

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Woodhill

3–13 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	9
1	Safety	19
<hr/>		
2	Respect	31
<hr/>		
3	Purposeful activity	49
<hr/>		
4	Resettlement	57
<hr/>		
5	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	67
<hr/>		
	Appendices	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	75
	II Prison population profile	76
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	79

Introduction

Woodhill is one of the more complex establishments in the prison system and a significant management challenge. As one of three core local prisons in the high security estate, Woodhill combines a normal local prison function serving courts in the South East Midlands with an additional responsibility holding high risk and category A prisoners, many either unconvicted or only recently convicted. Added to this, on house unit 6, the prison has a number of smaller more specialist facilities, including two protected witness units and two close supervision centres holding some of the country's most disruptive prisoners.

Recent inspections acknowledged the prison's success in managing these competing pressures: in maintaining a proportionate approach to the very real challenges of security at this prison and in ensuring reasonable standards of safety and respect. Our principle criticism was the lack of sufficient activity to occupy prisoners. This inspection found, to a great extent, that the situation remained much the same.

The prison had solid systems in place to tackle bullying and violence and few prisoners reported feeling unsafe. Vulnerable prisoners, in contrast, expressed more qualified views about their safety, which was not helped by the weak induction arrangements they experienced. Risk assessments for young adult prisoners located on the vulnerable prisoner wing and more generally around the establishment needed to be more robust. The prison continued to successfully manage the balance between the security requirements of the high risk minority without needlessly impacting on regime outcomes for the majority. Segregation usage was low but use of force was high and the use of special accommodation was excessive. In both situations management supervision needed to improve and specific incidents required further enquiry.

The number of self-harm incidents had risen considerably over the previous 12 months and we sensed a lack of focus in addressing this trend. A number of procedures aimed at supporting those in crisis were just adequate and there was evidence that some prisoners were unnecessarily subject to suicide and self-harm processes rather than being supported with alternative measures.

The quality of accommodation generally at Woodhill was among the best in the estate and relationships across the prison continued to be a strength. The close supervision centre (CSC) was, however, concerning: A wing, for example, essentially constituted a locked down regime despite being described as an assessment facility. Risk assessments and unlock protocols meant that prisoners were usually only unlocked singly and under heavy supervision. We were not fully assured about all aspects of these risk assessments or that adequate quality assurance and safeguards were in place.

Equality was well promoted and there were useful initiatives concerning nearly all the various strands of diversity. Most prisoners however, expressed negative perceptions about the quality of health care. Access to some services was reasonable but staff shortages had impacted delivery. Primary mental health provision was inadequate and there were long delays in transferring patients to mental health hospitals. We also had concerns about the accessibility of mental health services for those held in the CSC.

A structural problem at Woodhill remained the lack of sufficient activity to occupy prisoners. More places had become available since we last visited but we still found about half of the population not engaged in any purposeful activity. The provision of vocational training was limited and had reduced since our last inspection and the education places on offer were

underused. The quality of learning and skills generally was just satisfactory but the reasonable amounts of time out of cell mitigated some of the worst effects of this situation on individual prisoners.

Offender management for higher risk prisoners and those who could access it was reasonably good although the profile of offender management generally in the prison needed to increase. Resettlement need was identified early among those arriving at the prison and provision across the strands and pathways that contributed to effective resettlement was reasonably good. Prisoners, however, claimed limited knowledge of the services on offer, arguably linked to the fact that too few benefitted from meaningful sentence management. Public protection arrangements also required improvement.

Overall this inspection describes a prison little changed from when we last inspected. The complexity of the establishment is managed reasonably well and the vast majority of prisoners are not disadvantaged because of the additional security needs of the few. The prison is stable and generally safe but more management attention is required across a number of high risk areas such as self-harm prevention, segregation and the CSC. The need to occupy the prisoners more fully and purposefully remains unaddressed.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2012

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Woodhill is a core local prison within the high security estate. It accommodates a wide variety of prisoners, including remand and convicted, adults and young prisoners, who are categorised from category D to category A. It also accommodates prisoners who are managed under close supervision centre (CSC)/Rule 46 and Managing Challenging Behaviour Strategy (MCBS).

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

Public

Region/Department

High Security Directorate, with links to the South Central area

Number held

763

Certified normal accommodation

669

Operational capacity

829

Date of last full inspection

November 2009

Brief history

Woodhill was built by the public sector and opened in 1992 as a publicly run prison.

Short description of residential units

Each house unit is divided into two wings, A and B (with the exception of house unit 5, which is a Bedford build, and house unit 6, which has five discrete wings). Each wing on the main house units is designed to hold 60 prisoners in single cells. Some of these cells have been converted into doubles.

House unit 1

House unit 1 houses the induction unit on 1B, with the majority of the category A prisoners based on 1A.

House unit 2

House unit 2A holds young prisoners and adults, housing young men aged from 18 years in single and double accommodation.

House unit 2B is currently an adult wing, housing remand and convicted men aged 21 and over.

House unit 3

House unit 3 houses a mix of remand and convicted prisoners on both wings.

House unit 4

House unit 4A houses a mix of adult remand and convicted prisoners and is the enhanced workers unit. House unit 4B is the vulnerable prisoner unit, housing adult males, including category A and young prisoners.

The first night centre

The first night centre houses all new prisoners aged 18 and over, regardless of status, for their first few days in custody before moving to the induction unit. The unit comprises 28 cells.

House unit 5

House unit 5 was an additional unit that was built after the main prison. The unit comprises 51 cells, all of which are purpose built for two prisoners. It is the dedicated IDTS unit.

House unit 6/close supervision centre (CSC)

House unit 6 comprises five wings (A to E). A wing is the CSC wing and national assessment centre. The prisoners who are located on A wing are deemed to be the most violent and disruptive within the whole prison system. B wing is a post-assessment CSC unit. C wing accommodated the first national MCBS unit and holds both local and national MCBS prisoners. House units 6D and 6E are part of a national protected witness scheme.

Name of governor

Nigel Smith

IMB chair

Eve Barrett and Gill Vine (Joint Chairs)

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Milton Keynes PCT

Learning and skills providers

The Manchester College

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

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

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

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

Safety prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Safety

HP5 Staff in reception were welcoming and reception procedures were efficient. The first night centre and processes were supportive and most prisoners felt safe on their first night. Induction arrangements were generally good but inadequate for vulnerable prisoners and those on house unit 6 (closed supervision centre, protected witness unit and MCBS). Violence reduction arrangements were reasonably good and few prisoners reported feeling unsafe, although bullying on the vulnerable prisoner unit was evident. The particular needs and vulnerabilities of young adults had not been fully considered. The quality of suicide and self-harm arrangements for some prisoners was poor. Security arrangements were mostly proportionate. Illicit drug use was low. The level of use of force was high and governance was poor. Special accommodation was used excessively. Segregation processes were reasonable but reintegration planning was weak. Clinical and psychosocial services for prisoners requiring support with substance misuse were satisfactory. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good.

HP6 Prisoners reported long waits for transport between courts and the prison, and vice versa, because of poor punctuality of the escort provider. Escort vans were clean and prisoners were generally treated well by escort staff. All prisoners were handcuffed between the vans and reception, and strip-searched in reception without risk assessment. Reception was clean and bright and holding rooms were appropriate. Reception staff were polite and welcoming and most prisoners said that they had been treated well there. A Listener was employed in reception but was not utilised in this role. The assessment of new prisoners was thorough, with confidential interviews in reception and the first night centre.

HP7 First night arrangements were good. The dedicated first night centre was welcoming and staff were assisted by prisoner representatives. Accommodation was clean and well prepared. Prisoners were provided with suitable information to help them settle in and almost all prisoners in our survey said that they had felt safe on their first night.¹

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

- HP8 Induction procedures for main location prisoners were good, with a prompt start to the programme, which was thorough and well paced. Vulnerable prisoners were excluded from the structured programme and did not receive an adequate induction. There were no formal induction procedures for prisoners on house unit 6.
- HP9 There was a comprehensive violence reduction strategy and governance was good, with a rolling action plan informed by a prisoner survey and analysis of the violence reduction coordinator's report. Few prisoners reported feeling unsafe at the time of the inspection. The levels of reported bullying were generally low but were higher on the vulnerable prisoner unit. In our survey, 45% vulnerable prisoners said that they had felt unsafe at some time, and half of them said that they had been victimised by other prisoners. The three-stage bullying management scheme was mainly observational but included a third stage of constructive work to address antisocial behaviour. Victim support plans were in place.
- HP10 Processes for identifying vulnerable prisoners on arrival and assessing their suitability were generally effective. Vulnerable prisoners were located on house unit 4. There were few young adult prisoners at the prison and, although they were mostly held on house unit 2, they were mixed with adults without an age-appropriate risk assessment being carried out. Some young adult prisoners were held on the vulnerable prisoner unit and, although age-appropriate assessments had been completed, they did not specifically address the risk of grooming by older sexual offenders. There was little differentiation in aspects of the regime for young adults.
- HP11 There was a comprehensive suicide prevention policy but governance was inadequate. Levels of self-harm were high and had risen since the previous year. There was insufficient analysis of suicide and self-harm data. The number of prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures was high and some ACCT forms appeared to have been opened unnecessarily and kept open too long. The management of some prisoners subject to ACCT processes was poor and too many such prisoners, including those with serious mental health issues, were segregated and held in special accommodation. There was a team of Listeners, who felt well supported by the local Samaritans team.
- HP12 Security arrangements were generally proportionate and not overwhelmed by the presence of category A prisoners. However, some procedures were excessive – for example, the use of patrol dogs to supervise night-time unlocks for all prisoners. A large amount of intelligence was generated and was quickly analysed and acted on by the security department. Closed visits were not overused but most were inappropriately imposed for non-visits-related issues.
- HP13 The positive random mandatory drug testing rate was reasonably low. Drug testing rates and our survey results indicated that illicit drug availability was low but there was some evidence of diverted prescribed medication. The incentives and earned privileges scheme was operated fairly but basic prisoners were not set targets to improve behaviour.
- HP14 There were relatively few adjudications and monitoring arrangements were thorough. Levels of use of force were high and governance was poor. The video recording of

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*.)

planned interventions was not routine and the content and appropriateness of interventions were not reviewed. We observed examples of use of force which required further investigation. Too many prisoners had been located in special accommodation and too many remained there for excessive periods. Management and monitoring of the use of special accommodation were poor. House unit 6 had its own special accommodation and high-control cells, and governance was similarly inadequate. There was no central record of their use so it was not possible to see how often they had been used, for how long or by whom. For those prisoners for whom paperwork was available, quality assurance procedures were inadequate and documentation not always completed fully.

- HP15 The use of segregation was reasonably low and monitoring arrangements were appropriate. Staff–prisoner interactions on the unit were good and staff displayed a good knowledge of prisoners in their care. The empty cells were not adequately prepared for use and were in a poor state of repair, and the unit was generally dirty. The showers were insufficiently screened and the exercise yards were bare. The regime on the unit was limited and we were given falsified evidence concerning prisoners’ access to televisions. Reintegration and care planning was inadequate and too many prisoners were transferred to other establishments.
- HP16 The clinical and psychosocial services delivered a good standard of care to prisoners requiring support with substance misuse but they lacked integration and joint working.

Respect

- HP17 The quality of accommodation and environment was generally good. Staff–prisoner relationships were mostly positive and interactive, including on house unit 6. The environment on house unit 6 was oppressive. Decisions around some risk assessment processes for prisoners on house unit 6 were not fully justified and governance was poor. The diversity strategy was comprehensive and most diversity strands were established. Provision for older prisoners and those with disabilities was good. In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners reported less favourably than white prisoners across many areas. Support for foreign national prisoners was effective. Faith provision was good. Staff shortages disrupted health services and compromised mental health provision. A good selection of meal choices was offered, and a wide range of goods was available in the prison shop. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- HP18 Outside areas were clean and attractive. The general design of residential accommodation was excellent and they were light and bright but cleanliness varied. Cells were generally clean. Some cells were starting to show wear and tear and some contained graffiti. Toilet screening was inadequate in most cells.
- HP19 There was unrestricted access to showers but some were unclean and in a poor state of repair. Exercise areas were large and drab. Prisoners could wear their own clothes, and prison clothing and bedding were of decent quality. Prisoners were positive about the timeliness and fairness of responses to applications.
- HP20 Prisoners on house unit 6 rarely left the unit. The environment was oppressive and lacked normalising or stimulating features. The exercise yards were large bleak cages. Staff and prisoners were confused about the purpose of B wing, which was

intended to be a close supervision centre (CSC) management unit. Although A wing was described as a CSC assessment wing, it was difficult to see how this could work in practice, as most prisoners were locked up for much of the day and subject to restrictive access to association and regime activities.

- HP21 Most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect. On many units we saw limited supervision of prisoners but the interactions that took place were mostly positive. Electronic case notes were comprehensive.
- HP22 Staff on house unit 6 dealt well in difficult circumstances and with some extremely challenging and dangerous prisoners. Relationships between staff and prisoners there appeared good, and staff were well informed of prisoners' personal circumstances and the security issues affecting their custody. Case management was satisfactory and particularly good on C wing. Some prisoners were subject to highly controlled unlock arrangements requiring multiple staff. However, risk assessments which dictated unlock protocols and access to out-of-cell activities for individual prisoners were not always recorded in sufficient detail and we were not confident that the risk management decisions were appropriate, or that adequate quality assurance processes or safeguards were in place.
- HP23 Diversity and equality were well managed. There was a good overarching equality and diversity policy and associated action plan. Investigations into inequality and discriminatory behaviour were thorough. There were regular forums for some prisoners from minority groups, although they were less frequent for black and minority ethnic prisoners, who were more negative than white prisoners across a range of indicators in our survey. However, our prisoner groups, ethnic monitoring and our observations did not support this. There was good support for prisoners who identified as Gypsy/Traveller.
- HP24 Provision for foreign national prisoners was good and this group was more positive than British prisoners across a range of issues in our survey. They had regular access to immigration advice, there was a good selection of translated material and frequent use was made of interpreting services.
- HP25 Older prisoners and those who declared a disability were identified on reception and care plans were initiated. Support mechanisms for such prisoners were good, with a variety of training and recreational events taking place weekly. Governance of evacuation processes was poor. Many prisoners with mobility problems did not have a plan and the ones we found were out of date. In our survey, prisoners who had declared a disability reported more negatively than able-bodied prisoners on access to the gym, exercise and education but there were no monitoring arrangements to explore these perceptions.
- HP26 More prisoners than in comparator prisons felt that their religious beliefs were respected. Regular faith awareness training was delivered to staff. Chaplaincy facilities, including multi-faith provision, were good.
- HP27 The number of complaints was high but prisoners were positive about the fairness and promptness of replies. Quality assurance was thorough and responses were generally respectful and dealt reasonably with the issues raised. Effective monitoring and analysis had led to improvements in practice.

- HP28 Most prisoners were negative about the overall quality of health care. Some important nurse-led clinics had not been run for a few months and some had long waiting lists due to staff shortages. There was good access to the GP and practice nurses. Dental services were good and the waiting list was short. Pharmacy services were adequate but medicines management was not sufficiently robust and some prisoners were not able to get their medication on time. There were good standards of care on the inpatient unit. There were difficulties in transferring prisoners to outside appointments due to a shortage of escort staff. Primary mental health provision was inadequate and prisoners waited too long for a referral. Despite the high number of prisoners with acute mental health problems, the quality of secondary mental health services was good. However the ability to practise was severely hampered by the regime and unlock arrangements on house unit 6. Patients waiting for transfers to mental health units experienced unacceptable delays.
- HP29 A good selection of meal choices was offered and the food was appetising, although meals were served too early. A wide range of goods was available in the prison shop and consultation arrangements were in place.

Purposeful activity

- HP30 Time out of cell was good and few prisoners were locked up during the day. The regime on house unit 6 was poor and monotonous. There were insufficient good-quality activity places to enable prisoners to be fully occupied, and education places were not sufficiently utilised. Learning and skills provision was not sufficiently informed by a needs analysis and delivery was hampered by staff shortages. The quality and range of education were mainly adequate and there was too little vocational training. The range of work was reasonable and good work skills were developed but not accredited. Outcomes for learners were generally only satisfactory. Recreational PE provision was good. The library provided a reasonable service. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were poor.
- HP31 Time out of cell for most prisoners was good, at over nine hours on weekdays, but too many prisoners were insufficiently occupied. Over half the population was not engaged in meaningful activity at any one time. Prisoners were sometimes locked up early or had association curtailed through staff shortages. On house unit 6, time out of cell was good on all except A wing, and to a lesser extent B wing, where risk-assessed unlock protocols resulted in long periods of lock-up for many prisoners. The regime on the unit was mundane and lacked variety, with a general lack of stimulating activities across all the units. Access to some off-wing activities for those on C wing were a welcome, recent addition.
- HP32 Managers had begun to develop and implement quality improvement processes across the learning and skills provision. The number of activity and work places had increased but there were still insufficient for the population and those available in education were not fully utilised. Provision was not sufficiently informed by a needs analysis. Long delays in security clearance for new education staff was affecting their deployment and had severely impacted on the education department's ability to deliver their contracted hours. The allocation process was satisfactory overall but there were no links with sentence planning.

- HP33 There was an adequate range of accredited education provision for vulnerable and mainstream prisoners but not for those in house unit 6. The utilisation of work places was good. However, just over half the job roles were in wing work, which did not occupy prisoners sufficiently meaningfully. There was little vocational training, and the amount had reduced since the previous inspection.
- HP34 Learners worked well towards achieving their qualifications. Teaching and learning were generally well planned and learners received a high level of effective support. Prisoners developed good skills and produced good quality work. Relationships between staff and prisoners were respectful but little outreach provision was available to support prisoners' literacy and numeracy.
- HP35 Achievements in education were satisfactory overall and vocational training qualifications were generally good. Despite the development of good vocational and employability skills at work, these were not recorded or accredited.
- HP36 Library accommodation was small but adequate and provided a reasonable service.
- HP37 There was good access to PE. Both central and wing-based facilities were appropriate and generally well equipped. Recreational and PE courses were well managed. Accredited courses were provided at level 1 but there were no progression opportunities to higher level courses. Success rates were high.

Resettlement

- HP38 The reducing reoffending strategy covered all the pathways but a further needs analysis was required to inform provision. Offender management did not have a sufficiently high profile in the wider prison and too few prisoners were actively sentence managed. The management of high risk of harm prisoners was generally good. Public protection arrangements were not effectively applied. Home detention curfew, parole and categorisation processes were well managed, although some category A prisoners faced unacceptable delays in their reviews. There was effective and early identification of resettlement needs. Resettlement services were generally good but too many prisoners did not know about them. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- HP39 The profile of resettlement and offender management was not sufficiently high in the wider prison. The resettlement needs analysis was out of date and did not adequately map out the needs of the different types of prisoner held at the establishment. Resettlement services were appropriate, with no major gaps, although too few prisoners knew whom to turn to for help with many aspects, and in our survey fewer prisoners than at other local prisons said that they had been helped to prepare for release.
- HP40 Not all relevant prisoners had an offender supervisor. A large number of prisoners who should have been managed under the offender management model did not have contact with an offender supervisor beyond the assessment and planning stages. However, some high-risk and complex prisoners received a comprehensive service, with frequent and meaningful contact with their offender supervisor. Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments and risk management plans were of adequate quality. For the many remand and short-term prisoners who were not

subject to offender management arrangements, there was no effective custody planning or case management.

- HP41 Home detention curfew assessments were sound and almost half of those considered over the previous six months had been granted. Parole processes were managed well and reports were up to date.
- HP42 Public protection arrangements were undermined by weak governance and a large backlog of assessments, which potentially left some prisoners subject to unnecessary restrictions. Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were managed adequately and offender management unit staff were sometimes involved in meetings.
- HP43 Categorisation and reviews were generally managed effectively, although some category A prisoners experienced unacceptable delays in the completion of their annual review.
- HP44 Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) were managed effectively. Local support forums took place, and potential and recently sentenced ISPs received a good level of information.
- HP45 Prisoners' resettlement needs were assessed on arrival and prisoners were referred to other agencies as required. Discharge interviews, aimed at ensuring that resettlement needs were being met, were sometimes undertaken too close to release.
- HP46 Trained and specialist housing advisers had provided a range of support to a large number of prisoners in the previous six months. However, there was little analysis of the effectiveness of the housing advice and support given, and over one in 10 prisoners in this period had been released without accommodation to go to.
- HP47 Education, training and employment provision was weak. A pre-release programme was delivered by the education department but not all prisoners were referred before release and there was a lack of collective working between agencies. The careers information and advice service provider had some good through-the-gate links, which provided prisoners with a range of support. There were no links with employers.
- HP48 Health discharge planning was adequate. There were links with community mental health services. Links with local palliative care services were being developed, although they were in their infancy.
- HP49 There was an up-to-date drug and alcohol strategy, informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. Wing-based counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) drop-in clinics had recently started. There was an adequate range of drug programmes but no accredited therapeutic alcohol programme. An alcohol worker had recently been appointed. Links with local drug intervention programme teams were good.
- HP50 A range of financial support and advice was available, including a budgeting and money management course and a debt clinic. Prisoners were unable to open a bank account before release.
- HP51 The visitors centre, and play support worker provided an excellent service for families and visitors. Prisoners could access sufficient visits. Father and children's days were

available but not family days and there was no access to parenting courses. Visits facilities on house unit 6 were adequate but some prisoners were unnecessarily subject to high-risk category A visits, which severely limited privacy.

