

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP/YOI Forest Bank

9 –19 October 2012

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Glossary of terms

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

Crown copyright 2013

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

Contents

	Introduction	5
	Fact page	7
	Healthy prison summary	9
1	Safety	17
<hr/>		
2	Respect	31
<hr/>		
3	Purposeful activity	45
<hr/>		
4	Resettlement	53
<hr/>		
5	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	63
<hr/>		
	Appendices	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	70
	II Prison population profile	71
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	74

Introduction

Forest Bank is a local prison in Manchester holding up to 1,364 adult and young adult male prisoners. Open for 12 years, the establishment is privately run under a 25-year private finance initiative contract by Sodexo Justice Services. When we last visited in 2010, we found a good local prison where improvement was evident. This broadly remains the case, with the establishment performing well against most of our healthy prison tests, although we did see some deterioration in the quality of activity and learning and skills provided.

Forest Bank operates in a challenging inner city environment but there was clear evidence that it attaches great importance to the task of keeping people safe. A number of safety concerns we raised at our last inspection had been addressed and, although the number of violent incidents was still significant, there were indications that the prison's approach was leading to improvement. Use of force was also low. Most vulnerable prisoners indicated that they felt safe, and the prison had reasonably good arrangements to support and help those in self-harm crisis.

Security was applied in a way proportionate to risk and facilitated the running of the prison. The incentives scheme was used innovatively to encourage positive behaviour, although some aspects of its supervision required improvement. The number of prisoners segregated was relatively high. The segregation environment was reasonable and there was some care planning, but the regime was limited and oversight and governance needed to improve.

The prison's approach to confronting the supply of drugs was effective and there were some very impressive interventions to support opiate-dependent prisoners. More than 200 prisoners were receiving a range of interventions, with evident good practice, from a well-integrated team.

The environment was modern, clean and bright, and access to amenities was good. Staff-prisoner relationships were respectful, although the promotion of diversity was limited. We identified differing and negative perceptions from various minority groups, and it was clear that the prison needed to be more active in identification, engagement and consultation with these groups.

Our principal concern at this inspection was the provision of activity. Time out of cell, generally, remained reasonably good with many prisoners achieving at least six hours a day out of cell, even if engaged in activity only part time. However, we still found over 40% of prisoners locked up doing nothing during the working part of the day. The provision of learning and skills was drifting. There was no needs analysis and the use of data to support quality improvement was lacking to the extent that we were not assured that learning outcomes were meaningful. The frustration of prisoners was evident and too few thought their learning experience would be of benefit on release. Vocational training was better, though limited, and plans to replicate a full working week in workshops had only been partially successful.

Work in support of resettlement remained a strength. A key advantage for the prison was that most prisoners came from homes within an 18-mile radius. There was a good assessment of need and good links with local services, leading to a significant increase in the number of prisoners benefiting from the integrated offender management initiative. Resettlement interventions were also generally very good, although custody planning for shorter term prisoners was lacking.

Overall this is a good report. The prison works in a difficult context but manages the risks it faces reasonably well. Strengths such as the quality of the environment and local connections are maximised, and the prison remained safe and respectful. However, we would encourage renewed effort to improve the quality of the regime so that more prisoners will be required to use their time purposefully.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

December 2012

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Category B local prison for adult and young adult men

Prison status

Private - Sodexo Justice Services

Region

North West

Number held

1,341

Certified normal accommodation

1,064

Operational capacity

1,364

Date of last full inspection

Unannounced full follow-up inspection: 29 June–9 July 2010

Unannounced full inspection: 10-14 September 2007

Brief history

The prison opened in 2000 under a 25-year private finance initiative (PFI) contract to provide 800 places as a category B local prison. Spaces gradually increased to 1,160 before a 264-place extension was opened in November 2009. Following a reduction in prisoner places, the establishment now holds 1,364 remand and sentenced adult males and remanded young adults (18-21 year olds).

Short description of residential units

Wings A-F are the original prison; G and H are the new buildings:

A1: Young adults
A2: General
B1: General
B2: General
C1: Workers/enhanced
C2: Compact-based drug testing
D1: General
D2: General
E1: Drug regime maintenance
E2: General
F1: Drug regime maintenance/basic regime
F2: General
G1: Recovery wing
G2: Kitchen workers
H1: Integrated drug treatment system/induction
H2: Vulnerable prisoners
Health care inpatients (20)

Name of director

Trevor Shortt

Name of controller

Brian Langan

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Sodexo Justice Services. GP services are sub-contracted to Cimmaron. Mental health in-reach services are provided by Greater Manchester West Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust.

