	28%	21%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	50%	44%	50%	60%	47%
4.7	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	48%	37%	49%	44%	48%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	60%	54%	62%	56%	62%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	45%	58%	46%	56%	54%	55%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	86%	70%	85%	100%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	49%	46%	53%	65%	49%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	43%	35%	35%	37%	48%	34%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	46%	41%	47%	50%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	17%	6%	9%	9%	4%	10%
7.1	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	76%	82%	48%	86%	92%	78%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	74%	77%	54%	80%	96%	73%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	23%	26%	22%	26%	44%	22%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	35%	44%	31%	43%	48%	40%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	33%	39%	40%	12%	44%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	10%	17%	15%	4%	17%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	48%	23%	26%	29%	4%	33%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	15%	11%	9%	12%	0%	14%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2%	2%	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	4%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	10%	1%	0%	3%	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	Young adults under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under 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?	52%	26%	48%	30%	16%	34%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	20%	9%	4%	13%	8%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	4%	9%	2%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	2%	4%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	2%	4%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	3%	9%	3%	4%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	13%	0%	0%	4%	4%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	28%	28%	27%	42%	24%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	39%	40%	38%	40%	54%	38%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	80%	52%	35%	62%	72%	56%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	78%	26%	41%	38%	20%	41%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	38%	23%	23%	27%	12%	29%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	33%	44%	37%	43%	63%	38%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	13%	7%	0%	10%	21%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	16%	39%	32%	33%	33%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	3%	7%	4%	6%	8%	5%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	31%	52%	24%	50%	56%	45%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	21%	38%	52%	31%	28%	35%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	37%	44%	38%	20%	42%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	5%	6%	4%	7%	20%	4%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	10%	7%	4%	8%	12%	7%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	54%	41%	52%	42%	24%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	47%	23%	26%	30%	24%	30%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (veterans) HMP Norwich 2012

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

Key to tables

		Veterans (ex-armed services prisoners)	Non-veterans
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	149
1.3	Are you sentenced?	68%	73%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	19%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
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)?	12%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	7%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	32%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	-	-
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	32%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	81%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	62%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	76%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	75%	69%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	56%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	38%	77%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	44%	42%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Veterans (ex-armed services prisoners)	Non-veterans
	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?	44%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	66%	82%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	22%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	44%	49%
4.7	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	46%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	56%	62%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	40%	57%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	93%	83%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	66%	49%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	34%	36%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	47%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	12%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	85%	77%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	34%	23%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	40%	42%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	47%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	34%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	20%	11%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	4%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Veterans (ex-armed services prisoners)	Non-veterans
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	34%	32%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	7%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	7%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	7%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	7%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	15%	28%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	46%	39%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	66%	59%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	20%	39%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	13%	29%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	40%	42%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	20%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	40%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	7%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	47%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	20%	36%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	26%	40%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	20%	5%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	0%	8%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	34%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	29%

Wing analysis



Prisoner survey responses (vulnerable prisoners vs main population) HMP Norwich 2012

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

Key to tables

		Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		18	155
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	11%	15%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	66%	72%
1.3	Are you on recall?	5%	14%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	25%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	5%	4%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
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)?	5%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	11%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	6%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	11%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	28%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	17%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	30%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	39%	50%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.3	Was the van clean?	66%	65%
2.4	Did you feel safe?	78%	81%
2.2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	16%	23%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.1	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	0%	30%
2.5	Were you offered a toilet break?	0%	12%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	84%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	78%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%	3%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	89%	81%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	78%	61%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72%	76%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	66%	68%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	11%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	5%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	5%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	28%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	22%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	34%	17%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	28%	20%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	22%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	28%	7%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	16%	31%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	54%	37%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	50%	84%
3.6	A shower?	11%	17%
3.6	A free telephone call?	16%	22%
3.6	Something to eat?	78%	76%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	50%	72%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	55%	49%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued		
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	28%	41%
3.7 Someone from health services?	72%	67%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	22%	24%
3.7 Prison shop/canteen?	22%	17%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	36%	34%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	47%	38%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	11%	29%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	17%	27%
3.8 Health services?	36%	40%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	47%	36%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	66%	75%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	39%	77%
For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	28%	49%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	66%	82%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody		
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	59%	41%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	53%	49%
4.1 Get bail information?	11%	17%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	55%	36%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	5%	26%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	55%	51%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	78%	81%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	66%	67%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	72%	67%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	50%	31%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	66%	59%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	11%	21%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22%	22%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	55%	48%
4.7 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	39%	49%
4.8 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	45%	63%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	53%	55%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	45%	39%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	100%	81%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	58%	62%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	58%	45%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	78%	48%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	54%	32%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	50%	30%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	30%	13%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	62%	18%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	34%	37%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	75%	43%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	9%
	For those who have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit:		
6.4	Were you treated very well/well by staff?	75%	37%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	89%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	100%	74%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	64%	37%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	30%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	53%	40%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	68%	74%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	61%	37%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	55%	26%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	50%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	11%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	11%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	5%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	28%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	11%	3%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	39%	31%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	12%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	16%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	3%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	42%	22%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	36%	26%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	47%	39%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	0%	7%
	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?	44%	43%
9.2	The nurse?	59%	61%
9.2	The dentist?	22%	39%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	23%	39%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	66%	58%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	82%	64%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	39%	38%
	For those who have problems:		
9.5	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	67%	49%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	28%	33%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	22%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	45%	25%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	0%	9%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	11%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	23%	12%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	50%	46%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	0%	47%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	100%	79%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	22%	29%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	0%	28%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	23%	52%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	21%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	50%	40%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	5%	9%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	22%	34%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	7%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	88%	73%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	21%	47%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	53%	60%
	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?	36%	46%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	66%	73%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	29%	56%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	53%	53%
	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?	36%	49%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	46%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	5%	21%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	0%	38%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55%	36%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	0%	8%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	0%	8%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	39%	32%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	34%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	30%	29%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	39%	31%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (A6 landing & E wing)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	92%	50%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	0%	50%
13.2	Contact by letter?	18%	24%
13.2	Contact by phone?	0%	16%
13.2	Contact by visit?	82%	30%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	64%	21%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	58%	37%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	84%	60%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	nobody?	67%	53%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	0%	22%
13.6	Offender manager?	33%	16%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	0%	6%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	0%	19%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	14%	53%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison/in the community?	0%	36%
13.9	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	4%
13.10	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	6%	11%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
13.11	Employment?	16%	26%
13.11	Accommodation?	25%	35%
13.11	Benefits?	23%	37%
13.12	Finances?	15%	25%
13.13	Education?	18%	35%
13.14	Drugs and alcohol?	43%	48%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.12	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	27%	51%