- HP52 Offending behaviour programme provision was adequate, with short waiting lists and a focus on transfer to facilitate offending behaviour work. The involvement of staff and families in the post-programme reviews was good.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP53 Concern: There were high numbers of prisoners subject to ACCT, some unnecessarily so and some subject to them for too long. This detracted from the care required for those prisoners for whom ACCT was appropriate. For those who needed to be subject to ACCT processes, we observed occasions where care was poor and there was high use of segregation and special accommodation for prisoners in crisis.

Recommendation: Measures, including training and monitoring, should be taken to improve the quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) assessment, reviews and case management. The use of ACCT should be reviewed to ensure that it is only used when prisoners are at risk of suicide or self-harm. Alternative support mechanisms should be put in place for prisoners who need support but are not at risk of self-harm. Segregation and special accommodation should be used only exceptionally and as a last resort for prisoners in crisis and at risk of suicide and self-harm.

- HP54 Concern: The use of force and use of special accommodation were high. The monitoring and governance of both were poor and there were examples where the level of force used required further investigation and occasions where special accommodation was used inappropriately and for too long.

Recommendation: The monitoring and governance of the use of force and use of special accommodation should be urgently reviewed to achieve a reduction in their use.

- HP55 Concern: Some young adults were co-located with adult prisoners, including adult sex offenders, without a suitable assessment of their potential vulnerability.

Recommendation: All young adults should be subject to a suitable risk and vulnerability assessment before location.

- HP56 Concern: The regime for some prisoners in the CSC was severely limited by risk assessment, which determined the level of staff supervision, time unlocked, and access to association and basic equipment for each prisoner. These risk assessments had a considerable impact on the lives of individual prisoners and those sharing their unit. Many prisoners had very little time out of their cells and it was difficult to see how they could be effectively assessed. Risk management decisions were not adequately recorded and there was little monitoring or safeguarding in place.

Recommendation: Risk assessment arrangements in the close supervision centre should encourage appropriate time out of cell and risk assessment decisions should be fully recorded and subject to quality assurance.

HP57 Prisoners were unable to access some health services and clinics and had to wait too long for others, including primary mental health support.

Recommendation: All required health services and clinics should be provided and waiting times for access to primary mental health services should be reduced.

HP58 Too few prisoners could engage in learning and skills activity and over half the population were not engaged in meaningful activity at any one time. For those who could engage, the provision was generally only satisfactory.

Recommendation: The number of purposeful work and vocational training opportunities should be extended, to employ more of the prison's population. The quality of learning and skills provision and outcomes for prisoners should be improved.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Travelling conditions were good but poor punctuality of escort providers led to some long waits for prisoners. Prisoners were handcuffed between reception and the vans. Prisoners were not informed of moves in good time. The video-link facility was good and well used.
- 1.2 In our survey, 73% of respondents, against a comparator of 65%, said that they were treated well by escort staff. Vehicles used were clean and modern.
- 1.3 The late arrival of escort vans taking prisoners to court led to long waits in reception, and prisoners told us that they often had long waits at court after their cases had finished. This was being monitored by the prison, which had found that, since the introduction of new contractors, the percentage of escort vans arriving late had increased, from 6.5% to more than 20% in some months.
- 1.4 All prisoners were unnecessarily handcuffed between reception and the vans.
- 1.5 Prisoners were not informed of transfer until the morning of the move, giving them no time to notify friends and family.
- 1.6 Reasonable use was made of the video-link suite, which contained two dedicated court rooms and private interview booths. In the six months before the inspection, the virtual courtrooms had been used for 349 cases, and the interview booths on 839 occasions.

Recommendations

- 1.7 Escort vans should be dependably punctual.
- 1.8 Subject to risk assessment, prisoners should not be handcuffed between reception and escort vehicles, and should be informed of transfer on the evening before the move.

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 Reception was clean and bright. Procedures were efficient and staff welcoming. The prisoner orderly did not have a formal role to greet new prisoners. The dedicated first night centre was well prepared for new prisoners and there were good procedures to ensure that prisoners were safe and provided with key prison information. Staff were well supported by prisoner orderlies. Most prisoners received a thorough and well-paced induction but those allocated to the vulnerable prisoner wing and house unit 6 did not.

1.10 The reception area was bright and clean, with notices displayed in the holding rooms. Staff were efficient and welcoming to new arrivals. In our survey, 76% of prisoners said that they had been treated well in reception, which was better than the comparator (57%) and than at the time of the previous inspection (66%). All prisoners were given a full strip search, regardless of risk, but 92% of prisoners in our survey said that this had been carried out in a respectful way.

1.11 A Listener was available in reception but he told us that he did not have a formal role in supporting and informing new arrivals.

1.12 The assessment of new prisoners was thorough, with a private interview in reception. A meal was available at mealtimes but most prisoners did not wait long in reception.

1.13 All new prisoners went to the dedicated first night centre. A further private interview there assessed their vulnerability. The prisoners we interviewed had been provided with essential information, had the opportunity to shower, and been given a meal and bedding. A free telephone call was provided, except when there were public protection concerns, and a canteen pack was available. Accommodation was well prepared by prisoner orderlies, who were available to meet new prisoners. Arrangements for keeping vulnerable prisoners safe were well developed, and in our survey 91% of prisoners overall said that they had felt safe on their first night at the prison.

1.14 With the exception of vulnerable prisoners, most prisoners went to the induction unit on the day after reception. The induction process was thorough; it took place in a dedicated classroom, started on arrival on the unit, provided written information and lasted three days. It included presentations from induction orderlies, who were available on the unit to answer any questions. In our survey, 83% of respondents said that they had been on an induction course, of whom 70% said that it had covered everything they needed to know. During induction, prisoners visited relevant areas of the prison, met key staff and were inducted into the gym. There was also an assessment of their resettlement and educational needs, with referrals made to relevant departments.

1.15 The induction of vulnerable prisoners was inadequate. They did not receive a structured programme, and its delivery was the responsibility of whoever was allocated the role of movements officer on the day. Such prisoners told us that, in practice, they were not given any information by staff and relied on other prisoners for information.

1.16 There was also no structured induction programme for prisoners allocated to house unit 6.

Recommendations

1.17 The prisoner orderly in reception should have a formal role in supporting and informing new prisoners.

- 1.18 There should be an adequate, structured induction programme for vulnerable prisoners and those allocated to house unit 6.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.19 There was a comprehensive violence reduction strategy and governance was good. Consultation with prisoners had been developed and information about violent incidents was used to inform practice. The level of violent incidents was not high and serious assaults were investigated. There was a three-stage bullying monitoring process, which included work to address attitudes, and a victim support process.
- 1.20 There was a comprehensive violence reduction strategy, overseen by a multidisciplinary committee. Membership of the committee was appropriate but attendance was variable. The agenda covered evidence of violent behaviour, and action required to reduce the risk of violence. The committee worked to a rolling action plan, informed by monthly reports of violent incidents and consultation with prisoners. Information was analysed to identify areas of risk for prisoners and action was taken accordingly.
- 1.21 Prisoners arriving at the prison were well informed about violence reduction and there was a telephone hotline number available in residential units and advertised around the prison, including visits areas, to report bullying.
- 1.22 In our survey, 35% of respondents said that they had ever felt unsafe, which was better than the 41% comparator, and only 9% that they felt unsafe currently, against a comparator of 17%.
- 1.23 Consultation with prisoners was good, with an annual survey by the psychology department and informal responses to identified areas of concern by the safer custody officer (see section on vulnerable prisoners).
- 1.24 The level of violent incidents recorded was not high, at 124 in the six months before the inspection. There had been five serious assaults in this period, which had been investigated by the safer custody officer and a report submitted to the committee.
- 1.25 When there was evidence or suspicion of bullying, a three-stage monitoring system was used. This was mainly observational in the first two stages but the third stage, implemented after sustained bullying behaviour had been observed, involved segregation and intervention to address the perceptions and attitudes of the prisoner. There had been 158 uses of anti-bullying monitoring in 2011, and at the time of the inspection there were six prisoners subject to levels 1 and 2 of these measures, with only two uses of stage 3.
- 1.26 Victim support plans were opened when there was a suspicion of bullying, either with or without identification of the bully, or there were unexplained injuries. These identified the support required to keep the prisoner safe and monitored his behaviour.

- 1.27 The residential staff we spoke to were trained in the anti-bullying and victim support procedures and were confident in using them.

Vulnerable prisoners

1.28 There was a dedicated unit for vulnerable prisoners, with a diverse range of reasons for separation. There were concerns about the safety of some prisoners. Access to the regime for vulnerable prisoners was mostly reasonable but there were difficulties in attending education classes. Young adult prisoners were mixed with adults, even on the dedicated young adult wing, but risk assessments were not adequate. There was no specific regime for young adults.

- 1.29 Vulnerable prisoners were efficiently identified on arrival and were accommodated on house unit 4. The population of vulnerable prisoners comprised a mixture of those segregated because of the nature of their offence, usually sexual offending, and those who were at risk from other prisoners for reasons such as debt.
- 1.30 In our survey, these prisoners were more negative than prisoners on other wings about many aspects of the regime. In particular, 45% said that they had felt unsafe in the prison and 50% that they had been victimised by other prisoners.
- 1.31 We observed good relationships with staff, but some prisoners said that they did not feel they were well enough protected. They told us that some of the more vulnerable prisoners on the wing were targeted by younger men with more experience of prison. This had been recognised by the violence reduction officer, who had held some focus groups with older and vulnerable prisoners, although no specific action had been taken as a result.
- 1.32 Vulnerable prisoners had access to most aspects of the regime, including workshops and education. In our survey, 69% of vulnerable prisoners said that they had a prison job and 31% that they were involved in vocational or skills training, compared with 51% and 9%, respectively, of prisoners on other wings.

Young adult prisoners

- 1.33 There were 30 prisoners under the age of 21 held in the prison. These included convicted, unconvicted and detainee prisoners. There was no specific regime for young adult prisoners which took into account their additional needs and provided additional services.
- 1.34 A wing on house unit 2 was designated as accommodation for young adult prisoners but also held older men, and no age-appropriate risk assessment was completed on the younger prisoners to ensure that they could mix safely with adults. A number of young adults were located on other residential units, for reasons of their own safety or to be close to relatives. Risk assessments had been completed on them, but those carried out on young adult vulnerable prisoners did not specifically address the risk presented by adult sex offenders. Although staff told us that they tried to monitor young adults on the vulnerable prisoner wing closely and took the risk into consideration when deciding on cell sharing, we were concerned at their vulnerability on a wing with adults who might have been convicted of offences against young people, and where prisoners spent a lot of time unlocked (see main recommendation HP55).

Recommendation

- 1.35 The safety of prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wing should be reviewed and improved.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.36 There was an up-to-date self-harm and suicide prevention strategy but governance was inadequate. The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) supervision was sometimes poor, and a large number were opened and kept open too long. Some prisoners on ACCT supervision had been segregated. There were good arrangements for the provision and support of Listeners.
- 1.37 There was an up-to-date safer custody strategy, which covered all relevant issues and was complemented by a policy on the management of vulnerable prisoners. A monthly multidisciplinary committee oversaw safer custody and was attended by prisoners and Samaritans representatives. Although membership of the committee was appropriate, the minutes of meetings showed that attendance was inconsistent. The detailed information provided by the safer custody senior officer was not sufficiently focused or well analysed to lead consistently to improvement in the care of prisoners, and the committee did not have its own action plan.
- 1.38 There was ongoing training in the prevention and management of self-harm but staff in some crucial areas, such as night duty, did not have up-to-date training.
- 1.39 The safer custody senior officer investigated serious incidents of self-harm and provided a report to the committee. Just before, and immediately after our inspection, there had been two self-inflicted deaths which were subject to Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) investigation. Earlier deaths in custody had been reviewed and reported to the committee, and action plans had been completed.
- 1.40 The number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents opened was high. In the previous 12 months, 518 had been opened, and at the time of the inspection there were 47 open. Levels of self-harm were also high and had risen considerably, from 127 incidents reported in 2010 to 283 in 2011. There was no evidence that the safer custody committee was addressing the situation described by these statistics.
- 1.41 ACCT documents were mostly of reasonable quality but we found serious weaknesses. Too many had been opened unnecessarily and many had remained open longer than necessary. Attendance at planning and review meetings was not multidisciplinary and it was often not clear what action had been taken or was planned following a review. The care of some prisoners with mental health problems was not adequate. One prisoner with mental health problems on an open ACCT document had been held in the segregation unit, in spite of recommendations from health services and wing staff that he should be transferred to the

health care department. He had been placed in special accommodation without furniture and clothes and denied a television, which could have provided some distraction in his depressed state (see main recommendation HP53).

- 1.42 A team of Listeners and Samaritans telephones were available 24 hours a day, except on house unit 6, where Listeners were not permitted and Samaritans telephone access was restricted. Listeners felt well supported by the local Samaritans group, which held training sessions weekly.

Recommendation

- 1.43 Governance of safer custody, including the use of information, target setting and attendance at committee meetings, 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.²

- 1.44 There was no safeguarding policy or procedures but some support was provided.

- 1.45 The prison did not have a specific policy or procedures for adult safeguarding. Some prisoners with vulnerabilities who required extra support were identified and their needs met through safer custody, health and diversity arrangements but these needed to be better coordinated under an adult safeguarding policy.

- 1.46 There were guidelines and a policy for the management of vulnerable prisoners, which contained guidance on the identification of vulnerability, but this mainly concerned those at risk by nature of their offences or relationships with other prisoners.

Recommendation

- 1.47 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.

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

- 1.48 Security arrangements were mostly appropriate. The presence of high risk category prisoners did not overly impact on the general population and systematic arrangements were supported by effective dynamic security. Mandatory drug testing (MDT) rates were relatively low, although staff and prisoners told us that there was an issue with the diversion of prescribed medication, some of which was not detectable through current MDT test panels.
- 1.49 Physical security measures were robust and appropriate. Most of the category A prisoners were held on one unit, where they were integrated with other lower security category prisoners. Staff on the unit interacted well with prisoners, demonstrated a sound knowledge of the risks posed and understood the need for enhanced observation and the general management of category A prisoners (see also section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- 1.50 Patrol dogs constantly patrolled the grounds and were appropriately deployed to cover high-risk category A prisoner moves outside of residential units and unlocks out of general unlock times. All prisoners unlocked during the night state, regardless of security category, were escorted by a patrol dog (and handler). This was unnecessarily oppressive and not in line with the local security strategy, which stated that patrol dogs would be stationed outside of house units during any unlock of category A prisoners.
- 1.51 An average of around 800 security information reports (SIRs) were submitted each month, which were analysed efficiently and, where necessary, acted on. The highest percentage of SIRs were violence and substance related.
- 1.52 The security committee meetings were well attended and reviewed available intelligence in order to set monthly security objectives, which were communicated to all staff. There were two full-time police liaison officers, supported by a detective sergeant, who were fully integrated into the wider security team.
- 1.53 At the time of the inspection, there were 12 prisoners subject to closed visits, although most had been placed on restrictions as an administrative response to positive drug tests, rather than for visits-related activity. There were also only three visitors subject to banning orders. All visits restrictions were imposed initially for a three-month period and were then reviewed monthly by senior managers.
- 1.54 The average positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate quoted at the time of the inspection for the six months from July to December 2011 was 6.18%, against a key performance target of 8%. The MDT suites were clean, tidy and appropriately equipped.
- 1.55 In our survey, 22% of respondents, against a comparator of 29%, said that it was easy to get illicit drugs, 5% that they had developed a problem with drugs while at the prison and 8% that they had developed a problem with diverted medication while at the prison. However, staff and prisoners on some wings told us that large quantities of diverted medication were abused, especially gabapentin. Benzodiazepines and buprenorphine were the most commonly detected drugs in MDT results but gabapentin was not on the current MDT testing panel.
- 1.56 Suspicion test positive rates were low, at 18% for the six months from July to December 2011, although this may have been partly due to the use of undetectable abused medication. We were told that few suspicion tests fell out of the required 72-hour testing window but there was no specific monitoring of slippage.

Recommendations

- 1.57 Senior managers should review the procedures for out-of-hours unlocks.
- 1.58 Visits sanctions should be imposed only when there is sufficient evidence to suggest visits-related trafficking activity.
- 1.59 The range of drugs covered by mandatory drug testing should be widened to include the most commonly diverted medications, including gabapentin.
- 1.60 A mechanism to monitor suspicion testing should be developed, to ensure that all tests are undertaken within the required time frame.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.61 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was operated fairly and consistently across the prison. Managers were balanced in their decision making. Basic prisoners were afforded daily time out of cell but were not set targets to improve behaviour.
- 1.62 Information about the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was available during induction and on the house units. A written warning system was in place, although some prisoners told us that they were not always informed when a warning was issued. Electronic case notes were used to record warnings, and case notes were generally of good quality.
- 1.63 The paperwork showed that staff and prisoners were clear about the criteria for promotion and demotion on the scheme, and decisions were fair and justified. Managers took into account good behaviour during potential demotion reviews. There were sufficient differentials between the levels to encourage positive behaviour.
- 1.64 At the time of the inspection, less than 3% of the population were on the basic regime and they were afforded some daily time out of cell. We found little evidence of targets being set to improve behaviour. There was a suitable appeals process.

Housekeeping point

- 1.65 Prisoners placed on the basic level should be set meaningful written targets to improve their behaviour.

Disciplinary procedures

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.66 Use of adjudications was not high and records of hearings were generally well completed, with effective quality assurance. The use of force was high and use of special accommodation very high and appeared to be not always justified. Overall governance of use of force was poor. The regime in the segregation unit was minimal and the environment generally poor.
- 1.67 Levels of adjudications had remained static throughout 2010 and 2011, at around five per day. Only 26 cases had been referred to the independent adjudicator, which was a reduction from 41 in 2010.
- 1.68 The most regular breaches of discipline were recorded as disobeying lawful orders (335), possession of unauthorised articles (179) and assaults and threats (172 and 158, respectively).
- 1.69 Adjudication procedures were sound, with a good level of enquiry at every stage. Quality assurance was effective.
- 1.70 Adjudications were held six days a week, in an appropriate setting within the segregation unit. Before adjudication hearings, prisoners were held in empty, bare cells, with nothing to occupy them. During adjudications, prisoners were not provided with a pen and paper to enable them to make notes.
- 1.71 The standardisation meeting was well attended and appropriately chaired by the deputy governor. Monitoring was effective and data from adjudications was also considered by the segregation monitoring and review group (SMARG).

Housekeeping points

- 1.72 The environment for prisoners waiting for adjudications should be improved.
- 1.73 Prisoners should have access to writing equipment to be able to make notes during adjudications.

The use of force

- 1.74 The bimonthly use of force meeting was well attended and a wide range of data discussed but general governance was poor. There had been 330 recorded uses of force in 2011, which was high (see main recommendation HP54).
- 1.75 Video recordings were not routinely made of planned interventions, and the storage and control of recordings that had been made were chaotic. Some of the video recordings of incidents had missed some key stages of interventions and showed staff being deployed to arrest 'passive' prisoners, and some (including where batons had been used) required further investigation.

- 1.76 The documentation we observed demonstrated a culture of de-escalation and contributions to use of force dossiers were generally of a good standard but too many (including one that recorded the use of a body belt) were incomplete. There was no one with the appropriate level of authority to oversee the documentation and records. F213 (the form used to report injuries to prisoners) records were particularly notable omissions.
- 1.77 Use of the special accommodation was very high, at almost 40 in 2011 (see main recommendation HP54). Too many prisoners were inappropriately located there and often for far too long, including overnight and even when evidence indicated they had calmed down and no longer required such conditions. Recording was also often poor; we found at least six dossiers that had not been entered into the log. Tear-resistant clothing appeared to be issued almost routinely, unnecessarily and without justification in many cases.

House unit 6

- 1.78 There was a separate special accommodation cell and three high-control cells on A wing on house unit 6. The documentation relating to the use of these cells was filed haphazardly, there was no central log and we were not easily able to ascertain how often and for how long these cells had been used. One use of the special accommodation for a prisoner who had self-harmed appeared inappropriate. Governance arrangements and monitoring were poor and there was little management oversight of the use of these cells (see main recommendation HP54).