Learning and skills provider

Sodexo Justice Services

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Barry Cave

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

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

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

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

Safety prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Safety

- HP5 The reception process was efficient, and the first night experience and induction were positive for most prisoners. Most prisoners felt safe and arrangements to deal with bullying and violent incidents were good. However, the number of incidents remained high, especially among young adults. Staff were committed to support prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm. The incentives scheme was used effectively to challenge poor behaviour. Adjudications were used appropriately but governance required improvement. The use of force was relatively low. Segregation unit staff had a good knowledge of their residents but the regime for some was poor. Prisoners with substance misuse needs were well catered for. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP6 The prison's catchment area meant there were relatively short journeys for prisoners and most felt safe during transit. Escort vans were received into the establishment quickly and prisoners disembarked swiftly, with handcuffs not routinely used.
- HP7 Reception holding rooms provided adequate facilities to occupy prisoners. Reception staff were respectful, and a Listener (prisoner trained to support those at risk of self-harm) was available. Searching was carried out in private and conducted appropriately, and health care staff interviewed all new arrivals in a private room. New arrivals were offered a free telephone call in reception. Procedures for dealing with vulnerable prisoners were sufficient.
- HP8 Most prisoners indicated that they felt safe on their first night. The first night wing and cells were clean and welcoming. All new arrivals received a first night risk interview in private on the day they arrived. The overspill location of some vulnerable prisoners on the first night wing (H1) occasionally meant that not all new arrivals could shower on their first night. First night staff handover arrangements were sound. The induction programme was sufficient, delivered well and in a suitable venue, and we were assured that everyone received an induction, but there was no translated information for non-English speaking prisoners.
- HP9 Formal arrangements to deal with violence were good, and the collection of data on the number and nature of incidents was better than we usually see. The violence reduction policy document was relevant, based on a thorough analysis of the pattern of violence in the prison, and informed by frequent consultation with prisoners. Overall, the level of violent incidents remained high, but there were early signs that recently introduced protocols were helping to reduce numbers. Violence reduction compacts usually reflected the robust management of bullies. The number of young adults involved in violent incidents was disproportionately high, and some investigations of violent incidents were cursory.

- HP10 Living conditions for vulnerable prisoners on H2 were very good and most said that they felt safe. Conditions on the overspill H1 were reasonable but the regime was sometimes limited. Prisoners on H1 complained that they were sometimes intimidated by other prisoners, but most said that they felt reasonably safe and their stay there was reasonably short.
- HP11 A suicide prevention policy had been published, and was well promoted and effective. The analysis of data to provide information about patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was very good. Staff entries in self-harm monitoring documents were usually good, and many reflected good day-to-day care. Staff knew the personal circumstances of individual prisoners at risk, but entries were focused on observed behaviour rather than good quality interaction. Case management arrangements were effective, care planning was consistent and case reviews were particularly good.
- HP12 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and reasonably well managed. Security intelligence was processed efficiently and generally responded to well. Random mandatory drug test results were much lower than the target but arrangements for suspicion drug tests were not monitored sufficiently. Some strip searching on reception, entry to the segregation unit and after visits was unnecessary. Closed visits were still used too frequently and often unrelated to activity in visits.
- HP13 The incentives scheme was used strategically to encourage responsible behaviour and operated consistently across the prison. There was a reasonable difference between the levels, and the regime for prisoners on basic was structured with built-in targets and reviews. Prisoners were usually promoted or demoted on the basis of the published criteria but we were not assured that decisions to downgrade to basic were always justified.
- HP14 The number of adjudications was lower than at similar prisons. Records of hearings were variable but many did not show sufficient exploration before a finding of guilt. Quality assurance lacked rigour. The use of force was also lower than the prison comparator and many incidents were low level. Relocation to the care and separation (segregation) unit (CSU) and the application of handcuffs during relocation were not routine. Some documentation lacked sufficient detail, and planned interventions were not always recorded and were not reviewed. Use of the special cell was low but supporting documentation was of poor quality and it was unacceptable that prisoners were routinely left in strip clothing. The use of an additional unfurnished cell in the CSU was not logged or properly authorised. Quality assurance and managerial oversight of use of force required improvement.
- HP15 Throughput in the CSU was high and young adults were over-represented. The physical environment had improved but exercise yards were austere and the special cells grim. The regime was limited for many residents, but staff were knowledgeable about prisoners and relationships were mostly positive. Quality care planning was taking place for some prisoners and reviews were timely, but good order or discipline review targets were perfunctory and not individualised. However, there were good links with the mental health team.
- HP16 Opiate-dependent prisoners were safely managed but methadone was the only opiate substitute available and specialist GP input was insufficient to meet the demand. Most of the 227 prisoners in treatment were on reducing doses, and they had impressive support from a well-integrated team. Prisoners benefited from a designated