Segregation

- 1.79 The segregation unit was dirty and generally in a poor state of repair, and empty cells were not adequately prepared for use. The servery and other general areas, such as the landings and shower areas, were also dirty. Communal showers were inadequately screened from view.
- 1.80 The average occupation level of the unit was reasonably low, at around five throughout 2011.
- 1.81 Around 38% of prisoners held under good order or discipline (GOOD) were transferred to other prisons. There was little evidence of active care or reintegration plans beyond a document completed following initial reception to the unit. Ongoing monitoring arrangements were appropriate and the quarterly segregation monitoring and review meetings were well attended by all but the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB).
- 1.82 The regime on the unit was minimal and consisted of daily showers, exercise (in one of the small bare yards), access to a small selection of books, and daily visits from a governor, chaplain and a member of the health services team. The IMB visited at least once a week. Attendance at religious services was subject to risk assessment but education was provided only on an in-cell basis. Despite assurances that prisoners were sometimes allowed televisions, we were unable to find any evidence of this, and the two documents that the prison provided as proof were from 2010 and one had clearly been falsified.
- 1.83 Staff-prisoner relationships were good and all of the regular segregation staff had a good level of knowledge of those in their care. Staff training records showed that consideration had been given to competence-based training for the environment, although there was no evidence of any mental health awareness training for any of the current unit staff.

Recommendations

- 1.84 The segregation unit should be kept clean and well maintained.
- 1.85 There should be care plans for long-term residents of the segregation unit.
- 1.86 Staff working regularly in the segregation unit should be trained in mental health awareness.

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 Although clinical and psychosocial services delivered a good standard of care and were highly regarded by prisoners, they lacked integration and joint working. Prescribing was relatively flexible, although prisoners were not initiated onto buprenorphine treatment while in the prison.
- 1.88 The integrated drug treatment system had gone live at the beginning of January 2012, although a clinical prescribing service had been in place for much longer. Both the clinical and the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) services were appreciated by prisoners, and in our survey 83% of prisoners, against a comparator of 78%, found the support helpful.
- 1.89 Prisoners considered the two services as separate, and there was insufficient formal integration between them, with no joint team meetings, few co-facilitated group sessions and a relatively ad-hoc approach to jointly attended clinical reviews.
- 1.90 Nearly 85% of the 99 prisoners on methadone were receiving maintenance doses. Although many of them were on remand or serving short sentences, and therefore not appropriate candidates for detoxification, there was an insufficiently coordinated approach to care planning to encourage longer-term maintained prisoners into reduction and recovery.
- 1.91 First night prescribing was in place and existing buprenorphine (Subutex) prescribing regimes were continued following confirmation from community prescribers. However, prisoners were not initiated onto buprenorphine treatment while in the prison because of the perception that a large proportion of the detected illicitly used Subutex was diverted from treatment.
- 1.92 There was no dual diagnosis service available at the time of the inspection; however, a specialist dual diagnosis worker had recently been appointed, pending security clearance.

Recommendations

- 1.93 Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) and clinical substance misuse services should further integrate and undertake joint care plans and reviews.

- 1.94 Steps should be taken to improve the supervision of medication administration, to prevent diversion, rather than refusing to initiate prisoners onto buprenorphine (Subutex).

Section 2: Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 All outside areas were well maintained. The cleanliness of the house units varied. Cells were clean, although some contained graffiti and most had inadequate toilet screening. There was good access to showers but some were in a poor state of repair and there was no privacy screening. Applications were dealt with fairly and rules were equitably enforced. Contact with the outside world was satisfactory. Prisoners could wear their own clothing and the quality of prison clothing was reasonable.
- 2.2 The standards of cleanliness varied across the house units, with most association areas clean but the mezzanine landings less so. House unit 5 was the dirtiest, with engrained dirt throughout. Communal areas were bright, with good sightlines. The outside environment was impressive but exercise yards were featureless and unwelcoming.
- 2.3 Access to cell cleaning was good and most cells we observed were clean. In our survey, 87% of respondents, against the comparator of 62%, said that they received cell cleaning materials weekly. Some cell floors were damaged and some cells had graffiti on the walls. Toilet screening in most cells was inadequate. The prisons offensive display was generally adhered to.
- 2.4 Cell sharing risk assessments were used to determine a prisoner's location. In our survey, more respondents than at comparator prisons felt safe. Prisoners told us that the environment was safe, and quiet and calm at night; however, we observed examples of limited staff supervision. Cell call bells were answered promptly.
- 2.5 Access to the showers was unrestricted, and in our survey 95% of respondents said that they were able to shower daily. Some showers were dirty and in a poor state of repair, although a refurbishment programme was under way. There was no privacy screening in any of the communal showers.
- 2.6 Bedding was of decent quality and weekly bedding exchange took place. Some mattresses were worn and required replacement.
- 2.7 In our survey, respondents were more positive than at comparator prisons about the speed and fairness of the applications process. Information on the services available was displayed on wing noticeboards but it was mainly in English only.
- 2.8 Prison rules and routines formed part of the induction programme and copies were available on wing noticeboards. Prisoners told us that generally staff were fair when implementing the rules.

- 2.9 Although the ratio of telephones on house units 2, 3 and 4 was only one telephone per 28 prisoners, prisoners said that access to the telephones was satisfactory. Incoming mail was distributed to prisoners only on weekdays, with no distribution on Saturdays. Recorded mail was always delivered to prisoners on the day after it arrived at the prison. Legal correspondence was not routinely opened by staff, and in 2011 only 14 such items had been opened in error, with those affected receiving a letter of apology.
- 2.10 All prisoners could wear their own clothing, and the quality of prison clothing was reasonable. Laundry facilities were available for prisoners who chose to wear their own clothes, and a central laundry provided facilities to clean prison clothing. In our survey, 69% of respondents, against a comparator of 52%, said that they were offered clean, suitable clothing weekly.
- 2.11 The facilities list was appropriate and met the needs of the population. Prisoners could have clothes sent in during the first two months at the prison and could order other property via the prison shop. Property was disseminated to prisoners promptly, with no backlog of applications in reception.

House unit 6

- 2.12 All the wings on house unit 6 were reasonably clean and the units were designed to allow natural light. All cells were single occupancy. Prisoners had adequate supplies of cleaning materials for their cells, which were generally clean. Toilets in all the cells were unscreened. Shower areas were clean on all but C wing, which had peeling paint, poor ventilation and required refurbishment. Exercise yards were large, bleak and cage-like, and prisoners on the protected witness unit (PWU) were not able to access routinely the garden that they had developed and worked on.
- 2.13 At the time of the inspection, most prisoners residing on the unit were unable to leave, because their risk assessments prevented such movement. The environment was oppressive and lacked normalising or stimulating features.
- 2.14 The unit was self-contained and provided prisoners with all services. Each wing had its own cardiovascular gym, visits area, small libraries, laundry facilities, telephones, and exercise and association areas. Meals were delivered on heated trolleys from the main kitchen and served from a central hotplate. Prisoners on the PWU had the choice of catering for themselves to minimise the risk of food contamination, or have meals delivered from the main kitchen. At the time of our inspection all prisoners were catering for themselves.

Recommendation

- 2.15 A cleaning and maintenance schedule should be implemented across the house units that improves and standardises the overall cleanliness of all wings and ensures that privacy screening is available for showers and in-cell toilets.

Housekeeping points

- 2.16 Mattresses should be replaced when they are worn and thin.
- 2.17 Information should be available in a range of languages that meet the needs of the population.
- 2.18 Mail should be delivered on Saturdays.

- 2.19 Prisoners on the protected witness unit should be allowed access to the wing garden.

House unit 6: close supervision unit/managing challenging behaviour unit/protected witness unit

- 2.20 A review of close supervision provision across the high security estate had taken place, resulting in some changes in provision at Woodhill. Case management was satisfactory and particularly good on C wing, although there was a lack of communication with prisoners from review boards. Risk management processes required some attention. Living conditions on house unit 6 were reasonable but the environment was oppressive and lacked any stimulating features. Access to meaningful activities was poor for most prisoners. Staff-prisoner relationships were generally good and staff dealt well with a challenging group of prisoners under sometimes difficult circumstances.
- 2.21 House unit 6 was a separate, secure building in the prison grounds, containing the close supervision centre (CSC) on A and B wings, the managing challenging behaviour unit (MCBU) on C wing and the protected witness units (PWU) on D and E wings. Following a review of the provision of CSCs in the high security estate, B wing had changed function in September 2011 to become a management unit for CSC prisoners, and the MCBU had opened in October 2011.
- 2.22 The CSC and MCBU housed prisoners administered and managed under a national strategy through the directorate of high security and aimed to provide secure units for prisoners who were highly disruptive or who demonstrated or expressed a desire to demonstrate violent and/or highly disruptive behaviour. Both units were used as a national resource within the high security estate. The PWU provided a secure and safe setting for prisoners whose lives were at risk because of having given evidence in cases of serious or organised crime. At the time of the inspection, there were 13 prisoners on the two CSC wings, 10 on the MCBU and six on the PWU. Staff on all the units dealt well with a challenging group of prisoners, often under difficult and trying circumstances.
- 2.23 Prisoners on the CSC wings and most prisoners on the MCBU were managed by a central management team, which determined the CSC units around the country to which prisoners would be allocated. This sometimes resulted in a difficult-to-manage population on these wings, as was the case during the inspection. The case files we examined indicated that prisoners had received written reasons for their allocation to the units, and prisoners we spoke to understood why they had been placed there. Not all prisoners agreed with their allocation and some were challenging these decisions through appropriate legal means. Although A wing was described as a CSC assessment wing, it was difficult to see how this could work in practice, as most prisoners were locked up for much of the day and subject to restricted access to association and regime activities. Four prisoners on the MCBU had been transferred to the unit from other house units at Woodhill and were managed by a local team.
- 2.24 Staff and prisoners were confused about the purpose of B wing, which was originally intended to be a progression wing for those managed under CSC guidelines but had more recently been reassigned and referred to as a management wing for CSC prisoners. Prisoners and staff on this wing felt that there had been a lack of progression for prisoners there and our observations supported this.
- 2.25 Personal officers carried out weekly reviews of prisoners in their care and prisoners were invited to contribute to them, although not all chose to do so. The reviews we examined

covered access to regime facilities, behaviour, risk factors and other observations. Senior officers on the wings carried out a weekly risk assessment review which determined for each prisoner how many officers were required to be present when he was unlocked and the regime activities that he could access.

- 2.26 Some risk assessments that we examined detailed little more than a list of dates when the prisoner had used facilities such as showers, telephones and exercise, and when they had acted appropriately with staff and other prisoners on the wing. These assessments did not reassure us that the risk management protocols were appropriate.
- 2.27 A full review of each prisoner on the CSC was carried out by the central management team every month. Each quarter, a full review of the care and management plan was carried out and prisoners could attend this meeting with a legal representative if they so wished. The reviews were carried out by multidisciplinary teams, and minutes of meetings showed that consideration was given to all prisoners held in CSC units across the prison estate and that decisions were made about appropriate locations and regimes for these prisoners. Case management was satisfactory on A and B wings and particularly good on C wing. Prisoners complained, and we found evidence, that few received written feedback from these meetings and that they were not given the chance to comment, even though the policy clearly allowed for this. There was no adequate quality assurance and there were no safeguards in place for case management processes (see main recommendation HP56).
- 2.28 Prisoners on all wings had access to psychological services, although the lack of a clinical psychologist was a clear gap in provision. Prisoners requiring such specialist support were considered for transfer to a small unit at HMP Manchester, where such services could be bought in. One prisoner from Woodhill was currently at Manchester for that purpose. Psychology staff had recently started group work on B wing, which was providing a useful forum for prisoners to discuss a range of issues with specialist staff.

Recommendations

- 2.29 The purpose of B wing should be clearly communicated to staff and prisoners, and underlying systems and regime provision should be implemented to support this.
- 2.30 There should be clinical psychologist provision on house unit 6.

Housekeeping point

- 2.31 Prisoners on the CSC should receive written feedback from review meetings and be given the chance to comment on decisions made.

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.

- 2.32 In general, there were good relationships between staff and prisoners but prisoners on house unit 3, which was a general remand and convicted prisoner unit, were less satisfied than those

on other units. There was limited supervision of prisoners but the interactions that took place were mostly positive. A suitable personal officer scheme was in operation.

- 2.33 Prisoners on most house units spoke positively about their relationships with staff, although prisoners on house unit 3 were less positive, describing staff as disinterested and lazy. In our survey, 88% of respondents, against the 70% comparator, said that staff treated them with respect and 83%, against the 71% comparator, that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem.
- 2.34 Across all the residential units, we observed limited supervision of prisoners during the core day, but interaction improved during association, and 26% of respondents to our survey, against the 17% comparator, said that staff spoke to them during association. We observed some good interactions between staff and prisoners of all grades.
- 2.35 There was a suitable personal officer scheme, and most prisoners knew who their personal officer was. In our survey, 76% of respondents, against the 63% comparator, said that their personal officer was helpful. Links between personal officers and the offender management unit were underdeveloped.
- 2.36 We saw staff using prisoners' preferred names, both during conversation and in electronic case history notes. Case history notes indicated that staff understood prisoners' issues and reflected a balanced view by staff.
- 2.37 Prisoner representatives and staff met monthly. Some action points took several months to be resolved.

House unit 6

- 2.38 Relationships between staff and prisoners were good and staff were fully aware of prisoners' personal circumstances and the security issues affecting their custody. Relationships on C wing (MCBU) were particularly good and prisoners on this unit praised staff for giving them a chance and treating them as individuals. There was a published selection policy for staff working on house unit 6 and there were appropriate support systems for those staff.

Recommendation

- 2.39 The prison should seek to understand the negative perceptions of prisoners on house unit 3 about staff, and address any concerns raised.

Housekeeping point

- 2.40 Links between personal officers and the offender management unit should be developed.

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.

2.41 The management of equality and diversity was generally effective. This was underpinned by good policies which recognised the distinct needs of each protected characteristic. Governance and monitoring arrangements identified inequality, and actions were taken. However, consultation arrangements and engagement with black and minority ethnic prisoners were inadequate. In general, the support given to foreign national prisoners, older prisoners and those with disabilities, and Gypsy/Traveller prisoners was effective; however, the negative perceptions of some Muslim prisoners, older prisoners and those with disabilities required further investigation. Good use was made of external links to promote equality and diversity.

Strategic management

2.42 There was a good overarching equality and diversity strategy document, covering a three-year period and associated action. Outstanding actions had been moved to the establishment consolidated action plan, which was regularly updated and reviewed at monthly senior management team meetings; however, the actions identified in equality impact assessments had not been included. The strategy included all diversity strands and specified governance and monitoring arrangements. There was an updated prisoner equality policy, which was publicised in residential areas and included information on the types of support available for each diversity strand.

Housekeeping point

2.43 Actions identified in equality impact assessments should be included in the prison's action plan.

Protected characteristics

2.44 The prisoner equality meeting, formerly known as the race equality action team (REAT) meeting, took place monthly. Attendance was good, included prisoner diversity representatives and was chaired by the governor or deputy. Ethnic monitoring data were routinely discussed and reports were provided by diversity leads, although sexual orientation and transgender issues were not mentioned. There were regular forums for some prisoners from minority groups but this was considerably less frequent for black and minority ethnic prisoners. In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners were more negative than white prisoners across a range of indicators. However, our prisoner groups, ethnic monitoring and our observations did not support this.

2.45 Incident reporting arrangements were good. Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were available in several languages. Ninety-two DIRFs had been submitted in 2011 and the quality of investigations into claims of inequality was good, with some leading to disciplinary procedures against staff when this was seen as necessary.

2.46 Ongoing diversity training ('challenge it, change it') was being delivered and most staff had been trained. Almost 200 staff had completed faith awareness training.

- 2.47 There was good support for the 21 prisoners who identified as Gypsy/Romany/Traveller. These prisoners could apply for an additional weekly PIN credit of £20 from their private cash if their only means of contact with family was by means of a mobile telephone. A focus group for these prisoners met monthly but attendance was poor on occasion, and meetings were cancelled. A database of approved Traveller sites was maintained.
- 2.48 A range of cultural events and religious festivals was celebrated. Traveller and Gypsy Month had been celebrated in June 2011 and supported by external groups, including the Irish Ambassador. Events had been arranged for Black History Month.
- 2.49 Foreign national prisoners accounted for 16% of the prison population and were generally more positive across a range of indicators than British prisoners. A range of translated material was available. Foreign national prisoners were identified during the reception process, with further checks made by the foreign nationals coordinator. New prisoners were seen within 48 hours and provided with information on their status. At the time of the inspection, the prison held 15 detainees. The national population management unit was notified weekly of all prisoners who were waiting to be moved.
- 2.50 Fortnightly clinics were held with local immigration enforcement staff, and a larger monthly surgery took place with the UK Border Agency and an independent law firm specialising in immigration law. The surgery we observed was well attended and included a Vietnamese and Russian interpreter. This was the only forum in which foreign national prisoners met as a group.
- 2.51 Screening processes for those with a disability were effective, and any prisoner who declared a disability (265 at the time of the inspection) or was over the age of 50 (77) was seen by one of the two full-time diversity officers or the disabled and older prisoners liaison officer (DOPLO). A comprehensive care plan was instigated and appropriate referrals for reasonable adjustments were made; care plans were routinely reviewed.
- 2.52 Support and engagement with older prisoners and those with disabilities was good, with a variety of information sessions, forums and recreational events taking place weekly. However, in our survey, prisoners who considered themselves to have a disability responded more negatively than their able-bodied counterparts about being victimised by prisoners and staff and they had more negative perceptions about access to the gym, education and exercise. Minutes from the disabled and older prisoner forum were comprehensive but these issues had not been raised there. There were gym classes for the over-50s and a stair lift had recently been installed in the education department.
- 2.53 Most older prisoners and those with a disability were located on the vulnerable prisoner unit but we found personal emergency evacuation plans for only two prisoners, and neither had been reviewed for some time.
- 2.54 There was good engagement with community groups. Disability awareness training had been delivered regularly to staff and some prisoner diversity representatives by Milton Keynes Centre for Integrated Living. MIND Milton Keynes and the Royal National Institute for Deaf People (RNID) had also visited the establishment to deliver training, and several external organisations had attended a Disability Day in November 2010, attended by 160 prisoners.
- 2.55 In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons (62% versus 54%) said that their religious beliefs were respected, although more Muslim than non-Muslim prisoners said that they had been victimised by staff because of their religious beliefs (18% versus 3%). Some Muslim prisoners told us that this perception was based on the fact that some staff lacked

cultural awareness. The Muslim chaplain and another full-time member of the chaplaincy team regularly delivered faith awareness training to staff, with a particular emphasis on Islam. Some Muslim prisoners complained to us that it was difficult to see the Muslim chaplain.

- 2.56 There were separate policies for gay/bisexual and transgender prisoners. In our survey, 2% had identified as gay or bisexual. In our meeting with a group of diversity representatives, they all said that they had not heard homophobic language being used by prisoners.
- 2.57 Prisoners identifying as gay, bisexual or transgender could access Q:Alliance, a local support network whose contact details were included in the prison's policy. This organisation responded to prisoners' requests on a one-to-one basis and had previously attended the prison to deliver training to staff. Information on gay/bisexual and transgender issues was displayed in residential areas.

Recommendations

- 2.58 There should be a regular consultation forum with black and minority ethnic prisoners, to ensure that their views contribute to the overall management of equality and diversity.
- 2.59 A foreign nationals group should be held, so that information and support can be shared and offered and any areas of concern referred to the prisoner equality meeting for action.
- 2.60 Perceptions of inequality of treatment and access to some activities should be monitored by age and disability, and appropriate action taken to rectify any inequalities.
- 2.61 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be developed for all prisoners with disabilities who require them, and staff should be aware of them.

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.

- 2.62 The chaplaincy team was integrated into the life of the prison and ensured that faith provision catered for the needs of the population. Areas dedicated to worship were good. Faith-based classes were available. A full-time resettlement chaplain post had recently been filled, to develop faith links outside the prison for prisoners coming towards the end of sentence.
- 2.63 The chaplaincy team reflected the faith/denominational requirements of the population, 65% of which was either Christian (51%) or Muslim (14%). A full-time vacancy for a resettlement chaplain had recently been filled to develop faith links outside the prison, and the team was well supported by a range of sessional chaplains. At the time of the inspection, a Christian Orthodox chaplain was being sourced to meet the needs of a small number of prisoners. New receptions were seen by a member of the chaplaincy team within 24 hours and each received an informative leaflet, available in a range of languages, on the chaplaincy services available.

- 2.64 A range of faith-based classes was available, predominantly for Christian and Muslim prisoners. Good pastoral care was provided to all prisoners who had experienced significant events, including bereavements, and one sessional chaplain was a trained counsellor.
- 2.65 Faith facilities, including ablution facilities for Muslim prisoners, were good.
- 2.66 The chaplaincy team had developed a competitively priced shop list specifically for religious artefacts, which was popular with prisoners, but this was about to be withdrawn to meet procurement rules. The team had also worked closely with the security department to produce guidance for staff on the searching of religious artefacts and prison visitors.

Good practice

- 2.67 *The chaplaincy team had worked closely with the security department to produce guidance for staff on the searching of religious artefacts and prison visitors.*

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.

- 2.68 Prisoners were positive about complaints. Complaint forms were freely available. The responses that we reviewed were mainly respectful and answered the issue raised.
- 2.69 In our survey, prisoners were positive about complaints, with 47% saying that complaints were dealt with fairly, which was better than the 29% comparator, and 51% that they were dealt with quickly, against the 33% comparator.
- 2.70 Complaint forms were freely available on all house units and processes for distributing and monitoring timeliness were efficient.
- 2.71 The average of 560 complaint responses submitted per month was high. Measures were being implemented to try to reduce the number of inappropriate complaints submitted.
- 2.72 The quality of complaints was monitored and the results were fed back to the staff responsible. The responses that we reviewed were mainly respectful and answered the issue raised. The subject of complaints was monitored and a full report was submitted to the senior management team, which resulted in changes to practice.

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.

- 2.73 Legal services, including bail information, were established. Licence recall prisoners were quickly identified and opportunities and facilities for legal visits were good.
- 2.74 Resettlement staff provided legal services and bail information, and all prisoners were interviewed within their first 24 hours at the establishment. Licence recall prisoners were identified and recall packs issued within five days of receipt from the parole board. Information on legal services and bail information was widely displayed in residential areas.
- 2.75 Access to and facilities for legal visits were good. There were 14 comfortable interview rooms, offering privacy, and there was a separate Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) room. Each of the visits rooms on house unit 6 had a separate interview room for legal visits.

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.

- 2.76 Some nurse-led clinics had not been run for a few months and some had long waiting lists due to staff shortages. There was good access to practice nurses. There were available appointments to see the GP but in our survey prisoners reported access to be poor. Dental services were good and the waiting list was short. Pharmacy services were adequate but medicines management was not sufficiently robust and some prisoners were not able to get medication on time. Primary mental health provision was inadequate but the quality of secondary mental health services was good, although patients waiting for transfers to mental health units experienced long delays.

Governance arrangements

- 2.77 Health services were commissioned by Milton Keynes Primary Care Trust (PCT), and 24-hour primary care nursing services were provided by Milton Keynes Community Health Services, hosted by Bedford Hospital NHS Trust. Medical services were provided by Resuscitate, a 24-hour GP consortium. Mental health services were provided by Milton Keynes Community Health Services for the main prison and Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust for house unit 6.
- 2.78 Governance arrangements were reasonably good, with reporting undertaken via the partnership board and the Trust clinical governance group. A health needs assessment had been undertaken in 2009. Action points had recently been reviewed with the intention of undertaking a further review later in the year. The needs analysis and mental health strategy did not adequately encompass learning disability, personality disorder or recovery working. There were plans to undertake a formal review of the mental health needs of prisoners.
- 2.79 Incident reporting and monitoring were of a good standard. There were policies and procedures, including for information sharing and communicable diseases. These were being

reviewed, as many were out of date, but there was no mechanism for staff to sign that they had read and understood them.

- 2.80 An acting head of health care provided good leadership, supported by a deputy head and two clinical leads. Staffing levels had been reviewed and skill mix adjustments were being undertaken. As a result of a high level of staff vacancies and sickness leave, the range of health services provided did not meet the health needs of the population. Clinical and managerial supervision was available and also a programme of training, although staff shortages had limited training opportunities.
- 2.81 There were regular infection control audits and monitoring of the cleaning contract. Cleaning staff were not always able to enter the treatment rooms, so not all rooms were cleaned every day. Emergency resuscitation equipment, including oxygen and automated electronic defibrillators, were available throughout the prison but there were no records to identify that appropriate checks had been undertaken. All nurses were up to date with basic life support but few officers had undertaken first-aid or defibrillator training.
- 2.82 We observed respectful interactions between health services staff and prisoners, although we received some complaints about some abrupt medical and nursing staff. Few clinical staff wore identification badges.
- 2.83 Prisoners were not given information about access to health services but knew how to complain about their health care. Responses to complaints were timely and addressed prisoners' concerns. We received verbal complaints about the inability to access outside hospital appointments, late or incorrect medication and a slow application process.
- 2.84 There was little health promotion and the information available was limited, pending the placement of display boards around the site.

Recommendation

- 2.85 **The health needs assessment of the prison population should be assessed and include prisoners with learning disabilities and personality disorders and recovery working.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.86 A process should be introduced by which staff sign to confirm that they have read and understood all clinical and pharmacy policies and procedures.
- 2.87 All officers should be trained to use the emergency equipment, including the automated electronic defibrillator.
- 2.88 All clinical staff should wear visible identification badges.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.89 An electronic screening tool was used to identify and document patients' needs on arrival, and a comprehensive health assessment was carried out within 72 hours; however, the latter was not always possible, so action was being taken to ensure that there was consistency in secondary screening.

- 2.90 Overall, the health services provided were safe and accessible but prisoners in our groups were negative about access and quality. GP surgeries were held twice a day, although many nurse-led clinics had not been held for some time (see main recommendation HP57). There was a high reliance on practice nurses to provide asthma, diabetes and dermatology clinics. At the time of the inspection, the waiting time to see a practice nurse was three weeks, although emergency appointments were available. In our survey, 47% of prisoners said that access to a nurse was good or very good, which was worse than the 53% comparator. Only 23% prisoners found it easy or very easy to see the doctor, which was worse than the comparator (27%), although we found that appointments were available.
- 2.91 There was a 24-week wait for chlamydia testing and a seven-week wait for the sexual health clinic. The genito-urinary medicine clinic was reliant on prisoners attending external appointments. Prisoners had no access to barrier protection.
- 2.92 Out-of-hours and emergency medical cover was effective. There was a good programme for immunisation, particularly for hepatitis B, and prisoners were offered these services while on the first night centre. There was also access to a podiatrist, optician and a physiotherapist. There was currently no smoking cessation clinic. Patients were triaged by nursing staff and referred to a practitioner as appropriate. However, a lack of training in this area often led to unnecessary referrals. A lead nurse and two other nurses supported the overall care of older prisoners. Links with local services enabled the acquisition of specialist equipment when required. There was no patient forum but staff attended the prisoner consultative meetings.
- 2.93 There was an effective appointment system, although prisoners complained of long waits for services such as the optician. We tested the application process and found no evidence that our application had been received by the health care department. Our evidence suggested a problem with the timeliness of the applications system.
- 2.94 SystmOne, the electronic clinical record system, was used, although not to its best effect. Record keeping was generally adequate and storage of records was compliant with Data Protection and Caldicott guidance.
- 2.95 The inpatient environment was spacious, clean and tidy, with natural light. The treatment room was in a poor state of decoration and the garden was large but bare. The unit was supposed to be staffed by uniformed officers, a qualified nurse during the day and two health services staff at night, but a qualified nurse was not always present during the day. Uniformed officers kept good patient-centred records, with clear agreements on expected behaviour, and good communication.
- 2.96 Although we saw no published guidelines for admission to inpatient beds, patients were admitted according to clinical need. Beds were not part of the certified normal accommodation. At the time of the inspection there were 11 inpatients and they reported a good environment and positive relationships with staff. The regime appeared calm and therapeutic.
- 2.97 Most inpatients had serious and enduring mental health needs. There were regular community meetings and ad-hoc group activities each day to encourage social interaction, and visits by an arts teacher and chaplain; the books and magazine stock on the unit was replenished by the library team.
- 2.98 The administrators managed external hospital appointments. There were three escort opportunities each day, which was not always sufficient. We saw evidence of cancelled or moved appointments, and these were not monitored or reported to partnership board.

Recommendations

- 2.99 Nursing staff should receive further training to be able to triage prisoners' health care needs.
- 2.100 Action should be undertaken to reduce waiting list and improve the application process to all clinics, particularly sexual health services.
- 2.101 The number of moved or cancelled external appointments should be monitored and inappropriate cancellations reduced.

Housekeeping points

- 2.102 There should be sufficient nursing staff in the inpatient department at all times.
- 2.103 There should be written admission criteria for inpatient beds that reflect the current good practice.
- 2.104 Risk assessment decisions between secondary care providers and health services and security staff should be reviewed, fully recorded and subject to quality assurance.

Pharmacy

- 2.105 Regular medicines and therapeutics committee meetings were held, chaired by the PCT pharmacist. The full range of standard operating procedures was under review, as they had not been updated for some time. The list of medications that could be held in possession was being extended to include the supply of monthly medicines. There was no special sick policy in use, with most medicines being prescribed. The use of medicines from the out-of-hours cupboard was documented and monitored, although it contained several medications that were not required.
- 2.106 The pharmacy and house unit treatment rooms, with the exception of the inpatient treatment room, were in good decorative order, clean and tidy. Not all refrigerators were subject to regular temperature checks. There were grilled doors available for the supply of medicines to prisoners. However, the supervision of prisoners by officers was of a varying standard. We observed some disruptive medication administration times, where there was the potential for bullying or diversion of medications.
- 2.107 Pharmacists assessed prisoners' medication regularly and conducted medicines use reviews as appropriate in daily pharmacy clinics. The treatment rooms were visited by pharmacy staff once a week, when cupboards were checked for stock levels and any unused or obsolete items were returned to the pharmacy. There were limited patient group directions in use, and those for the supply of ibuprofen and paracetamol were out of date. Gabapentin was regularly prescribed in the treatment of neuropathic pain. The pharmacist was in the process of trying to establish a pain clinic in order to reduce the amount of painkillers prescribed.
- 2.108 Some prescription charts contained alterations which had not been signed or dated by the prescriber; the administration of medication was not always recorded, some prisoners did not receive their medications at the correct times and some prisoners had more than one chart in use at one time. Prisoners were given adequate medication when going to court or being transferred or released.

- 2.109 The controlled drugs cabinet in the pharmacy was screwed rather than bolted to the wall. Controlled drugs were transported securely around the prison. The frequency of controlled drug stock audits, both in the pharmacy and on the wings, was inconsistent. Controlled drug register entries were occasionally altered without adequate explanation.

Recommendations

- 2.110 Discipline staff should be available to manage queues for the administration of medication on all house units.
- 2.111 A full range of patient group directions should be available to enable more potent medication to be administered by the pharmacist or nurse.

Housekeeping points

- 2.112 There should be a review of the medication stored in the out-of-hours cupboard.
- 2.113 Maximum and minimum temperatures for the drug refrigerators should be recorded daily, to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2–8°C range.
- 2.114 All prescriptions should comply with guidance from regulatory bodies and duplication of medicine charts should be avoided.
- 2.115 The storage and recording of controlled drugs should meet current guidance.

Dentistry

- 2.116 The dental surgery was fit for purpose and equipment was maintained and in good working order. Cross-infection controls were generally satisfactory, as there was a 'clean and dirty' flow for the cleaning of equipment. However, the room adjoining the surgery was small, cramped and cluttered. Action to ensure compliance with infection control regulations was planned but implementation was slow.
- 2.117 Access to the dentist had improved over the previous few months. Applications were triaged by the dental team and patients rarely waited more than four weeks. At the time of the inspection, there were 38 patients waiting to be seen. Dental checks and a range of treatment at least equivalent to that available in the NHS were provided and oral health information was supplied on a one-to-one basis and at health events. There were problems with waste management and no regular facilities to discard chemical waste.

Housekeeping point

- 2.118 The dental rooms should be clear from clutter and effective waste management and infection controls should be in place.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.119 Around 33% of custody staff had been trained in mental health awareness in the previous two years. Separate training had been delivered to CSC staff.

- 2.120 Primary mental health provision was inadequate and prisoners waited too long for referrals. Prisoners complained about poor access to these services; average waits were over a month – one prisoner had been waiting 27 weeks – and there was a waiting list of 47 prisoners during the inspection. Primary mental health services included talking and group activities, and guided self-help for people with mild-to-moderate mental health problems.
- 2.121 Despite the high number of prisoners with acute mental health problems, the quality of secondary mental health services was good. However, the ability to practise was severely hampered by the regime and unlock arrangements in house unit 6. For example, clinical interviews and interventions were regularly temporarily curtailed due to the requirement to have all prisoners in cells while another is moved around; therapy had to be resumed when all prisoners were in their cells. Also, some clinical exchanges had to be conducted through locked cell doors, which affected the effectiveness of communication and clinical confidentiality.
- 2.122 The mental health in-reach team (MHIRT) had a caseload of approximately 100 patients at any one time, with intense input for up to 30 patients. The CSC mental health team (MHT) had around 11 patients at any one time, with intense input for around six patients. Both teams had sufficient capacity. The Trust MHIRT was composed of nurses and occupational therapists. Forensic psychiatrists supported the work of both teams. There was no clinical psychology input. Counselling services were available via the chaplaincy.
- 2.123 The care programme approach was used and the clinical records created by the CSC MHT were of good quality, although hampered by inadequate access to a computer.
- 2.124 All patients waiting for transfers to mental health units experienced unacceptable delays. At the time of the inspection, there were eight such patients, two of whom were transferred during the inspection. Delays were particularly associated with transfer to high secure hospitals or specialist personality disorder services (see main recommendation HP57).

Recommendations

- 2.125 There should be sufficient primary mental health care capacity to meet the needs of the population.
- 2.126 Prisoners needing assessment by specialist mental health services should be seen and transferred expeditiously within the current Government target for transfer.

Housekeeping point

- 2.127 The close supervision centre mental health team should be provided with adequate computer access.

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.

2.128 There was a wide range of meal choices and the food was appetizing. Meals were served too early. Consultation arrangements were adequate. All food areas were clean and well maintained and serveries were clean. Training provision for prisoners in the kitchen was good.

2.129 A four-week menu offered a wide range of choices to meet religious and healthy dietary needs. Meals were healthy and included a hot meal choice. Some prisoners we spoke to said that portion sizes were small; we considered portion sizes to be adequate.

2.130 In our survey, 24% of respondents, compared with 19% at the time of the previous inspection, said that the food was good, and we considered the food to be of good quality. Prisoners on the protected witness unit were able to cater for themselves. Meals were sometimes served too early and we saw lunch being served from 11.40am and the evening meal from 4.35pm.

2.131 Consultation with prisoners was via the monthly prisoner consultative meeting. Food comments books were available; although their use by prisoners was limited, the kitchen manager made regular comments in them. An annual food survey was carried out and resulted in menu changes.

2.132 The kitchen area was well laid out and areas for storing, preparing and cooking food were clean, well maintained and took into account religious needs. Wing serveries were clean.

2.133 Prisoners were trained in food hygiene before starting work in the kitchens and they were able to work towards a National Vocational Qualification at levels 1 and 2 in hospitality. Prisoners working in the kitchen and on the wing serveries were correctly attired.

Housekeeping point

2.134 Meals should be served at appropriate times.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.135 A wide range of goods was available. Consultation arrangements were in place. Prisoners could order from external catalogues but were charged for this service.

2.136 The prison shop operated under the standard national contract. Prisoners completed their order forms by Sunday and received their goods on set days during the following week, depending on which wing they resided on. New prisoners were offered a canteen pack in reception and then received an order form on the first Friday after their arrival.

2.137 Consultation occurred via the prisoner consultative committee. In our survey, 45% of respondents said that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, and prisoners could arrange to buy magazines and newspapers.

2.138 Prisoners could purchase items from a small range of external catalogues. Any postage charges incurred via Amazon were passed on to the prisoner and a £1 per order charge was levied on other external purchases. Prisoners were able to access accurate records of their finances, at no cost.

Housekeeping point

2.139 Prisoners should not incur a charge for external catalogue purchases.

Section 3: Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock, and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.³

3.1 Time out of cell was good but too many prisoners were not gainfully employed. Association periods were relaxed and staff were visible on the wings.

3.2 The prison was achieving just over nine hours unlocked on weekdays, which was consistent with the published core day. Prisoners who were not engaged in activity off the wing could associate and we saw few prisoners locked up during the core day. However, a large number of prisoners were not in employment and in our spot checks during the inspection we found more than half of prisoners not engaged in purposeful activity (see main recommendation HP58). In our survey, more prisoners than in comparator prisons (72% against 50%) said that they had access to association more than five times a week. During the inspection, association was curtailed or started late on two occasions because of staff shortages and on one occasion prisoners were locked up after lunch 15 minutes before the time specified.

3.3 Association periods were relaxed and staff were visible on the wings (see also section on staff–prisoner relationships). Pool and table tennis tables, widescreen televisions and a selection of board games were available. Prisoners could also socialise in their cells. House unit exercise yards were large and generally free of litter but drab and with limited seating.

House unit 6

3.4 Time out of cell was good on all wings on this unit, apart from A wing and to a lesser extent B wing. A daily regime was published on all the wings which allowed prisoners daily access to exercise, the gym, association and time for work with psychologists and mental health support staff. However, for some prisoners on these wings, risk assessments determined they had to be unlocked on their own or with multiple staff, which severely limited their access to any regime and shortened association times for the remaining prisoners (see main recommendation HP56).

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

- 3.5 The management of learning and skills was satisfactory overall. The self-assessment process was adequate and quality improvement initiatives were developing and being implemented across the wider learning and skills. A draft strategic plan was not informed by a needs analysis. The range and quality of provision in education was satisfactory overall but delivery was severely hampered by staff shortages. The range of work was reasonable and prisoners developed good skills but these were not accredited. There were too few vocational training opportunities. The number of activity places had increased but remained insufficient for the size of the population. Achievements for learners were satisfactory. The library provided a reasonable service.
- 3.6 Ofsted made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
- | | |
|--|--------------|
| Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: | Satisfactory |
| Quality of learning and skills and work provision: | Satisfactory |
| Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: | Satisfactory |

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.7 Learning and skills was managed by the head of reducing reoffending. A strategic plan had recently been developed but was not sufficiently informed by a needs analysis. A range of managers had developed and begun to implement quality improvement processes across the learning and skills provision. The self-assessment process and quality improvement group meetings had been reintroduced in the previous 18 months. Course reviews informed the judgements in the self-assessment report. Areas for improvement in this report were accurately identified and informed improvement plans. The development plan set out appropriate time-bound improvement targets. The recording of data satisfactorily identified the performance of different groups in education.
- 3.8 Weekly operational meetings monitored attendance at activity sessions and identified operational issues.
- 3.9 Staff were well qualified. Training and development was frequent, relevant and equipped staff with good occupational knowledge, as well as improving their knowledge of prison safety, safeguarding and security.
- 3.10 External security clearance had seriously affected the deployment of newly recruited education staff. Since August 2010, this had severely hampered the education department's ability to deliver their contracted hours. Although existing staff hours had been increased in the short term to provide cover for staff absence, some classes were still cancelled.

Recommendations

- 3.11 A detailed training needs analysis of different prisoner groups should be carried out, so that the range of education, work and vocational training opportunities reflects their needs and interests and informs future planning.
- 3.12 When security clearance delays the deployment of education staff, further contingency plans should be developed to limit the cancellation of classes and the negative impact on learners.

Provision of activities

- 3.13 The prison provided approximately 527 full-time-equivalent activity places, an increase of 77 places since the previous inspection, and met the need of approximately 69% of the population. Places available in education were not fully utilised (see main recommendation HP58).
- 3.14 There were 260 full-time-equivalent work places, of which 91% were utilised. A new purpose-built workshop had been built, which provided approximately 90 work places. Prisoners could work on the wings, in waste management, woodwork and mosaics, and in the kitchens, gardens and laundry. Wing work accounted for just over half of the work places and these jobs did not occupy prisoners sufficiently. Recently, more prisoners had been able to work part time and access education in the remainder of their day, giving them a full programme for the day.
- 3.15 There were insufficient vocational training places and the number had reduced since the previous inspection. There were 22 prisoners on Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA) computer fault diagnosis and repair courses and four kitchen workers taking catering qualifications. Prisoners working in waste management and laundry work completed a health and safety qualification, and kitchen workers a food hygiene qualification. Opportunities were missed to accredit the employment and vocational skills that prisoners demonstrated at work. No literacy or numeracy support was available in the workshop areas for prisoners attending work or vocational training.
- 3.16 The Manchester College provided approximately 241 full-time-equivalent education places. Most prisoners attended part time. Only 77% of places were utilised and some class sizes were small. Provision was equitable for vulnerable prisoners but few participated. Most of the provision was delivered in the education block, while 45 prisoners participated in education on their house blocks. The range of accredited education provision was sufficient to meet the needs of mainstream and vulnerable prisoners.
- 3.17 The allocation process was satisfactory and waiting lists were short. Skills for life needs, but not sentence planning targets, were taken into account when allocating activities.
- 3.18 Mainstream prisoners received a satisfactory education induction but for vulnerable prisoners this was poor. It was provided by a prison orderly and was not overseen sufficiently by the education department to monitor the quality of the process. The careers information and advice service provider, Tribal, participated in the prison induction and helped prisoners to select suitable activities. The initial assessment for mainstream prisoners was satisfactory and the outcomes were used effectively to develop individual learning plans with clear, specific and measurable targets. Progress reviews were regular and effective.