motivational and recovery unit, a very wide range of courses and accredited programmes, and some innovative recovery mentoring.

Respect

- HP17 The condition of residential accommodation and the communal environment were good, as was prisoner access to amenities. There were a significant number of complaints against staff, but most prisoners indicated that staff treated them with respect. Structures to promote diversity were weak and consultation underdeveloped. There was evidence that some minority groups felt victimised or unsafe, and the negative perceptions of young adults and prisoners with disabilities were concerning. There was good provision to meet prisoners' faith needs, and health services were good. Outcomes for prisoners overall were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.
- HP18 Communal areas and cells were bright and clean and the wings were relaxed. Access to daily showers was good and communal showers were clean, but they did not provide adequate privacy. All prisoners could wear their own clothes and the laundry facilities were adequate. Most prisoners felt that applications were dealt with fairly. Access to telephones was good and the introduction of in-cell telephones on G wing was an interesting initiative.
- HP19 In our survey¹ and during our conversations with prisoners, most said that staff treated them with respect. However, there were too many formal complaints against staff and investigations into these lacked sufficient rigour. Staff addressed most prisoners by their surnames. In our survey, most prisoners were positive about the personal officer scheme, but we found that the quality of personal officer work, including written work, was mixed. There was a well-attended and meaningful monthly prisoner consultation meeting.
- HP20 The diversity and inclusion team was not well developed, met only quarterly, did not cover all the protected characteristics, and its structure had an adverse impact on outcomes for some groups of prisoners. In our survey, responses from young adults and prisoners with disabilities were worse than those for older and non-disabled prisoners across a range of indicators. Monitoring data only covered race, but there was evidence of interventions when results were out of range. The management of discrimination reports was good.
- HP21 In our survey, too many Muslim respondents said they felt unsafe, and some minorities felt victimised. Consultation with, and arrangements for, some minority

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

groups, including foreign nationals, was underdeveloped, although the older prisoner forum and the actions resulting from it were good. We were not assured that all prisoners with disabilities were identified, and work with gay and bisexual prisoners was limited.

- HP22 The chaplaincy was very proactive and well integrated, delivering a good service for all faiths. Most prisoners said that their religious beliefs were respected and that they could access a religious leader of their faith. A wide range of groups and courses were available.
- HP23 In our survey, prisoners were positive about the handling of complaints and numbers were lower than the comparator. The quality of responses varied but most were just adequate and many required improvement. Regular quality assurance checks highlighted some poor practice but were not sufficiently rigorous, and it was difficult to see where they led to improvements.
- HP24 The legal services provision was reasonable but prisoners had insufficient access to telephones to contact solicitors.
- HP25 In our survey prisoners were generally satisfied with access to and the quality of health care, apart from that provided by the GPs and the dentist. The health care we saw provided was effective, professional and appropriate. Waiting times for all clinics were short. All new arrivals received an effective health care screening, pharmacy services were good, and 70% of patients had their medicines in possession. The quality of dental care was good, as were primary and secondary mental health services.
- HP26 The quality and quantity of food were reasonable, although many prisoners felt that portions were small. Consultation was limited to a twice yearly survey and a meeting with servery workers. Staff wrote entries in the food comments book on behalf of prisoners, which reduced its effectiveness. Access to the prison shop was better than we usually see.

Purposeful activity

HP27 Prisoners had a reasonable amount of time out of cell over the week but a high proportion were locked up at any one time during the working day. The prison performed poorly against Ofsted's principal assessments and we were concerned by the lack of direction in education, as it was difficult to measure whether outcomes were meaningful. The analysis of training need was inadequate. The quality of teaching had declined and required improvement. The lack of data analysis and quality assurance remained a concern. Industrial workshops and vocational training were well managed and provided useful basic employability skills, and a few prisoners gained vocational qualifications. Vulnerable prisoners and young adults had limited education, vocational training and library opportunities. PE provision was good. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

HP28 The core day indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve over 12 hours out of cell on weekdays, part-time employed prisoners received about six to seven hours out of cell and unemployed prisoners approximately five hours association. At a roll

check during the morning of the core day, we found about 43% the population locked in their cells, and the following afternoon about 40% were locked up. The weekend regime was good.

- HP29 Management did not use available data on education and workshops to inform and assure that the best possible outcomes for prisoners were realised. Prisoners' educational needs and work skills requirements were assessed in isolation from one another, which had a negative effect on the best possible outcomes for their employability. Vocational training and industry workshops were well managed and benefited from improved external links for contract work, but opportunities for employment in contract workshops for young adults were limited.
- HP30 There was good achievement of education and vocational qualifications for those who completed courses, but the inadequate analysis of prisoners' abilities when they joined courses made it unclear how meaningful or relevant the achievements were for prisoners who gained them. Prisoners developed good employability skills in vocational training and work areas but progress and skills development on most education courses were restricted by insufficient individual needs planning. We were not assured that prisoners were always allocated to the most appropriate class or that they received the support to help them achieve their learning goals.
- HP31 Too much teaching in education required improvement, and there were insufficient opportunities for teachers to share good practice from the minority of good and better sessions. Prisoners in vocational training and work had good individual coaching. Vulnerable prisoners had too few activity choices and poor library provision. The library service for mainstream prisoners was suitable but it was not open at weekends or in the evenings.
- HP32 Prisoners had very good access to recreational PE and facilities were good. Two accredited PE courses and a unit-based course focused on preparing men for employment in the fitness industry. Staff were excellent role models.

Resettlement

- HP33 Community partnership arrangements were especially impressive for a local prison. Integrated offender management work had increased and outcomes were very good. Public protection arrangements were well organised for the majority of prisoners although we were concerned about the assessment and coordination of some higher risk cases. There was helpful pathway provision in support of finance and debt, accommodation and children and families. There was a lack of treatment provision for sex offenders and accredited programmes were generally limited, but there was good work with other initiatives on some unique non-accredited offending behaviour programmes. There were effective links with community drugs and alcohol programmes. Outcomes for prisoners, overall, were good against this healthy prison test.
- HP34 The reducing reoffending plan had improved and a basic action plan for each resettlement pathway had been completed, including offender management, but identified objectives were broad and there was little that detailed the work of the department. The strategic reducing reoffending groups, with representatives from

each pathway, now met monthly, with good attendance and comprehensive information sharing.

- HP35 The most recent needs analysis was detailed and based on prisoner questionnaires and focus groups. The prison had effective external links across the region, and had developed a range of support for prisoners through integrated offender management projects and resettlement pathways.
- HP36 There was no structured custody planning for prisoners on remand or serving sentences of less than 12 months (approximately half the population), although this was mitigated by good links with some pathways, including accommodation and substance misuse services.
- HP37 All prisoners serving over 12 months were allocated an offender supervisor. Most work with this group was reasonable, but the level of support and engagement from community-based offender managers, in particular for high risk cases, was disappointing. High risk and complex cases were allocated to one of the three probation offender supervisors. The previous backlog of OASys (offender assessment system) assessments had been addressed.
- HP38 The integrated offender management work had increased fourfold since our last inspection and was a good and innovative approach to managing prisoners who met the criteria. The use of single points of contact in offender management, as well as the accommodation service and substance misuse teams, worked extremely well.
- HP39 Pre-release planning was variable, with OASys assessments not always completed in time, and there was no structured pre-release planning for those serving less than 12 months and not subject to integrated offender management. The public protection policy was comprehensive, arrangements were generally well managed and prisoners were identified quickly on arrival, although there remained some concerns about the overall management of some high risk prisoners. Treatment opportunities for sex offenders were extremely limited. The number of indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was relatively low and all were appropriately allocated to offender supervisors.
- HP40 Accommodation support was generally good with all prisoners seen individually during induction. Most prisoners were able to access accommodation on release. The number leaving with no fixed accommodation was around 3% in 2012, which was low for a local prison. The introduction of a 'tenancy ready' course was a useful initiative.
- HP41 An increased number of prisoners were progressing into education, training or employment after release. There were good links with external employers and support agencies.
- HP42 Health care discharge planning was good with community links when required. The care programme approach was used for patients with enduring mental health problems. There were good throughcare links with local drug intervention programme teams and strong connections to community drug and alcohol projects, including residential rehabilitation.
- HP43 There had been reasonable developments in the finance, benefit and debt pathway, and a debt and finance management course was available, as well as some individual debt management for prisoners.