House unit 6

- 3.19 There were few meaningful activities for prisoners on house unit 6, other than psychology groups. Education was provided to a small number and work was restricted to cleaning. Some prisoners on the managing challenging behaviour unit (MCBU) were able to attend visits, the library and religious services off the unit. Some prisoners were being considered to attend other off-wing activities in the near future.

Recommendations

- 3.20 Prisoners' employability and vocational skills at work should be recorded and accredited.
- 3.21 More literacy and numeracy support in vocational training and work areas should be provided.
- 3.22 Prisoners' sentence plan targets should be taken into account when allocating activities, to ensure that they are accessed in the correct sequence.
- 3.23 Plans to improve the quality of the education induction for vulnerable prisoners should be implemented.
- 3.24 Learning and skills provision on house unit 6 should be extended.

Quality of provision

- 3.25 Work and vocational training were provided mainly by instructional officers, who delivered satisfactory induction and coaching, and relationships with prisoners were respectful. Most off-wing work was appropriate and purposeful and met prisoners' needs. Attendance was good and prisoners were punctual. Safety was reinforced well by instructors and suitable personal protective equipment was used at all times.
- 3.26 Prisoners working in the gardens had designed and built some excellent areas around the prison. These included projects to landscape grounds and dig ponds, water features, faith gardens and an award-winning wildlife area. Prisoners were carrying out groundwork for a glasshouse to be installed.
- 3.27 The PICTA computer fault diagnosis and repair course provided suitable vocational training for prisoners at level 1; there were no longer opportunities to progress to higher-level awards, as an instructor had left. Vulnerable prisoners had previously accessed the PICTA course but insufficient numbers participating had resulted in the course being cancelled for this group. Some vulnerable prisoners were part-way through the course but there were no plans to allow them to complete the qualification.
- 3.28 Good vocational skills were being gained in horticulture, waste management and mosaics. In other work areas, prisoners demonstrated good employability skills. The mosaics tutor had developed links with local schools, councils and a local art gallery. Some of the mosaics work done by prisoners was displayed externally, resulting in some of the work being sold and money being donated to charity. Commissioned mosaic work was being produced for schools and local councils.
- 3.29 Teaching and learning were well planned and most prisoners participated well in lessons. In better lessons, tutors used a good range of highly interactive activities that promoted a challenging pace and prisoners made good progress towards their qualifications.
- 3.30 Accommodation and learning resources were satisfactory, and a few learning resources were of a high standard and included adaptations to meet diverse needs.

- 3.31 Tutors provided a high level of support to promote prisoners' involvement, increased understanding and progress. However, specialist assessment and support for dyslexia were underdeveloped.

Recommendations

- 3.32 Higher-level qualifications should be reintroduced for all prisoners studying in Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA).
- 3.33 Specialist assessment and support for prisoners with dyslexia should be developed.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.34 The achievement of qualifications was good in PICTA and in health and safety and food hygiene awards. Success rates in catering were good but only 20 full qualifications had been achieved since October 2010. Punctuality and attendance were good for work and vocational training.
- 3.35 Achievements in education were satisfactory overall. In 2010/11, success rates had been high on most information technology courses. In the same year, success rates had been satisfactory in literacy, numeracy, English for speakers of other languages, and personal and social development courses but low in functional skills English.
- 3.36 Prisoners enjoyed their lessons and made satisfactory gains in improving their confidence and communication skills. Their standards of work were satisfactory overall. During the inspection, the attendance rate at education lessons was satisfactory, at 81%.

Recommendation

- 3.37 Success rates in functional skills English should be improved.

Library

- 3.38 The library was small but managed effectively. It was staffed by a qualified full-time librarian, three part-time library assistants and one library orderly. Access for prisoners was timetabled suitably for house blocks and education classes. However, the library was open for only 24 hours a week, with no evening or weekend provision. Suitable arrangements were made to meet the needs of most prisoners who were unable to access the library. Attendance data were collected manually, with some limited analysis of trends. More detailed collection and analysis of data were hindered by the lack of a computer for stock and data management.
- 3.39 The library book stock was adequate for the population and the range of books stocked was appropriate. The limited range of additional resources, including music CDs, audio books and language tapes, was out of date. Daily newspapers were available, including a wide range in foreign languages. A satisfactory range of books was available in 27 foreign languages. Prisoners had suitable access to up-to-date legal books and Prison Service Orders.

Recommendations

- 3.40 The range of library resources should be updated and extended.
- 3.41 A computer should be installed in the library, to enable better management of the library stock and systematic analysis of data.

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.

- 3.42 The promotion and understanding of healthy living and personal fitness were good. All prisoners had good access to a wide range of recreational PE. Facilities met prisoners' needs but the cardiovascular room in the main gym was poorly maintained and was too far away from the resistance exercise area. Outcomes for accredited courses were good.
- 3.43 All prisoners attended an appropriate induction to the gym, where their suitability for exercise was assessed through a health screening questionnaire. Health, well-being and personal fitness formed part of the induction, and any concerns were referred to the health care department. Healthy living and personal fitness objectives were set and monitored for prisoners referred by the health care department or by the drugs treatment service through specific programmes.
- 3.44 Access to PE facilities was good, with up to five sessions a week available to prisoners on the standard level of the incentives and earned privilege scheme and up to seven sessions for enhanced status prisoners; these could take place during the day, in the evening and at weekends. Separate PE sessions for prisoners aged over 45 were arranged four times a week and provided lighter exercise. During the inspection, 60% of prisoners were accessing PE. Our survey results concerning access to the gym compared favourably against comparator prisons.
- 3.45 The gym was large and provided a variety of indoor activities. It contained a range of resistance training equipment, such as free weights. Spinning sessions and other activities were carried out in the main sports hall. A small area equipped with cardiovascular machines was poorly maintained, lacked sufficient ventilation and was too far away from the resistance exercise area for the activities to be combined. Exercise facilities available on six wings were supervised, and usage and attendance were monitored. An all-weather five-a-side pitch was used for football and outside jogging activities.
- 3.46 PE staff were suitably qualified and experienced. Accredited courses were available in basic health and fitness at entry level and at level 1. At the time of the inspection, three prisoners were completing a personal trainer course through distance learning, with support from PE staff. Achievement of qualifications was good. There were no practical courses above level 1.

Recommendations

- 3.47 A suitable area should be provided that allows resistance and cardiovascular training to be combined, to provide integrated fitness activities.

3.48 PE qualifications should be extended to level 2, to give prisoners progression opportunities.

Section 4: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The reducing reoffending strategy was not comprehensive and the most recent needs analysis was not adequately robust. The resettlement pathways were well catered for but the profile of resettlement and offender management in the wider prison was too low. Too many prisoners did not know whom to turn to for help or felt well enough prepared for release. The resettlement needs analysis was out of date and not sufficiently robust.
- 4.2 The reducing reoffending strategy was limited to the resettlement pathways and did not adequately detail how offender management would contribute to reducing reoffending. The profile of resettlement and offender management in the wider prison was insufficiently developed. Personal officers were not well integrated into the resettlement or offender management unit (OMU) work (see paragraph 4.11) and wing staff did not make use of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments or sentence and risk management plans to direct their work with prisoners. Resettlement services were well advertised and regular wing surgeries were held by OMU staff. In spite of this, too few prisoners responding to our survey said that they knew whom to turn to for help with many of the resettlement pathways; for example, only 34% and 47% knew how to access help with financial problems and accommodation, respectively. While key performance targets were prioritised, other, more outcome-focused targets were not identified or monitored.
- 4.3 The governance of the reducing reoffending strategy lacked adequate attention to the role of offender management and there was no action plan to set out the actions required or progress made in the implementation of an effective model.
- 4.4 The resettlement needs analysis was over a year old and out of date. The previous analysis had over-relied on the results of a prisoner survey and had not made use of data from OASys or resettlement assessments to generate details of the specific needs of the different types of prisoner held at the establishment – for example, vulnerable prisoners or those serving a life sentence.
- 4.5 Resettlement services were available across all of the seven pathways, with an additional one around faith. There were no major gaps in provision and each pathway had an identified lead manager to promote the work. Links with external statutory and voluntary agencies to assist with this resettlement work were adequate and some through-the-gate support was developing.
- 4.6 Outcomes were not monitored routinely to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resettlement services provided. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at other similar prisons, and none of the vulnerable prisoners, said that they had been helped to prepare for release. Less than half of the respondents said that they had been helped with problems on arrival at the establishment.

Staff involved in resettlement and offender management were, on the whole, adequately trained.

Recommendations

- 4.7 The reducing reoffending strategy should include a detailed vision for offender management, supported by a clear action plan which is monitored and evaluated.
- 4.8 A more robust and detailed resettlement needs analysis should be completed and used to inform the reducing reoffending strategy, and outcomes should be more carefully monitored to determine the effectiveness of provision.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.9 The offender management unit (OMU) was well resourced, with manageable caseloads. The offender management model was limited, which meant that a large proportion of prisoners had no contact with an offender supervisor beyond the offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and annual review. The lack of a full-time head of OMU had hindered progress and a strategic vision for the unit. While relatively few OASys assessments were late, most of these were for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs). Sentence planning was not well enough integrated into the other functions in the prison and too few prisoners had a plan. Home detention curfew assessments were well managed and timely. Categorisation reviews were generally managed effectively, although some of the prisoners presenting the highest risk waited too long to be reviewed. Initial screening for public protection concerns was well managed but a huge backlog in full assessments and weak governance were undermining the policy. Contributions to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were good and potential and recently sentenced ISPs were well supported but there were no specific lifer support days for them.
- 4.10 The OMU was well resourced, with six prison offender supervisors and up to five probation staff managing caseloads of between 25 and 30 prisoners each. However, too few prisoners were supervised under the offender management model. Only those who presented a high risk of serious harm to others, were serving life or indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP) or were prolific or priority offenders were allocated an offender supervisor. The full offender management model had not yet been implemented, with the model in place lagging behind that we have seen at other prisons. Only 25% of prisoners responding to our survey said that they had an offender supervisor, and 53% that no one was working with them to achieve their targets. There was no central database to monitor offender management and no evaluation of effectiveness. The lack of a full-time head of OMU during 2011 had led to a lack of strategic drive or vision. A manager had been appointed a few weeks before the inspection, who recognised the need to drive up the work of the unit and had reinstated team meetings and planned to deliver more offender supervisor training.
- 4.11 OASys assessments were mainly up to date, with only 14 late at the time of the inspection. OASys documents were of adequate quality, including relevant details about offending-related

problems and correctly identifying factors linked to risk of harm to others. The assessments were quality assured. Risk management plans were detailed but sentence plans were not sufficiently comprehensive or meaningful to the prisoner. Sentence planning was not well enough integrated with other prison functions, particularly the contribution of personal officers, who rarely attended sentence planning boards. Families were not invited to attend sentence planning boards. Far fewer (31%) prisoners than at comparator prisons (41%) said that they had a sentence plan, of whom just over half said that they had been involved in its development.

- 4.12 Prisoners without an offender supervisor received an inadequate service, with no ongoing contact after completion of the OASys assessment and plans. For prisoners presenting a high risk of harm, contact with their offender supervisor was regular and meaningful, and we saw some examples of proactive liaison with external agencies to promote good quality offender management.
- 4.13 Home detention curfew (HDC) processes were sound and well managed by the clerk. Assessments were initiated four weeks early, to ensure that they were completed before the first eligibility date. Reports were obtained from all relevant departments but a few reports from the external probation officer were overdue at the time of the inspection, with one being a month late. The processes for considering the application were robust and there was an appeals process. Decisions were defensible. About half of the 190 HDC applications in the six months before the inspection had been approved.

Recommendations

- 4.14 All sentenced prisoners should have an active offender supervisor, who maintains contact with them to oversee delivery of the plans and responds to any important changes.
- 4.15 Sentence plans should be more comprehensive and detailed.
- 4.16 Prisoners who are not eligible to be allocated an offender supervisor should have a formal custody plan and an identified member of staff to track and monitor progress.

Housekeeping point

- 4.17 Sentence plans should be actively shared with other staff in the prison and prisoners' families, through their involvement with sentence planning processes.

Public protection

- 4.18 Initial screening by the public protection unit identified prisoners who presented safeguarding concerns and placed them on the highest level of contact restrictions pending a full assessment. The public protection officer, based in the OMU, undertook the full assessments and compiled reports for consideration by the interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT). However, at the time of the inspection there was a backlog of 200 assessments, which meant that some prisoners might have been unnecessarily restricted from having contact with their children and families. The assessments completed were thorough and clear. The IRMT held a meeting to consider each case, including relevant cases involving multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs). This was well attended and included the police liaison officer and other relevant staff, including security. The overarching risk management meeting

was not as effective; it was poorly attended, lacked clarity of purpose and provided little governance.

- 4.19 Prisoners were told about the restrictions placed on them, and relevant staff (for example, visits staff) were aware of the issues and restrictions.
- 4.20 MAPPA was used effectively and we saw examples of the offender supervisor attending and contributing to level 3 meetings. Reports were submitted to level 2 meetings. MAPPA cases were appropriately identified and referred.

Recommendation

- 4.21 **Assessments to determine the level and type of restrictions on contact should be completed for all relevant prisoners as soon as possible after their arrival at the establishment.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.22 The role and purpose of the risk management meeting should be reviewed to improve governance.

Categorisation

- 4.23 The prison held prisoners of all categories. Categorisation for all but the highest category sentenced prisoners was undertaken by the observation, classification and allocation office. Paperwork was completed to a good standard and the process for approving the categorisation was adequate. Annual reviews for category A prisoners were managed by the small category A team but too many prisoners experienced unacceptably long delays because of staff shortages and a high workload. The reviews were complex and comprehensive, making them time consuming. Some took a long time to complete, as other departments did not submit their reports on time.
- 4.24 At the time of the inspection, 12 prisoners had been awarded category D status and were waiting for a suitable place at an open prison. On the whole, this did not involve a long wait.

Recommendation

- 4.25 **All category A reviews should be completed on time.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.26 Prisoners potentially facing an indeterminate sentence were identified on remand and given written information and support about the implications of such a sentence. Following sentence, indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) were managed effectively by a small team of suitably trained offender supervisors. However, nine of the 14 late OASys assessments (see paragraph 4.11) were for ISPs.
- 4.27 Most ISPs were transferred to a more suitable establishment fairly quickly after sentence but for more complex cases this could take considerably longer.

- 4.28 ISPs accessed the general regime and were appropriately prioritised for offending behaviour programmes. They could attend an IPP/lifer forum but did not have access to specific lifer days. Contact with the offender supervisor was meant to be monthly but some offender supervisors struggled to achieve this. However, in other cases, particularly those living on house unit 6, contact was more frequent. There was no formal monitoring of the frequency of contact.
- 4.29 The preparation of parole reports was timely and there was no backlog at the time of the inspection.

Recommendation

- 4.30 Family days should be available for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs).

Housekeeping points

- 4.31 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be completed on time for all ISPs.
- 4.32 The frequency of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners should be monitored, with action taken to ensure that it is regular and effective.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.33 Reintegration needs were assessed, referrals were made and there was a pre-discharge interview. The provision of accommodation, and finance, benefits and debt advice was good but too many prisoners had recently been released without accommodation and bank accounts were not available before release. Not all prisoners were referred to the pre-release course. An alcohol worker had recently been appointed but there was no therapeutic alcohol programme. Wing-based counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) drop-in clinics were held. Visits arrangements were generally good and the visitors centre was an excellent facility, although some visitors were unnecessarily delayed. The visits hall was bright but the tables limited family contact. Visits for some prisoners on house block 6 were over-restrictive. The provision of offending behaviour programmes was appropriate. Waiting lists were relatively short and prioritisation of places was appropriate. One-to-one work was carried out with the more complex and high-risk prisoners on house unit 6, and staff and family members were involved in the post-programme reviews.

- 4.34 Each prisoner was interviewed shortly after arrival to identify resettlement needs and make referrals to agencies. Those on remand or serving less than 12 months did not receive a formal custody plan and there was little way of ensuring the delivery of any identified interventions. Some prisoners had no contact between the initial and discharge interviews. Information gathered through the resettlement centre interviews on arrival and before discharge was not routinely shared with the OMU.

- 4.35 Resettlement needs were not routinely reviewed during the custodial period by a designated member of staff. A discharge interview took place but for some prisoners it was undertaken two weeks instead of four weeks before release, which was too late for some needs to be met. The discharge interview identified the release arrangements for the prisoner, including access to suitable clothing, their property and any eligibility for grants or other financial support.

Recommendation

- 4.36 The information gathered through the initial resettlement interview should be shared with offender management unit staff for inclusion in the offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and sentence plan.

Accommodation

- 4.37 Three trained housing advice workers specialised in accommodation services for prisoners, including those applying for HDC or bail. The key performance target of releasing 80% of prisoners into stable accommodation was met each year but there was no analysis of how many of these had been helped to obtain the accommodation by staff at the establishment. Housing workers were co-located with other resettlement staff, which promoted good communication and joint working. The housing advisers had worked with a large number of prisoners over the previous six months. However, 120 of the 945 prisoners discharged during this period had had no accommodation to go to.
- 4.38 A range of support and advice was on offer, including saving or closing tenancies, benefit claims and new applications for housing. Citizens Advice provided further support and advice. A short course, known as Sorting Out Housing, was offered.

Housekeeping point

- 4.39 The number of prisoners released without accommodation and the number helped to find stable accommodation should be monitored, to measure the effectiveness of the services provided.

Education, training and employment

- 4.40 The Manchester College had recently started to deliver a pre-release programme, which enabled prisoners to develop skills in presentation and preparing for interviews and improved their financial awareness. Prisoners were referred by careers information and advice support (CIAS) workers or applied themselves but there was no systematic referral for all prisoners who were reaching the end of their sentence.
- 4.41 Other agencies provided prisoners with help and support but there was little collective working to provide a more cohesive service and reduce duplication. CIAS staff interviewed prisoners preparing for release to identify need and refer them to agencies in the prison, and used their extensive external network well to provide support for prisoners after release. There were no links with employers.

Recommendation

- 4.42 Links with employers should be developed to support prisoners' employment prospects on release.

Housekeeping points

- 4.43 The pre-release course should be further developed and offered to all prisoners preparing for release.
- 4.44 The range of agencies supporting prisoners preparing for release should work better together, to provide a cohesive service for prisoners and avoid duplication of effort.

Health care

- 4.45 A health discharge policy was beginning to be used by health services staff. Prisoners were given information about GP services before release. There were plans to start a discharge planning clinic. There was good use of the care programme approach to link with community services, and released prisoners were followed up a week later. Although they were in their infancy, links with local palliative care services were being developed, and prisoners were able to receive treatment and care from specialist nurses while in prison.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.46 There was an up-to-date drug and alcohol strategy, informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. The strategy was overseen by a well-attended monthly drug strategy committee meeting.
- 4.47 The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team had recently started fortnightly drop-in clinics on the wings, giving basic information and advice. Other departments, such as housing support, had also attended the drop-ins. Prisoners told us that these were helpful.
- 4.48 The short duration drug programme was available, delivering up to 10 courses a year, with up to 12 places per course.
- 4.49 A specialist alcohol worker had recently been appointed to tackle the large number of prisoners with severe alcohol problems. The CARAT team worked with prisoners with lower-level alcohol problems. In addition to these services, the education department delivered a drugs and alcohol awareness course. The alcohol worker also attended towards the end of the course to tell prisoners about services and referral opportunities. Despite these services and the existence of the control of violence for angry impulsive drinkers (COVAID) offending behaviour programme, there was no therapeutic group-based alcohol programme available.
- 4.50 Compact-based drug testing (CBDT) had 260 compacts in place. There was a clear distinction between voluntary- and incentive-based compacts.
- 4.51 Links with local drug intervention programme (DIP) teams were described by CARAT workers as very good. Workers from these DIP teams had visited the prison to try to improve referrals, although none regularly visited prisoners before release.

Recommendation

- 4.52 A therapeutic, group-based alcohol programme should be introduced.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.53 An array of financial support and advice was available, including a budgeting and money management course and a debt clinic. A range of agencies, including Jobcentre Plus and Citizens Advice, worked well together to meet the needs of prisoners. The Jobcentre Plus adviser worked with a large number of prisoners to close down benefits claims and establish new appointments before release. Citizens Advice provided debt management advice. Despite considerable effort by the prison over the previous year, prisoners could not open a bank account but were able to open a very basic account on their day of release. Further work was being undertaken to facilitate better provision before release.