- HP44 Work on children and families was good with some innovative work, including around 'troubled families'. The visits hall was a generally positive environment, with good access and support through prison and Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT) staff, a charity offering advice and guidance to people affected by imprisonment.
- HP45 Although the prison provided only two accredited programmes, there had been significant work to develop other non-accredited interventions to address concerns identified in the needs analysis. These included the development of the 'inner strength' programme, addressing the significant number of prisoners with domestic violence histories.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP46 Concern: There was a lack of attention to the effective promotion of diversity which affected outcomes for some groups of prisoners. The prison was not aware of all prisoners in minority groups or their needs, and many had limited support. Responses from Muslim, disabled and young adult prisoners in our survey were worse than the comparators across a range of indicators. Consultation with prisoners from minorities was weak.

Recommendation: The needs of all prisoners with a protected characteristic should be reflected and addressed in the prison's strategic approach to managing diversity. The identification of such needs should be improved and there should be measurable improvement in the perceptions of, and outcomes for, minority groups.

- HP47 Concern: Education, vocational training and work provision for vulnerable prisoners was not equitable with other prisoners, and they also received poorer library provision and, although adequate, less frequent gym sessions.

Recommendation: The quality of activities, including the learning and skills, work and library provision, offered to vulnerable prisoners should be improved.

- HP48 Concern: There was a lack of clarity and some confusion on the overarching strategy to meet prisoners' individual learning needs. It was not always clear why prisoners were allocated to some specific activities, as this was not clearly defined as part of a strategy.

Recommendation: There should be a clear strategy, underpinned by a thorough review of prisoners' learning needs, to ensure activities and learning offered will support prisoners to gain employment on release. All activities should be monitored by effective quality assurance that provides accurate information about outcomes and quality.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

1.1 Journey times to the prison were usually short, but prisoners on longer journeys were not routinely offered refreshments. Prisoners felt safe during escort and were disembarked quickly, and escort staff were courteous.

1.2 The catchment area for the prison meant that most journey times for arriving prisoners were short and in our survey, only 15% of respondents said they spent more than two hours in the escort van. Prisoners on longer journey were not routinely offered refreshments. The cleanliness of vehicles varied and only 53% of respondents in our survey said the vans were clean, against the comparator of 68%.

1.3 In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said that they felt safe during their journey. Staff were courteous to prisoners in their care, and survey respondents said that escort staff treated them well. Escort vehicles were adequately equipped. Escort vans entered the establishment quickly and disembarkation was swift. Handcuffs were not routinely used for prisoners boarding or disembarking from vehicles. For most prisoners, their property arrived with them, and escort staff passed on all relevant documentation.

Housekeeping point

1.4 Escort vans should be clean.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

1.5 Reception procedures were swift and appropriate. First night arrangements were good, but not all new arrivals were offered a shower. The induction was suitable but there was no translated material, and the period for previous prisoners to be fast tracked was too long.

1.6 Reception was clean, welcoming and well laid out. Holding rooms were large, clean and had a television and newspapers, but furniture was old and dirty and notices were superficial.

1.7 Reception opened over lunch and, although there was an 8pm cut off, it stayed open until all expected prisoners arrived. Reception for most prisoners was quick, with court returns

spending minimal time there. In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said they were treated well in reception. Reception staff had a good relationship with prisoners.