Recommendation

- 4.54 Prisoners should be able to open a bank account before the day of their release.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.55 Prisoners' entitlement to visits depended on their incentives and earned privileges (IEP) level. Visits were available every day of the week except Friday. Each session was supposed to last two hours, although several visitors we spoke to complained of delays to the start of their visit. We observed visitors' progression from the visitors centre to the visits room and there were minimal delays. However, the property room in the visitors centre was not staffed until 1.45pm and a long queue of visitors had already formed at this time, potentially delaying these visitors.
- 4.56 Prisoners were generally satisfied with visits processes. We contacted the visits booking line on two separate occasions and our calls were answered promptly. We were able to book a visit for the following day and for the weekend.
- 4.57 The visitors centre was run by the Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT). It was bright, comfortable and welcoming, with a range of information displayed on the walls and a play area for children. The centre manager was passionate about providing a positive experience for visitors. Refreshments were available and the centre was open before and after visits. PACT provided a comprehensive visitors information book and information on assisted visits, both of which were available in 12 languages.
- 4.58 Entry procedures and searching were carried out respectfully and politely. Visitors were generally complimentary about visits staff. A visitors survey had been conducted in June 2011 and important findings had been summarised and published in a 'you said, we did' format. In the previous survey, 43% of visitors had said that visits did not start on time; this figure had dropped to 24% in the more recent survey but this was still unacceptably high.
- 4.59 The visits hall had space to accommodate 57 visits, and one row was set aside for vulnerable prisoners. This was easily identifiable by other prisoners but we were told that there were imminent plans to utilise 10 tables in the gallery for this purpose. The hall was furnished with brightly coloured fixed tables and chairs but the plinth dividing the table between the prisoner and his visitor was unnecessarily restrictive. There was a well-equipped play area, supervised by two experienced PACT staff. A separate room was provided in the visits hall for enhanced

prisoners' family visits. A refreshment kiosk serving hot and cold food was provided by Aramark.

- 4.60 Father and children's days took place once a month, on Saturday mornings, for up to 10 families and were available to prisoners on the standard and enhanced levels of the IEP scheme. Family days had not been a feature of the regime since 2008 but were due to recommence for up to 15 families in February 2012.
- 4.61 There were no parenting courses available, and Storybook Dads had ceased in June 2011, when the programme coordinator had left. The project was about to recommence with two volunteers from the Prison Fellowship of Chaplaincy.

House unit 6

- 4.62 Visitors arriving to see prisoners on this unit were collected from the visits hall waiting area and escorted to the unit, where the visit took place in one of three small rooms. Although each of the rooms was pleasantly furnished and had a small play area, all prisoners were, in practice, subject to high-risk category A visits because they took place on an individual basis, in the presence of at least two staff, and offered little privacy. Visitors had access to a vending machine on arrival on the unit. A few prisoners from the unit took their visits in the visits hall.

Recommendations

- 4.63 The plinth discouraging personal contact should be removed from the tables in the visits hall.
- 4.64 An accredited parenting or family skills course should be provided.
- 4.65 Risk assessments should determine whether prisoners on house unit 6 are subject to high-risk visits conditions.

Housekeeping point

- 4.66 The opening times for the property room should be brought forward, to prevent delays to the start of visits for visitors collecting or depositing property.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.67 The provision of offending behaviour programmes was limited in type and number but adequate for a local prison. The thinking skills programme (TSP) provided 54 places per year and controlling anger and learning to manage it (CALM) provided 14 places per year. Waiting lists were short and the prioritisation of places was appropriate. Appropriate attention was given to securing a transfer to a more appropriate establishment in order to complete programmes.
- 4.68 A good focus was given to preparing prisoners for group work and addressing individual diversity issues. For example, some prisoners who were unable to read or write had successfully completed the TSP in the previous year. The number of prisoners successfully completing programmes was good and dropout rates had reduced.

- 4.69 A motivational programme was being developed for some prisoners on house unit 6 as preparation for transfer to another close supervision centre. Psychologists and offender supervisors provided some good one-to-one work with prisoners on this unit concerning problem solving, assertiveness and anger management.
- 4.70 The Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme had not been delivered for some time but was due to recommence in February 2012.
- 4.71 Staff, including offender supervisors, and families were involved in the post-programme reviews, and facilitators had sometimes attended reviews in the community. Links with the OMU were developing.

Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 5.1 Measures, including training and monitoring, should be taken to improve the quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) assessment, reviews and case management. The use of ACCT should be reviewed to ensure that it is only used when prisoners are at risk of suicide or self-harm. Alternative support mechanisms should be put in place for prisoners who need support but are not at risk of self-harm. Segregation and special accommodation should be used only exceptionally and as a last resort for prisoners in crisis and at risk of suicide and self-harm. (HP53)
 - 5.2 The monitoring and governance of the use of force and use of special accommodation should be urgently reviewed to achieve a reduction in their use. (HP54)
 - 5.3 All young adults should be subject to a suitable risk and vulnerability assessment before location. (HP55)
 - 5.4 Risk assessment arrangements in the close supervision centre should encourage appropriate time out of cell and risk assessment decisions should be fully recorded and subject to quality assurance. (HP56)
 - 5.5 All required health services and clinics should be provided and waiting times for access to primary mental health services should be reduced. (HP57)
 - 5.6 The number of purposeful work and vocational training opportunities should be extended, to employ more of the prison's population. The quality of learning and skills provision and outcomes for prisoners should be improved. (HP58)

Recommendation

To NOMS

-
- 5.7 The range of drugs covered by mandatory drug testing should be widened to include the most commonly diverted medications, including gabapentin. (1.59)

Recommendation

To GeoAmey

-
- 5.8 Escort vans should be dependably punctual. (1.7)

Recommendation

To the partnership board

-
- 5.9 The number of moved or cancelled external appointments should be monitored and inappropriate cancellations reduced. (2.101)

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.10 Subject to risk assessment, prisoners should not be handcuffed between reception and escort vehicles, and should be informed of transfer on the evening before the move. (1.8)

Early days in custody

- 5.11 The prisoner orderly in reception should have a formal role in supporting and informing new prisoners. (1.17)
- 5.12 There should be an adequate, structured induction programme for vulnerable prisoners and those allocated to house unit 6. (1.18)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.13 The safety of prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wing should be reviewed and improved. (1.35)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.14 Governance of safer custody, including the use of information, target setting and attendance at committee meetings, should be improved. (1.43)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.15 The governor should initiate contact with the local Director of Adult Social Services (DASS) and the Local Safeguarding Adults Board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.47)

Security

- 5.16 Senior managers should review the procedures for out-of-hours unlocks. (1.57)
- 5.17 Visits sanctions should be imposed only when there is sufficient evidence to suggest visits-related trafficking activity. (1.58)
- 5.18 A mechanism to monitor suspicion testing should be developed, to ensure that all tests are undertaken within the required time frame. (1.60)

Segregation

- 5.19 The segregation unit should be kept clean and well maintained. (1.84)
- 5.20 There should be care plans for long-term residents of the segregation unit. (1.85)
- 5.21 Staff working regularly in the segregation unit should be trained in mental health awareness. (1.86)

Substance misuse

- 5.22 Counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) and clinical substance misuse services should further integrate and undertake joint care plans and reviews. (1.93)
- 5.23 Steps should be taken to improve the supervision of medication administration, to prevent diversion, rather than refusing to initiate prisoners onto buprenorphine (Subutex). (1.94)

Residential units

- 5.24 A cleaning and maintenance schedule should be implemented across the house units that improves and standardises the overall cleanliness of all wings and ensures that privacy screening is available for showers and in-cell toilets. (2.15)
- 5.25 The purpose of B wing on house unit 6 should be clearly communicated to staff and prisoners, and underlying systems and regime provision should be implemented to support this. (2.29)
- 5.26 There should be clinical psychologist provision on house unit 6. (2.30)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.27 The prison should seek to understand the negative perceptions of prisoners on house unit 3 about staff, and address any concerns raised. (2.39)

Equality and diversity

- 5.28 There should be a regular consultation forum with black and minority ethnic prisoners, to ensure that their views contribute to the overall management of equality and diversity. (2.58)
- 5.29 A foreign nationals group should be held, so that information and support can be shared and offered and any areas of concern referred to the prisoner equality meeting for action. (2.59)
- 5.30 Perceptions of inequality of treatment and access to some activities should be monitored by age and disability, and appropriate action taken to rectify any inequalities. (2.60)
- 5.31 Personal emergency evacuation plans should be developed for all prisoners with disabilities who require them, and staff should be aware of them. (2.61)

Health services

- 5.32 The health needs assessment of the prison population should be assessed and include prisoners with learning disabilities and personality disorders and recovery working. (2.85)
- 5.33 Nursing staff should receive further training to be able to triage prisoners' health care needs. (2.99)
- 5.34 Action should be undertaken to reduce waiting list and improve the application process to all clinics, particularly sexual health services. (2.100)

- 5.35 Discipline staff should be available to manage queues for the administration of medication on all house units. (2.110)
- 5.36 A full range of patient group directions should be available to enable more potent medication to be administered by the pharmacist or nurse. (2.111)
- 5.37 There should be sufficient primary mental health care capacity to meet the needs of the population. (2.125)
- 5.38 Prisoners needing assessment by specialist mental health services should be seen and transferred expeditiously within the current Government target for transfer. (2.126)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.39 A detailed training needs analysis of different prisoner groups should be carried out, so that the range of education, work and vocational training opportunities reflects their needs and interests and informs future planning. (3.11)
- 5.40 When security clearance delays the deployment of education staff, further contingency plans should be developed to limit the cancellation of classes and the negative impact on learners. (3.12)
- 5.41 Prisoners' employability and vocational skills at work should be recorded and accredited. (3.20)
- 5.42 More literacy and numeracy support in vocational training and work areas should be provided. (3.21)
- 5.43 Prisoners' sentence plan targets should be taken into account when allocating activities, to ensure that they are accessed in the correct sequence. (3.22)
- 5.44 Plans to improve the quality of the education induction for vulnerable prisoners should be implemented. (3.23)
- 5.45 Learning and skills provision on house unit 6 should be extended. (3.24)
- 5.46 Higher-level qualifications should be reintroduced for all prisoners studying in Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA). (3.32)
- 5.47 Specialist assessment and support for prisoners with dyslexia should be developed. (3.33)
- 5.48 Success rates in functional skills English should be improved. (3.37)
- 5.49 The range of library resources should be updated and extended. (3.40)
- 5.50 A computer should be installed in the library, to enable better management of the library stock and systematic analysis of data. (3.41)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.51 A suitable area should be provided that allows resistance and cardiovascular training to be combined, to provide integrated fitness activities. (3.47)

- 5.52 PE qualifications should be extended to level 2, to give prisoners progression opportunities. (3.48)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.53 The reducing reoffending strategy should include a detailed vision for offender management, supported by a clear action plan which is monitored and evaluated. (4.7)
- 5.54 A more robust and detailed resettlement needs analysis should be completed and used to inform the reducing reoffending strategy, and outcomes should be more carefully monitored to determine the effectiveness of provision. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.55 All sentenced prisoners should have an active offender supervisor, who maintains contact with them to oversee delivery of the plans and responds to any important changes. (4.14)
- 5.56 Sentence plans should be more comprehensive and detailed. (4.15)
- 5.57 Prisoners who are not eligible to be allocated an offender supervisor should have a formal custody plan and an identified member of staff to track and monitor progress. (4.16)
- 5.58 Assessments to determine the level and type of restrictions on contact should be completed for all relevant prisoners as soon as possible after their arrival at the establishment. (4.21)
- 5.59 All category A reviews should be completed on time. (4.25)
- 5.60 Family days should be available for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs). (4.30)

Reintegration planning

- 5.61 The information gathered through the initial resettlement interview should be shared with offender management unit staff for inclusion in the offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and sentence plan. (4.36)
- 5.62 Links with employers should be developed to support prisoners' employment prospects on release. (4.42)
- 5.63 A therapeutic, group-based alcohol programme should be introduced. (4.52)
- 5.64 Prisoners should be able to open a bank account before the day of their release. (4.54)
- 5.65 The plinth discouraging personal contact should be removed from the tables in the visits hall. (4.63)
- 5.66 An accredited parenting or family skills course should be provided. (4.64)
- 5.67 Risk assessments should determine whether prisoners on house unit 6 are subject to high-risk visits conditions. (4.65)

Housekeeping points

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.68 Prisoners placed on the basic level should be set meaningful written targets to improve their behaviour. (1.65)

Disciplinary procedures

- 5.69 The environment for prisoners waiting for adjudications should be improved. (1.72)
- 5.70 Prisoners should have access to writing equipment to be able to make notes during adjudications. (1.73)

Residential units

- 5.71 Mattresses should be replaced when they are worn and thin. (2.16)
- 5.72 Information should be available in a range of languages that meet the needs of the population. (2.17)
- 5.73 Mail should be delivered on Saturdays. (2.18)
- 5.74 Prisoners on the protected witness unit should be allowed access to the wing garden. (2.19)
- 5.75 Prisoners on the CSC should receive written feedback from review meetings and be given the chance to comment on decisions made. (2.31)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.76 Links between personal officers and the offender management unit should be developed. (2.40)

Equality and diversity

- 5.77 Actions identified in equality impact assessments should be included in the prison's action plan. (2.43)

Health services

- 5.78 A process should be introduced by which staff sign to confirm that they have read and understood all clinical and pharmacy policies and procedures. (2.86)
- 5.79 All officers should be trained to use the emergency equipment, including the automated electronic defibrillator. (2.87)
- 5.80 All clinical staff should wear visible identification badges. (2.88)

- 5.81 There should be sufficient nursing staff in the inpatient department at all times. (2.102)
- 5.82 There should be written admission criteria for inpatient beds that reflect the current good practice. (2.103)
- 5.83 Risk assessment decisions between secondary care providers and health services and security staff should be reviewed, fully recorded and subject to quality assurance. (2.104)
- 5.84 There should be a review of the medication stored in the out-of-hours cupboard. (2.112)
- 5.85 Maximum and minimum temperatures for the drug refrigerators should be recorded daily, to ensure that heat-sensitive items are stored within the 2–8°C range. (2.113)
- 5.86 All prescriptions should comply with guidance from regulatory bodies and duplication of medicine charts should be avoided. (2.114)
- 5.87 The storage and recording of controlled drugs should meet current guidance. (2.115)
- 5.88 The dental rooms should be clear from clutter and effective waste management and infection controls should be in place. (2.118)
- 5.89 The close supervision centre mental health team should be provided with adequate computer access. (2.127)

Catering

- 5.90 Meals should be served at appropriate times. (2.134)

Purchases

- 5.91 Prisoners should not incur a charge for external catalogue purchases. (2.139)

Offender management and planning

- 5.92 Sentence plans should be actively shared with other staff in the prison and prisoners' families, through their involvement with sentence planning processes. (4.17)
- 5.93 The role and purpose of the risk management meeting should be reviewed to improve governance. (4.22)
- 5.94 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be completed on time for all ISPs. (4.31)
- 5.95 The frequency of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners should be monitored, with action taken to ensure that it is regular and effective. (4.32)

Reintegration planning

- 5.96 The number of prisoners released without accommodation and the number helped to find stable accommodation should be monitored, to measure the effectiveness of the services provided. (4.39)

- 5.97 The pre-release course should be further developed and offered to all prisoners preparing for release. (4.43)
- 5.98 The range of agencies supporting prisoners preparing for release should work better together, to provide a cohesive service for prisoners and avoid duplication of effort. (4.44)
- 5.99 The opening times for the property room should be brought forward, to prevent delays to the start of visits for visitors collecting or depositing property. (4.66)

Examples of good practice

Faith and religious activity

- 5.100 The chaplaincy team had worked closely with the security department to produce guidance for staff on the searching of religious artefacts and prison visitors. (2.67)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Michael Calvert	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Jessica Broughton	Researcher
Laura Nettleingham	Senior researcher
Samantha Booth	Senior researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Drugs inspector
Helen Carter	Health services inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Eilean Robson	Pharmacist
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
John Grimmer	Ofsted inspector
Margaret Hobson	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	19	442	61.1
Recall	0	60	8
Convicted unsentenced	2	50	6.9
Remand	3	142	19.2
Civil prisoners	0	1	0.1
Detainees	4	12	2.1
Other	2	17	2.5
Total	30	724	100

Sentence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	11	229	31.8
Less than 6 months	3	83	11.4
6 months to less than 12 months	2	55	7.6
12 months to less than 2 years	5	90	12.6
2 years to less than 4 years	3	46	6.5
4 years to less than 10 years	1	37	5
10 years and over (not life)	3	77	10.6
ISPP	0	28	3.7
Life	2	79	10.7
Total	30	724	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age - 21	-	-
Under 21 years	30	4
21 years to 29 years	302	40.1
30 years to 39 years	223	29.6
40 years to 49 years	124	16.4
50 years to 59 years	53	7
60 years to 69 years	20	2.7
70 plus years	2	0.3
Please state maximum age - 76	-	-
Total	754	100

Nationality	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	22	591	81.3
Foreign nationals	8	109	15.5
Not stated	0	24	3.2
Total	30	724	100

Security category	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	1	0.1
Uncategorised sentenced	10	221	30.6
Category A	2	45	6.2
Category B	0	54	7.2

Category C	1	393	52.3
Category D	0	10	1.3
Other	17	0	2.3
Total	30	724	100

Ethnicity	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	14	440	60.2
Irish	0	11	1.5
Other white	0	46	6.1
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	1	15	2.1
White and black African	0	3	0.4
White and Asian	1	5	0.8
Other mixed	1	7	1.1
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	7	0.9
Pakistani	2	17	2.5
Bangladeshi	0	6	0.8
Other Asian	3	15	2.4
Black or black British			
Caribbean	3	50	7
African	4	23	3.6
Other black	0	14	1.9
Chinese or other ethnic group			
Chinese	0	0	0
Other ethnic group	0	8	1.1
Not stated	1	57	7.6
Total	30	724	100

Religion	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	3	0.4
Church of England	5	125	17.2
Roman Catholic	1	148	19.8
Other Christian denominations	7	108	15.3
Muslim	10	100	14.6
Sikh	0	3	0.4
Hindu	0	6	0.8
Buddhist	0	11	1.5
Jewish	0	3	0.4
Other	0	5	0.7
No religion	7	212	29.1
Total	30	724	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	1	0.1	120	15.9
1 month to 3 months	10	1.3	155	20.6
3 months to 6 months	3	0.4	99	13.1
6 months to 1 year	4	0.5	70	9.3
1 year to 2 years	1	0.1	36	4.8
2 years to 4 years	0	0	15	2
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	19	2.5	495	65.6

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	3	0.4	80	10.6
1 month to 3 months	5	0.7	76	10.1
3 months to 6 months	0	0	52	6.9
6 months to 1 year	3	0.4	18	2.4
1 year to 2 years	0	0	3	0.4
2 years to 4 years	0	0	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	11	1.5	229	30.4

Main offence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	5	186	25.3
Sexual offences	2	66	9.1
Burglary	2	89	12
Robbery	7	50	7.5
Theft and handling	3	65	9.1
Fraud and forgery	0	6	0.8
Drugs offences	2	79	10.7
Other offences	8	167	23.3
Civil offences	0	3	0.4
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	1	13	1.8
Total	30	724	100

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Choosing the sample size

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

At the time of the survey on 3 January 2012, the prisoner population at HMP Woodhill was 734 (excluding the CSC/MCBS). The sample size was 211. Overall, this represented 29% of the prisoner population.

The population of the CSC and MCBS units were sampled separately to the main population at HMP Woodhill. At the time of the survey, the population of these distinct areas was 23 and the sample included all prisoners.

Selecting the sample

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

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Six respondents from the main population, and three respondents from the CSC and MCBS population, refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, four respondents, all from the main population, were interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;

- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

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

Response rates

In total, 188 respondents from the main sample completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 26% of the main prison population. The response rate in this case was 89%. In addition to the six respondents from the main population who refused to complete a questionnaire, seven questionnaires were not returned and 10 were returned blank.

From the CSC and MCBS units, 15 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires, representing 65% of the population. Three respondents from the CSC and MCBS units refused to complete a questionnaire, four questionnaires were not returned and one questionnaire was returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses refer to the main population and exclude the CSC and MCBS units. For the main population, the following analyses have been conducted:

- The current 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 36 local prisons since November 2006.
- The current survey responses in 2012 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Woodhill in 2009.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the vulnerable prisoner wing (4B) 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 – that is, the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are

indicated by blue shading and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

Summary

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

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

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

Summary of prisoner survey results

Section 1: About You

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	9	(5%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	71	(38%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	63	(34%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	29	(16%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	10	(5%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	5	(3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	106	(56%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	23	(12%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	36	(19%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	22	(12%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	1	(1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	59	(32%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	27	(15%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	16	(9%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	20	(11%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	19	(10%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	17	(9%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	9	(5%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	5	(3%)
	<i>Life</i>	10	(5%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>	20	(11%)
	<i>No</i>	167	(89%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	182	(99%)
	<i>No</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	180	(98%)
	<i>No</i>	4	(2%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	120	(66%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	7	(4%)
	<i>White - other</i>	10	(5%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> ..	9	(5%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	8	(4%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	5	(3%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	2	(1%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	1	(1%)

<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> ...	7 (4%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	3 (2%)		

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

Yes	6 (3%)
No	172 (97%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	50 (27%)	<i>Hindu</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Church of England</i>	47 (25%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	38 (21%)	<i>Muslim</i>	20 (11%)
<i>Protestant</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Sikh</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	14 (8%)	<i>Other</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>	177 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	2 (1%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

(i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)

Yes	38 (20%)
No	148 (80%)

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

Yes	10 (5%)
No	173 (95%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	55 (30%)
No	128 (70%)

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

Yes	105 (57%)
No	79 (43%)

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>	129 (71%)
Yes	25 (14%)
No	21 (12%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	129 (69%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	48 (26%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (5%)

Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	137 (76%)
	No.....	36 (20%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	150 (81%)
	No.....	33 (18%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than two hours.....	129 (70%)
	Yes.....	1 (1%)
	No.....	50 (27%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	55 (30%)
	Well.....	81 (44%)
	Neither.....	38 (20%)
	Badly.....	5 (3%)
	Very badly	6 (3%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply)	
	Yes, someone told me	127 (69%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	10 (5%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	40 (22%)
	Don't remember	10 (5%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	167 (92%)
	No.....	13 (7%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours.....	114 (63%)
	2 hours or longer.....	61 (34%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	168 (92%)
	No	13 (7%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	51 (28%)
	Well.....	90 (49%)
	Neither.....	36 (19%)
	Badly.....	4 (2%)
	Very badly.....	4 (2%)

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)

Loss of property	21 (12%)	Physical health	27 (15%)
Housing problems.....	36 (20%)	Mental health.....	31 (18%)
Contacting employers	8 (5%)	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	7 (4%)
Contacting family	38 (22%)	Getting phone numbers	39 (22%)
Childcare	2 (1%)	Other.....	4 (2%)
Money worries.....	35 (20%)	Did not have any problems	61 (35%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	35 (20%)		

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

Yes	53 (30%)
No.....	60 (34%)
Did not have any problems	61 (35%)

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

Tobacco.....	149 (81%)
A shower	98 (53%)
A free telephone call.....	132 (72%)
Something to eat.....	153 (83%)
PIN phone credit	66 (36%)
Toiletries/ basic items.....	139 (76%)
Did not receive anything	5 (3%)

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

Chaplain	110 (61%)
Someone from health services.....	145 (81%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	95 (53%)
Prison shop/ canteen.....	56 (31%)
Did not have access to any of these	15 (8%)

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

What was going to happen to you.....	126 (71%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	104 (58%)
How to make routine requests (applications)	102 (57%)
Your entitlement to visits.....	104 (58%)
Health services	114 (64%)
Chaplaincy	108 (61%)
Not offered any information	21 (12%)

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

Yes	165 (91%)
No.....	13 (7%)
Don't remember	4 (2%)

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

Have not been on an induction course	31 (17%)
Within the first week	129 (70%)

More than a week 21 (11%)
 Don't remember 4 (2%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 31 (17%)
 Yes 105 (58%)
 No 32 (18%)
 Don't remember 12 (7%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?
Did not receive an assessment..... 54 (30%)
 Within the first week 45 (25%)
 More than a week 61 (34%)
 Don't remember 19 (11%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to.....

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	24 (13%)	61 (34%)	21 (12%)	29 (16%)	17 (9%)	30 (16%)
Attend legal visits?	31 (19%)	58 (36%)	23 (14%)	9 (6%)	5 (3%)	36 (22%)
Get bail information?	12 (8%)	28 (18%)	23 (15%)	14 (9%)	17 (11%)	59 (39%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?
Not had any letters 32 (17%)
 Yes 57 (31%)
 No 96 (52%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?
 Yes 73 (40%)
 No 15 (8%)
 Don't know 93 (51%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	128 (69%)	51 (28%)	6 (3%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	175 (95%)	6 (3%)	4 (2%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	153 (84%)	23 (13%)	6 (3%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	159 (87%)	18 (10%)	6 (3%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	84 (46%)	62 (34%)	37 (20%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	128 (72%)	47 (26%)	4 (2%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	54 (30%)	55 (31%)	69 (39%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	Very good.....	8	(4%)
	Good.....	36	(19%)
	Neither.....	55	(30%)
	Bad.....	51	(28%)
	Very bad.....	35	(19%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?		
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>	8	(4%)
	Yes.....	81	(45%)
	No.....	92	(51%)
Q4.7	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	Yes.....	111	(62%)
	No.....	18	(10%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	51	(28%)
Q4.8	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	Yes.....	113	(62%)
	No.....	10	(5%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	59	(32%)
Q4.9	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?		
	Yes.....	118	(65%)
	No.....	22	(12%)
	Don't know.....	42	(23%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	48	(26%)
	Very easy.....	43	(24%)
	Easy.....	45	(25%)
	Neither.....	15	(8%)
	Difficult.....	4	(2%)
	Very difficult.....	4	(2%)
	Don't know.....	23	(13%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	145	(80%)	
	No.....	23	(13%)	
	Don't know.....	14	(8%)	
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?	26 (15%)	100 (59%)	44 (26%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	26 (17%)	65 (44%)	58 (39%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....	104	(64%)	
	No.....	15	(9%)	

Don't know 43 (27%)

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?	75 (44%)	45 (26%)	51 (30%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	75 (46%)	45 (27%)	44 (27%)

Q5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?

Yes 22 (14%)
 No 136 (86%)

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

Don't know who they are 79 (47%)
 Very easy 13 (8%)
 Easy 24 (14%)
 Neither 35 (21%)
 Difficult 12 (7%)
 Very difficult 4 (2%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

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

Don't know what the IEP scheme is 19 (11%)
 Yes 89 (51%)
 No 43 (24%)
 Don't know 25 (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)

Don't know what the IEP scheme is 19 (11%)
 Yes 73 (44%)
 No 60 (36%)
 Don't know 14 (8%)

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

Yes 12 (7%)
 No 165 (93%)

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 have not been to segregation in the last 6 months 143 (83%)
 Very well 7 (4%)
 Well 11 (6%)
 Neither 6 (3%)
 Badly 1 (1%)
 Very badly 4 (2%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?

Yes 154 (88%)

	No.....	22 (13%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	146 (83%)
	No.....	29 (17%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	78 (45%)
	No.....	97 (55%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	7 (4%)
	Never.....	17 (10%)
	Rarely.....	43 (24%)
	Some of the time.....	64 (36%)
	Most of the time.....	30 (17%)
	All of the time.....	17 (10%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	92 (51%)
	In the first week.....	40 (22%)
	More than a week.....	25 (14%)
	Don't remember.....	22 (12%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her	92 (54%)
	Very helpful.....	25 (15%)
	Helpful.....	34 (20%)
	Neither.....	10 (6%)
	Not very helpful.....	4 (2%)
	Not at all helpful.....	5 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	63 (35%)
	No.....	119 (65%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	16 (9%)
	No.....	158 (91%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply)	
	Never felt unsafe	119 (68%)
	Everywhere.....	8 (5%)
	Segregation unit.....	3 (2%)
	Association areas.....	22 (13%)
	Reception area.....	5 (3%)
	At the gym.....	11 (6%)
	In an exercise yard.....	8 (5%)
	At work.....	8 (5%)
	During movement.....	15 (9%)
	At education.....	9 (5%)
	At meal times.....	9 (5%)
	At health services.....	9 (5%)
	Visits area.....	9 (5%)
	In wing showers.....	18 (10%)
	In gym showers.....	9 (5%)
	In corridors/stairwells.....	5 (3%)
	On your landing/wing.....	15 (9%)
	In your cell.....	14 (8%)
	At religious services.....	5 (3%)

Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	48 (27%)
	No.....	131 (73%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	29 (16%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Medication</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Debt</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<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>	9 (5%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	44 (25%)
	No.....	134 (75%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	15 (8%)
	<i>Medication</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	111 (68%)
	Yes	24 (15%)
	No.....	29 (18%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:						
		Don't know	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	38 (22%)	11 (6%)	29 (17%)	18 (10%)	50 (29%)	29 (17%)
	The nurse	28 (16%)	29 (17%)	52 (30%)	20 (12%)	26 (15%)	16 (9%)
	The dentist	42 (25%)	8 (5%)	9 (5%)	11 (7%)	43 (25%)	56 (33%)
Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:						
		Not been	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	40 (22%)	19 (11%)	44 (25%)	21 (12%)	28 (16%)	26 (15%)
	The nurse	29 (17%)	20 (12%)	59 (35%)	21 (12%)	22 (13%)	18 (11%)
	The dentist	76 (46%)	14 (8%)	16 (10%)	16 (10%)	13 (8%)	30 (18%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	Not been						26 (15%)
	<i>Very good</i>						12 (7%)
	<i>Good</i>						45 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i>						25 (15%)
	<i>Bad</i>						38 (22%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						25 (15%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes.....						93 (52%)
	No.....						85 (48%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?						
	Not taking medication						85 (48%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						27 (15%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						34 (19%)
	No.....						30 (17%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes.....						67 (37%)
	No.....						112 (63%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (For example; a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)						
	Do not have any emotional or mental health problems						112 (64%)
	Yes.....						25 (14%)
	No.....						37 (21%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?		
	Yes.....		46 (26%)
	No.....		132 (74%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?		
	Yes.....		32 (18%)
	No.....		143 (82%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?		
	<i>Very easy</i>		15 (9%)

Easy.....	23 (14%)
Neither.....	10 (6%)
Difficult.....	12 (7%)
Very difficult.....	8 (5%)
Don't know.....	102 (60%)

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

Very easy.....	10 (6%)
Easy.....	15 (9%)
Neither.....	14 (8%)
Difficult.....	11 (6%)
Very difficult.....	13 (8%)
Don't know.....	109 (63%)

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

Yes.....	8 (5%)
No.....	168 (95%)

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

Yes.....	13 (7%)
No.....	161 (93%)

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

<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	123 (71%)
Yes.....	25 (14%)
No.....	26 (15%)

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

<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	143 (81%)
Yes.....	19 (11%)
No.....	15 (8%)

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

<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	139 (80%)
Yes.....	28 (16%)
No.....	6 (3%)

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	29 (17%)	19 (11%)	64 (37%)	23 (13%)	25 (15%)	12 (7%)
Vocational or skills training	51 (31%)	14 (9%)	43 (26%)	27 (16%)	19 (12%)	10 (6%)
Education (including basic skills)	42 (26%)	21 (13%)	53 (33%)	23 (14%)	17 (10%)	7 (4%)
Offending behaviour programmes	67 (41%)	12 (7%)	27 (17%)	20 (12%)	22 (13%)	15 (9%)

Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply)			
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>			46 (28%)
	Prison job			85 (52%)
	Vocational or skills training.....			19 (12%)
	Education (including basic skills).....			42 (26%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....			11 (7%)
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
				<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	44 (28%)	42 (27%)	48 (30%)
	Vocational or skills training	55 (42%)	28 (22%)	28 (22%)
	Education (including basic skills)	49 (35%)	42 (30%)	24 (17%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	59 (47%)	22 (17%)	23 (18%)
				22 (17%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?			
	<i>Don't want to go</i>			31 (18%)
	Never.....			48 (28%)
	Less than once a week.....			36 (21%)
	About once a week.....			48 (28%)
	More than once a week.....			8 (5%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?			
	<i>Don't use it</i>			79 (47%)
	Yes.....			60 (36%)
	No.....			30 (18%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?			
	<i>Don't want to go</i>			40 (23%)
	0.....			46 (26%)
	1 to 2.....			16 (9%)
	3 to 5.....			60 (34%)
	More than 5.....			13 (7%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?			
	<i>Don't want to go</i>			43 (25%)
	0.....			27 (16%)
	1 to 2.....			49 (28%)
	3 to 5.....			39 (22%)
	More than 5.....			16 (9%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?			
	<i>Don't want to go</i>			5 (3%)
	0.....			2 (1%)
	1 to 2.....			5 (3%)
	3 to 5.....			37 (21%)
	More than 5.....			126 (72%)
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.....			7 (4%)
	2 to less than 4 hours.....			25 (14%)
	4 to less than 6 hours.....			40 (23%)
	6 to less than 8 hours.....			43 (25%)

8 to less than 10 hours.....	15 (9%)
10 hours or more.....	30 (17%)
Don't know	13 (8%)

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	61 (36%)
	No.....	107 (64%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	77 (45%)
	No.....	95 (55%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	43 (25%)
	No.....	129 (75%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	29 (17%)
	Very easy	21 (12%)
	Easy	44 (26%)
	Neither	18 (10%)
	Difficult.....	31 (18%)
	Very difficult	22 (13%)
	Don't know	7 (4%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	Not sentenced	59 (34%)
	Yes	63 (36%)
	No.....	52 (30%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison?	
	Not sentenced/ NA	111 (64%)
	No contact.....	31 (18%)
	Letter.....	12 (7%)
	Phone	7 (4%)
	Visit	22 (13%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	41 (25%)
	No.....	124 (75%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	59 (34%)
	Yes	36 (21%)
	No.....	80 (46%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced	139 (79%)

Very involved.....	7 (4%)
Involved.....	14 (8%)
Neither.....	5 (3%)
Not very involved.....	4 (2%)
Not at all involved.....	6 (3%)

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

Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	139 (79%)
Nobody.....	19 (11%)
Offender supervisor.....	13 (7%)
Offender manager.....	11 (6%)
Named/ personal officer.....	9 (5%)
Staff from other departments.....	7 (4%)

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

Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	139 (79%)
Yes.....	18 (10%)
No.....	12 (7%)
Don't know.....	8 (5%)

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

Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	139 (80%)
Yes, in another prison.....	7 (4%)
Yes, in the community.....	9 (5%)
No plans.....	10 (6%)
Don't know.....	9 (5%)

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

Yes.....	6 (4%)
No.....	71 (44%)
Don't know.....	86 (53%)

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

Yes.....	19 (12%)
No.....	140 (88%)

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

	Do not need help	Yes	No
Employment	44 (28%)	38 (24%)	74 (47%)
Accommodation	40 (26%)	54 (35%)	61 (39%)
Benefits	40 (26%)	60 (39%)	54 (35%)
Finances	44 (31%)	34 (24%)	66 (46%)
Education	46 (32%)	41 (28%)	59 (40%)
Drugs and alcohol	54 (37%)	49 (34%)	43 (29%)

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?

Not sentenced.....	59 (35%)
Yes.....	57 (34%)
No.....	53 (31%)

Summary of prisoner survey results – close supervision centre

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	1 (7%)	
	<i>21 - 29</i>	6 (40%)	
	<i>30 - 39</i>	4 (27%)	
	<i>40 - 49</i>	4 (27%)	
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (93%)	
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	1 (7%)	
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	1 (7%)	
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	1 (7%)	
	<i>10 years or more</i>	1 (7%)	
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	0 (0%)	
	<i>Life</i>	12 (80%)	
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (13%)	
	<i>No</i>	13 (87%)	
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (100%)	
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (100%)	
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	8 (57%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> ..	4 (29%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>

<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	1 (7%)
<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1 (7%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> ...	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.....	0 (0%)
No.....	13 (100%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Hindu</i>	1 (7%)
<i>Church of England</i>	3 (20%)	<i>Jewish</i>	1 (7%)
<i>Catholic</i>	2 (13%)	<i>Muslim</i>	6 (40%)
<i>Protestant</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other</i>	1 (7%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (7%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	15 (100%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	0 (0%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs) (i.e. do

Yes.....	5 (33%)
No.....	10 (67%)

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

Yes.....	0 (0%)
No.....	14 (100%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	2 (14%)
No.....	12 (86%)

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

Yes.....	4 (29%)
No.....	10 (71%)

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>	5 (33%)
Yes.....	3 (20%)
No.....	6 (40%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (7%)

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	5 (33%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	10 (67%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)

Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	10 (67%)
	No.....	3 (20%)
	Don't remember	2 (13%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	11 (73%)
	No.....	3 (20%)
	Don't remember	1 (7%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	My journey was less than two hours.....	5 (33%)
	Yes.....	1 (7%)
	No.....	9 (60%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	2 (13%)
	Well.....	4 (27%)
	Neither.....	6 (40%)
	Badly.....	2 (13%)
	Very badly	1 (7%)
	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	7 (47%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	4 (27%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	7 (47%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	8 (53%)
	No.....	7 (47%)
	Don't remember.....	0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours.....	6 (60%)
	2 hours or longer.....	3 (30%)
	Don't remember	1 (10%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	8 (53%)
	No	6 (40%)
	Don't remember	1 (7%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	0 (0%)
	Well.....	0 (0%)
	Neither.....	3 (33%)
	Badly.....	4 (44%)
	Very badly.....	1 (11%)

Don't remember 1 (11%)

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	6 (40%)	Physical health	5 (33%)
Housing problems.....	0 (0%)	Mental health.....	6 (40%)
Contacting employers	0 (0%)	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	0 (0%)
Contacting family	6 (40%)	Getting phone numbers	5 (33%)
Childcare	0 (0%)	Other	0 (0%)
Money worries.....	1 (7%)	Did not have any problems	5 (33%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	7 (47%)		

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

Yes 3 (21%)
 No..... 6 (43%)
Did not have any problems..... 5 (36%)

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

Tobacco.....	4 (27%)
A shower	2 (13%)
A free telephone call.....	4 (27%)
Something to eat.....	8 (53%)
PIN phone credit	2 (13%)
Toiletries/basic items.....	6 (40%)
Did not receive anything	6 (40%)

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	3 (21%)
Someone from health services.....	5 (36%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	2 (14%)
Prison shop/canteen.....	1 (7%)
Did not have access to any of these	8 (57%)

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.....	4 (27%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	3 (20%)
How to make routine requests (applications)	4 (27%)
Your entitlement to visits.....	4 (27%)
Health services	4 (27%)
Chaplaincy	3 (20%)
Not offered any information	10 (67%)

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

Yes 10 (71%)
 No..... 4 (29%)
 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..... 10 (71%)
 Within the first week

More than a week 2 (14%)
 Don't remember 0 (0%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 10 (71%)
 Yes 2 (14%)
 No..... 2 (14%)
 Don't remember 0 (0%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?
Did not receive an assessment..... 14 (93%)
 Within the first week 0 (0%)
 More than a week 0 (0%)
 Don't remember 1 (7%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	3 (20%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)
Attend legal visits?	2 (17%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	3 (25%)
Get bail information?	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	6 (75%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?
Not had any letters 2 (13%)
 Yes 10 (67%)
 No..... 3 (20%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?
 Yes 4 (27%)
 No..... 2 (13%)
 Don't know 9 (60%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	7 (47%)	8 (53%)	0 (0%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	14 (93%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	9 (60%)	6 (40%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	10 (67%)	5 (33%)	0 (0%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	9 (60%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	6 (43%)	8 (57%)	0 (0%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	2 (13%)	9 (60%)	4 (27%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?
 Very good..... 1 (7%)
 Good..... 1 (7%)

Neither.....	5 (33%)
Bad.....	5 (33%)
Very bad.....	3 (20%)

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>	0 (0%)
Yes.....	3 (20%)
No.....	12 (80%)

Q4.7 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes.....	6 (40%)
No.....	7 (47%)
Don't know/N/A.....	2 (13%)

Q4.8 Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?

Yes.....	9 (64%)
No.....	4 (29%)
Don't know/N/A.....	1 (7%)

Q4.9 Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?