- 1.8 New arrivals were checked in at a private reception desk and went through the reception process in a private room. Procedures for dealing with vulnerable prisoners were satisfactory. Health care staff saw all new arrivals in a dedicated private room in reception. A Listener (prisoner trained to support those at risk of self-harm) was available in reception while arrivals were processed.
- 1.9 Prisoners were searched in a separate dedicated search area. In our survey, 77% of respondents, against the comparator of 75%, said that they were searched in a respectful way. We observed staff search prisoners sensitively.
- 1.10 New arrivals were offered a free two-minute telephone call and given a £5 advance to buy tobacco and telephone credits. In our survey, three-quarters of respondents said they were offered a telephone call.
- 1.11 In our survey, 83% of respondents, against the comparator of 72% said that they felt safe on their first night. We spoke with a new arrival in custody for the first time and he told us that all his anxieties about prison were alleviated once he had arrived on the first night wing.
- 1.12 H wing was the first night and induction wing and it was bright, clean and welcoming. First night cells were clean and appropriately equipped. All new arrivals were seen for a one-to-one interview in private, and we were assured that first night assessments were always carried out whatever time prisoners arrived. Handover arrangements between day and night staff worked well.
- 1.13 In our survey, only 19% of respondents, against the comparator of 33%, said they were offered a shower on the day they arrived. Some new arrivals did not get a chance to shower because the first night landing was also used as an overspill for vulnerable prisoners, which affected the regime (see also paragraph 1.30).
- 1.14 A one-day induction in a suitable venue, with appropriate multimedia, was carried out every day, except for vulnerable prisoners who had their induction on just one day a week. A prison custody officer (PCO) delivered the interactive induction programme enthusiastically. There was a comprehensive induction booklet, but there was no translated information for non-English speakers.
- 1.15 We were assured that induction took place for all relevant prisoners the day after their arrival. In our survey, 81% of respondents said they had received an induction, of whom 68% said it was useful.
- 1.16 New arrivals who had been in Forest Bank in the previous 12 months could have a fast-track induction. We were not assured that prisoners discharged up to a year earlier would have retained all the necessary information to ensure they did not need a full induction.

Recommendation

- 1.17 Induction information should be provided in a variety of languages and formats.

Housekeeping points

- 1.18 All new arrivals should be able to shower on their first night in custody.
- 1.19 Notices in reception holding rooms should be relevant and up to date.
- 1.20 The induction fast-track arrangements should ensure that prisoner needs are met.

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.

- 1.21 The number of violent incidents remained high, especially among young adults, but recently introduced violence reduction protocols were beginning to take effect. Formal arrangements to deal with violence were good, as were the collection and monitoring of data on incidents, but investigations of violent incidents were not always thorough enough. Living conditions for vulnerable prisoners on H2 were very good and most prisoners said that they felt safe there, but the regime on the overspill landing was sometimes limited. There were some complaints of intimidation by other prisoners, but most vulnerable prisoners said that they felt reasonably safe.
- 1.22 There had been a full review of the arrangements to reduce violence in the prison in early 2012. The new violence reduction policy document that had resulted was properly considered, based on a detailed analysis of the patterns of violence, and informed by frequent consultation with prisoners through routine exit surveys and monthly consultation meetings. It was further supported by other local policies and procedures, such as the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and security reporting systems.
- 1.23 Good priority was given to arrangements to deal with violence. A safer custody committee met monthly to monitor overall progress of both the violence reduction and suicide prevention strategies. Meetings were always well attended and minutes showed properly focused discussions. Information provided by the violence reduction manager on the number, type and location of violent incidents each month was comprehensive, and it was analysed well to identify trends, patterns and problem areas.
- 1.24 Opportunities for bullying remained evident but the robust use of formal measures since July 2012 (see following) was beginning to reduce the number of incidents. There had been nearly 145 fights and assaults in the previous six months, but about 98% were minor and did not result in serious injuries. However, the number of incidents involving young adult prisoners was disproportionately high. While only 10% of the population, they accounted for about 35% of all fights and assaults.
- 1.25 Formal arrangements to deal with bullying and other violence had been modified into a simple system to identify, monitor and change antisocial behaviour. It was based chiefly on IEP sanctions supported by regular reviews to monitor behavioural changes. Prisoners found to be

involved in violent incidents as a result of proven adjudication or following a formal investigation of bullying were immediately placed on the basic level of the IEP scheme and located on F1 wing (see paragraph 1.61).