Yes.....	2 (13%)
No.....	8 (53%)
Don't know.....	5 (33%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i>	1 (7%)
Very easy.....	2 (14%)
Easy.....	1 (7%)
Neither.....	1 (7%)
Difficult.....	1 (7%)
Very difficult.....	8 (57%)
Don't know.....	0 (0%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes.....	13 (87%)
No.....	2 (13%)
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 applications dealt with fairly?	1 (8%)	5 (38%)	7 (54%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	11 (79%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

Yes.....	12 (80%)
No.....	3 (20%)
Don't know.....	0 (0%)

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?	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	10 (83%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	11 (85%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes			4 (27%)
	No			11 (73%)
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>			0 (0%)
	Very easy			0 (0%)
	Easy			3 (23%)
	Neither			7 (54%)
	Difficult			2 (15%)
	Very difficult			1 (8%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>			0 (0%)
	Yes			7 (47%)
	No			7 (47%)
	Don't know			1 (7%)
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>			0 (0%)
	Yes			3 (20%)
	No			12 (80%)
	Don't know			0 (0%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes			8 (53%)
	No			7 (47%)
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>			4 (29%)
	Very well			1 (7%)
	Well			2 (14%)
	Neither			3 (21%)
	Badly			3 (21%)
	Very badly			1 (7%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?			
	Yes			10 (71%)
	No			4 (29%)

Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	8 (62%)
	No.....	5 (38%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	4 (29%)
	No.....	10 (71%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	2 (14%)
	Never	1 (7%)
	Rarely	5 (36%)
	Some of the time.....	5 (36%)
	Most of the time.....	0 (0%)
	All of the time.....	1 (7%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	3 (20%)
	In the first week.....	4 (27%)
	More than a week.....	5 (33%)
	Don't remember	3 (20%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	3 (21%)
	Very helpful.....	2 (14%)
	Helpful.....	3 (21%)
	Neither.....	4 (29%)
	Not very helpful.....	0 (0%)
	Not at all helpful	2 (14%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	10 (67%)
	No.....	5 (33%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	6 (40%)
	No.....	9 (60%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	5 (33%)
	Everywhere.....	2 (13%)
	Segregation unit.....	2 (13%)
	Association areas	3 (20%)
	Reception area.....	1 (7%)
	At the gym.....	1 (7%)
	In an exercise yard	2 (13%)
	At work.....	2 (13%)
	During movement	5 (33%)
	At education.....	2 (13%)
	At meal times.....	3 (20%)
	At health services	2 (13%)
	Visits area	2 (13%)
	In wing showers	3 (20%)
	In gym showers.....	1 (7%)
	In corridors/stairwells	2 (13%)
	On your landing/wing	5 (33%)
	In your cell.....	4 (27%)
	At religious services	1 (7%)

Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	2 (13%)
	No.....	13 (87%)
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>	2 (13%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	9 (60%)
	No.....	6 (40%)
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>	3 (20%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	5 (33%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	4 (27%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	7 (47%)
	<i>Medication</i>	3 (20%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (27%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (27%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (20%)
	<i>Your from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (13%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (7%)
	<i>Your age</i>	3 (20%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (20%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	3 (20%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i>	2 (13%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (7%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	6 (40%)
	Yes	6 (40%)
	No.....	3 (20%)

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		1 (7%)	0 (0%)	4 (27%)	4 (27%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)
The nurse		1 (7%)	3 (21%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)
The dentist		1 (7%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (21%)	8 (57%)
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		2 (14%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)
The nurse		1 (7%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)
The dentist		2 (15%)	1 (8%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	5 (38%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
		<i>Not been</i>					
						1 (7%)
		<i>Very good</i>					
						1 (7%)
		<i>Good</i>					
						3 (20%)
		<i>Neither</i>					
						3 (20%)
		<i>Bad</i>					
						4 (27%)
		<i>Very bad</i>					
						3 (20%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
		Yes					8 (53%)
		No					7 (47%)
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>					7 (47%)
		Yes, all my meds					1 (7%)
		Yes, some of my meds					1 (7%)
		No					6 (40%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
		Yes					8 (57%)
		No					6 (43%)
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>					6 (43%)
		Yes					5 (36%)
		No					3 (21%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	15 (100%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	15 (100%)

Q10.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

Very easy	2 (15%)
Easy	2 (15%)
Neither	0 (0%)
Difficult	0 (0%)
Very difficult	1 (8%)
Don't know	8 (62%)

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

Very easy	0 (0%)
Easy	1 (8%)
Neither	0 (0%)
Difficult	1 (8%)
Very difficult	1 (8%)
Don't know	10 (77%)

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

Yes	1 (7%)
No	14 (93%)

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

Yes	2 (13%)
No	13 (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>	12 (80%)
Yes	2 (13%)
No	1 (7%)

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>	15 (100%)
Yes	0 (0%)
No	0 (0%)

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

<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	13 (87%)
Yes	0 (0%)
No	2 (13%)

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	4 (31%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	3 (23%)
Vocational or skills training	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (29%)	6 (43%)
Education (including basic skills)	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)	7 (50%)
Offending behaviour programmes	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	8 (57%)

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

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	4 (33%)
---	---------

Prison job	7 (58%)
Vocational or skills training.....	0 (0%)
Education (including basic skills).....	2 (17%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	0 (0%)

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	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
Vocational or skills training	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
Education (including basic skills)	5 (45%)	3 (27%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)
Offending behaviour programmes	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)

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

Don't want to go	0 (0%)
Never.....	7 (58%)
Less than once a week.....	2 (17%)
About once a week.....	3 (25%)
More than once a week.....	0 (0%)

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

Don't use it	7 (50%)
Yes.....	3 (21%)
No.....	4 (29%)

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

Don't want to go	1 (8%)
0.....	5 (38%)
1 to 2.....	1 (8%)
3 to 5.....	5 (38%)
More than 5.....	1 (8%)

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

Don't want to go	1 (7%)
0.....	6 (43%)
1 to 2.....	0 (0%)
3 to 5.....	4 (29%)
More than 5.....	3 (21%)

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

Don't want to go	3 (21%)
0.....	1 (7%)
1 to 2.....	0 (0%)
3 to 5.....	2 (14%)
More than 5.....	8 (57%)

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.....	4 (31%)
2 to less than 4 hours.....	3 (23%)
4 to less than 6 hours.....	3 (23%)
6 to less than 8 hours.....	1 (8%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	0 (0%)
10 hours or more.....	1 (8%)

Don't know 1 (8%)

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 1 (9%)
 No 10 (91%)
- Q12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?**
 Yes 12 (80%)
 No 3 (20%)
- Q12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?**
 Yes 6 (40%)
 No 9 (60%)
- Q12.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?**
I don't get visits 3 (21%)
 Very easy 1 (7%)
 Easy 3 (21%)
 Neither 2 (14%)
 Difficult 0 (0%)
 Very difficult 4 (29%)
 Don't know 1 (7%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

- Q13.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?**
Not sentenced 1 (8%)
 Yes 9 (69%)
 No 3 (23%)
- Q13.2 What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
Not sentenced/NA 4 (33%)
 No contact 2 (17%)
 Letter 4 (33%)
 Phone 1 (8%)
 Visit 4 (33%)
- Q13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?**
 Yes 6 (46%)
 No 7 (54%)
- Q13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?**
Not sentenced 1 (8%)
 Yes 2 (17%)
 No 9 (75%)
- Q13.5 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?**
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 10 (77%)
 Very involved 0 (0%)

<i>Involved</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Neither</i>	1 (8%)
<i>Not very involved</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Not at all involved</i>	2 (15%)

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>	10 (77%)
<i>Nobody</i>	2 (15%)
<i>Offender supervisor</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Offender manager</i>	1 (8%)
<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	1 (8%)
<i>Staff from other departments</i>	1 (8%)

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

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	10 (71%)
<i>Yes</i>	2 (14%)
<i>No</i>	1 (7%)
<i>Don't know</i>	1 (7%)

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>	10 (71%)
<i>Yes, in another prison</i>	1 (7%)
<i>Yes, in the community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>No plans</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Don't know</i>	3 (21%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	0 (0%)
<i>No</i>	6 (46%)
<i>Don't know</i>	7 (54%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	0 (0%)
<i>No</i>	13 (100%)

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	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	11 (79%)
Accommodation	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	10 (71%)
Benefits	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	11 (79%)
Finances	2 (14%)	0 (0%)	12 (86%)
Education	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	12 (86%)
Drugs and alcohol	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	10 (83%)

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>	1 (8%)
<i>Yes</i>	3 (25%)
<i>No</i>	8 (67%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Woodhill 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 Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
	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		188	5329	188	179
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	5%	6%	5%	11%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	69%	67%	69%	60%
1.3	Are you on recall?	12%	10%	12%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	24%	19%	24%	12%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	3%	3%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11%	12%	11%	12%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%		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)?	25%	26%	25%	21%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	5%	3%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	11%	11%	11%	15%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	19%	20%	20%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%		6%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	30%	28%	30%	32%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	57%	54%	57%	53%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.3	Was the van clean?	76%		76%	
2.4	Did you feel safe?	81%		81%	
2.2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	26%	18%	26%	18%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.1	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	47%		47%	
2.5	Were you offered a toilet break?	2%		2%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	65%	73%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	69%		69%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%		5%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	81%	92%	84%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
	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%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	92%	73%	92%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	57%	76%	66%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	65%	76%	65%	80%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	14%	12%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	20%	26%	20%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	5%	8%	5%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	22%	34%	22%	33%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	8%	1%	6%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	20%	23%	20%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	22%	20%	23%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	15%		15%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	18%		18%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	9%	4%	9%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	22%	31%	22%	30%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	47%		47%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	81%	86%	81%	78%
3.6	A shower?	53%	33%	53%	51%
3.6	A free telephone call?	72%	58%	72%	76%
3.6	Something to eat?	83%	80%	83%	90%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	36%		36%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	76%		76%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
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?	62%		62%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	81%		81%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	53%		53%	
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	31%	14%	31%	24%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	71%	46%	71%	48%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	58%	47%	58%	49%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	57%	38%	57%	37%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	58%	45%	58%	39%
3.8	Health services?	64%	51%	64%	51%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	61%	48%	61%	50%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	91%	72%	91%	77%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	76%	83%	73%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	70%	58%	70%	56%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	70%		70%	
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?	47%	41%	47%	40%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	55%	59%	55%	57%
4.1	Get bail information?	26%	24%	26%	21%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	31%	40%	31%	25%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	40%		40%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	69%	52%	69%	64%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	80%	95%	92%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	84%	82%	84%	86%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	87%	62%	87%	85%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	46%	38%	46%	44%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	72%	64%	72%	70%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	30%	28%	30%	29%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	24%	24%	24%	19%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	45%	45%	50%
4.7	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	54%	62%	57%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	62%	55%	62%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	65%	58%	65%	57%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	48%		48%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
	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?	80%		80%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	69%	56%	69%	59%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	53%	47%	53%	45%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	64%		64%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	47%	29%	47%	35%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	51%	33%	51%	40%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	14%		14%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	22%	22%	22%	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?	51%	49%	51%	59%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	44%	44%	43%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	7%	7%	6%
	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit:				
6.4	Were you treated very well/well by staff?	62%		62%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	88%	70%	88%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	83%	71%	83%	82%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	45%		45%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	26%	17%	26%	21%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	49%	45%	49%	52%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	76%	63%	76%	66%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	41%	35%	35%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	17%	9%	14%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	27%	21%	27%	17%
	Since you have been here have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	10%	13%	8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	6%	6%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%		16%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	5%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%		4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%		3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%		2%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%		1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	6%	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	4%	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	4%	3%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
	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?	25%	25%	25%	24%
	Since you have been here have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	12%	11%	5%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	5%	3%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%		9%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%		6%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%		0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	5%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	5%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%		2%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%		1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	6%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	45%	34%	45%	42%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
	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?	23%	27%	23%	28%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	47%	53%	47%	38%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	10%	10%	10%	12%
	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?	46%	44%	46%	55%
9.2	The nurse?	56%	58%	56%	54%
9.2	The dentist?	34%	32%	34%	30%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	39%	40%	39%	39%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	52%	50%	52%	49%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	67%		67%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional wellbeing or mental health problems?	37%	34%	37%	30%
	For those who have problems:				
9.5	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	41%		41%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	26%	36%	26%	29%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	18%	26%	18%	28%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	29%	22%	20%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	15%		15%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	5%	9%	5%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%		8%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	49%		49%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	56%		56%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	83%	78%	83%	78%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
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?	48%		48%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	35%		35%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	45%		45%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	24%		24%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	53%	43%	53%	37%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	12%	10%	12%	11%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	26%	27%	26%	22%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	7%	7%	9%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	72%	69%	72%	57%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	37%	42%	37%	37%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	58%	53%	58%	41%
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?	37%	51%	37%	55%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	65%	65%	65%	52%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	47%	59%	47%	64%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	53%	51%	53%	42%
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?	33%	49%	33%	52%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	37%	33%	28%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	36%		36%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	42%	31%	42%	36%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	32%	38%	32%	64%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	72%	50%	72%	55%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	17%	9%	17%	7%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	36%	35%	36%	39%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	45%	47%	45%	54%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	25%	33%	25%	27%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	38%		38%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Woodhill 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Woodhill 2012	HMP Woodhill 2009
	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?	55%		55%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	48%		48%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	19%		19%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	11%		11%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	36%		36%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	25%		25%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	31%	41%	31%	49%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	58%	57%	58%	66%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	nobody?	53%		53%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	36%		36%	
13.6	Offender manager?	31%		31%	
13.6	Named/personal officer?	25%		25%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	19%		19%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	47%	64%	47%	46%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison/in the community?	46%		46%	
13.9	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%		4%	
13.10	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	12%	15%	12%	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?	34%		34%	
13.11	Accommodation?	47%		47%	
13.11	Benefits?	53%		53%	
13.12	Finances?	34%		34%	
13.13	Education?	41%		41%	
13.14	Drugs and alcohol?	53%		53%	
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?	52%	47%	52%	48%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, nationality and religion) HMP Woodhill 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

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
Number of completed questionnaires returned		45	137	20	167	20	165
1.3	Are you sentenced?	69%	69%	60%	69%	71%	69%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	23%	7%			15%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	89%	100%	95%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	100%	84%	99%	90%	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)?			53%	21%	90%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	4%	0%	4%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	41%	2%	15%	10%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	25%	15%	21%	10%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	7%	0%	6%	0%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	38%	27%	50%	27%	50%	27%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	74%	75%	73%	55%	76%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	61%	71%	67%	70%	60%	70%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	93%	95%	92%	84%	93%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	79%	85%	76%	58%	79%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	54%	68%	44%	68%	70%	64%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	74%	83%	67%	83%	70%	82%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86%	93%	100%	90%	85%	91%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	82%	80%	84%	79%	84%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	51%	42%	47%	21%	51%

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	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	74%	67%	85%	67%	84%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	41%	47%	37%	47%	42%	47%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	23%	25%	30%	23%	31%	23%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	45%	50%	44%	53%	44%
4.7	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	61%	64%	62%	67%	61%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	62%	63%	60%	62%	70%	61%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	52%	69%	50%	67%	44%	67%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	81%	79%	80%	58%	83%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	68%	50%	66%	53%	67%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	29%	58%	47%	51%	24%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	44%	44%	44%	50%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	7%	5%	7%	11%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	87%	87%	89%	87%	88%	88%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	86%	82%	83%	84%	76%	84%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	13%	32%	11%	28%	19%	28%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	45%	51%	47%	49%	44%	49%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	42%	31%	37%	34%	39%	34%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	6%	6%	10%	11%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	29%	25%	21%	28%	23%	27%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	24%	15%	16%	16%	23%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	2%	0%	4%	11%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	7%	2%	0%	4%	6%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	1%	0%	2%	6%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	2%	3%	5%	3%	0%	3%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British national prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better							
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	26%	25%	11%	26%	30%	24%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	6%	6%	9%	12%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	14%	1%	6%	4%	12%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	10%	2%	0%	4%	18%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	7%	0%	6%	1%	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	2%	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	23%	23%	23%	23%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	38%	51%	35%	49%	53%	47%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	38%	56%	23%	56%	30%	54%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	29%	39%	17%	40%	33%	37%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	8%	26%	6%	24%	6%	24%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	46%	56%	47%	53%	57%	53%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	15%	10%	30%	10%	6%	13%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	36%	22%	53%	23%	25%	26%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	7%	6%	7%	0%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	33%	44%	31%	28%	33%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	52%	39%	44%	41%	44%	42%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	35%	31%	33%	31%	39%	31%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	62%	77%	70%	72%	61%	73%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	14%	19%	6%	19%	18%	17%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	46%	24%	47%	30%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36%	21%	11%	27%	28%	24%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Woodhill 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

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	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		38	148
1.3	Are you sentenced?	63%	70%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	8%	29%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	6%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	12%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	-	-
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	11%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	29%	31%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	73%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	69%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	91%	92%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	78%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	86%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	78%	82%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89%	91%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	74%	85%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	59%	45%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	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?	64%	70%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	81%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	49%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22%	24%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	46%
4.7	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	61%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	61%	63%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	67%	64%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	81%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	74%	62%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	56%	50%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	33%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	6%
7.1	Do most staff in this prison treat you with respect?	91%	87%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	85%	83%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	35%	25%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	62%	46%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	34%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	10%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	38%	24%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	17%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	6%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	15%	0%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	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?	32%	23%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	9%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	3%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	9%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	70%	43%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	83%	44%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	80%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	24%	22%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	63%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	17%	11%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	14%	28%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	10%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	28%	34%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	22%	47%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	22%	33%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	78%	71%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	13%	19%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	25%

Wing analysis



Prisoner survey responses (wing analysis) HMP Woodhill 2012

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP wing (House block 4B)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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		20	164
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	6%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	65%	68%
1.3	Are you on recall?	15%	12%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	10%	25%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	12%
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)?	10%	27%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	5%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	55%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	15%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	27%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	45%	59%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.3	Was the van clean?	84%	76%
2.4	Did you feel safe?	80%	82%
2.2	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	25%	26%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.1	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	60%	47%
2.5	Were you offered a toilet break?	0%	2%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	73%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	71%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	0%	6%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	95%	91%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	YP wing (House block 4B)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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?	55%	63%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	95%	92%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	77%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	90%	62%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	15%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	21%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	5%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	40%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	5%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	30%	19%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	21%	14%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	35%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	25%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	15%	23%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	47%	45%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	55%	84%
3.6	A shower?	35%	55%
3.6	A free telephone call?	15%	79%
3.6	Something to eat?	80%	83%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	15%	37%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	65%	76%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP wing (House block 4B)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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?	50%	63%
3.7	Someone from health services?	85%	80%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	60%	53%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	21%	33%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	50%	73%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	61%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	25%	61%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	21%	63%
3.8	Health services?	35%	67%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	50%	62%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	90%	91%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	45%	88%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	100%	69%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	47%	73%
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?	45%	48%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	61%	54%
4.1	Get bail information?	7%	29%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	21%	32%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	35%	41%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	55%	70%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	75%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	80%	85%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	90%	86%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	55%	45%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	60%	73%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	21%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	35%	23%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	44%
4.7	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	64%
4.8	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	55%	63%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	80%	64%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	45%	49%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	YP wing (House block 4B)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	81%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	60%	72%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	31%	56%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	69%	64%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	37%	49%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	34%	54%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	14%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	13%	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?	42%	52%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	33%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	7%
	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit:		
6.4	Were you treated very well/well by staff?	67%	61%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	89%	88%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	79%	84%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	47%	43%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	37%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	55%	48%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	77%	75%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP wing (House block 4E)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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?	45%	33%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	9%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	50%	23%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	25%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	15%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	25%	16%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	15%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	15%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	5%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	21%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	21%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP wing (House block 4E)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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?	45%	22%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	15%	1%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	15%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	10%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	15%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	15%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	80%	34%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP wing (House block 4B)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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?	21%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	58%	46%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	6%	11%
	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?	37%	47%
9.2	The nurse?	65%	55%
9.2	The dentist?	26%	35%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	28%	40%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	75%	49%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	86%	64%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	50%	35%
	For those who have problems:		
9.5	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	59%	36%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	5%	28%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	5%	19%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	16%	23%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	16%	14%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	5%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	8%
	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%	48%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	53%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	100%	82%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP wing (House block 4B)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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?	47%	50%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	30%	36%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	30%	47%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	6%	27%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	69%	51%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	31%	9%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	21%	26%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	7%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	88%	70%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	34%	37%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	93%	55%
	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?	8%	44%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	86%	62%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	39%	49%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	71%	52%
	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?	31%	34%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	32%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	42%	35%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	16%	45%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	27%	32%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	64%	73%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	11%	18%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	30%	37%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	61%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	33%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	31%	39%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	VP wing (House block 4B)	All other wings (excl. Seg & HCC)
	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?	57%	55%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	17%	53%
13.2	Contact by letter?	0%	22%
13.2	Contact by phone?	0%	13%
13.2	Contact by visit?	83%	29%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	33%	24%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	47%	30%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	50%	60%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	nobody?	67%	50%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	33%	37%
13.6	Offender manager?	0%	37%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	17%	27%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	0%	23%
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	33%	50%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison/in the community?	50%	45%
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?	0%	13%
	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?	24%	35%
13.11	Accommodation?	43%	47%
13.11	Benefits?	40%	55%
13.12	Finances?	39%	33%
13.13	Education?	26%	43%
13.14	Drugs and alcohol?	34%	54%
	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?	57%	51%