- 1.26 Allegations of violence, particularly bullying, were usually treated consistently and were investigated promptly by senior custody officers. However, many investigations were often cursory and seemed to assume guilt. Some records did not give assurance of thorough investigation of evidence and consideration of the prisoner's personal circumstances in every case. Nearly all investigations resulted in prisoners placed on formal procedures. In the previous three months, more than 70 prisoners had been located on to F1 for alleged or proven violent incidents.
- 1.27 Prisoners put on basic level (see paragraph 1.61) were expected to complete a recently introduced violence reduction agreement (acceptable behaviour compact), which included exercises to deal with the consequences of behaviour, its impact and strategies to deal with anger.
- 1.28 The vulnerable prisoner unit on H2 wing was predominately for sex offenders and a smaller group of other prisoners who felt at risk on the mainstream wings. There were about 98 prisoners on H2 at the time of inspection. They had all requested to be accommodated there and a clear protocol for admission considered their vulnerability and risk.
- 1.29 Living conditions on H2 were particularly good. Cells were clean and well furnished and communal areas were bright and airy. Vulnerable prisoners here had reasonable access to the prison regime, including association and exercise, and were usually out of their cells for at least six hours a day, but the quality of work and education they were offered was limited (see also paragraph 3.18 and main recommendation HP47). Generally they said that they felt safe.
- 1.30 The induction unit on H1 was also used as an overspill for vulnerable prisoners (see also paragraph 1.12). At the time of inspection, 24 vulnerable men were located there. Living conditions here were also very good but the regime was sometimes limited, particularly for association, due to the need to separate them from induction prisoners. However, this was partly mitigated by short stays of mostly about two weeks before they moved to H2.
- 1.31 Prisoners on H1 complained that they were sometimes intimidated by other prisoners but most said that they felt reasonably safe. A full activities regime had been published and vulnerable prisoners (on H1 and H2) had access to most facilities, such as education, religious services and the gym, but access to the library was poor (see also paragraph 3.34 and main recommendation HP47).
- 1.32 Relationships between officers and vulnerable prisoners were good, and staff entries in prisoner records gave assurance that they had a good knowledge of prisoners' circumstances and associated risk. Our own observations indicated that staff were clearly focused on the vulnerability of their prisoners, and supervision was very good.

Recommendation

- 1.33 **Investigations into incidents of violence should be thorough and include a full examination of all available evidence. Effective quality checks should be introduced.**

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.

- 1.34 The suicide prevention policy was well promoted. The analysis of data to identify patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was very good. Many staff entries in self-harm monitoring documents indicated good day-to-day care, but a few were mainly observational and gave little indication of the supportive relationships we saw. Case management arrangements were generally effective. Care planning was consistent and case reviews were good.
- 1.35 The published suicide prevention policy was relevant to the needs of prisoners and the prison. We found copies on all residential units and communal areas. Staff were aware of its content and understood its aims. A full-time coordinator supported by a nominated manager were jointly responsible for ensuring that procedures to manage prisoners at risk from self-harm were properly implemented, and were a central point for advice and guidance for staff.
- 1.36 The suicide prevention committee monitored the overall implementation of the strategy at well-attended monthly meetings. Minutes showed that individual cases were discussed and that the specific needs of prisoners were met. The committee used a wide range of information to identify trends and patterns of behaviour by location, type, timing and peripheral circumstances of incidents. This was used to develop the strategy and update the continuous improvement action plan.
- 1.37 The Listener scheme (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) was well established and prisoners had 24-hour access to them. The scheme was explained during induction and publicised on information notices. At the time of our inspection, there were 18 Listeners. Along with a Samaritans representative, they attended all safer custody meetings, and gave a report of their work. Prisoners could use a free direct telephone line to the Samaritans during the day.
- 1.38 There had been 184 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents opened in the previous six months. About 80% of these were raised during the initial stages of custody. About a quarter of those on ACCTs were treated in the health care centre. There were 18 open documents at the time of inspection.
- 1.39 The formal arrangements for prisoners on ACCTs in the health care centre, through designated case managers, were effective. Support plans were generally very good, and there was good attendance at reviews by staff who knew the personal circumstances of the prisoner. Staff entries in documents were detailed and gave assurance that staff reacted quickly to meet the needs of their prisoners.
- 1.40 On the residential wings, detailed support plans were usually prepared through consultation with the prisoner that identified specific needs and allocated responsibilities to a nominated key worker. The progress of plans was reviewed at set times in agreement with their prisoner.

- 1.41 The quality of staff entries in ACCT documents was generally good, and we observed staff who genuinely cared about prisoners and focused appropriately on their needs. However, a few entries were too observational and gave little indication of the supportive relationships we saw.

Recommendation

- 1.42 Staff entries in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents 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

- 1.43 There was not yet a structure to inform a specific policy to deal with adults in need of community care services because of their mental or other disability, age or illness.
- 1.44 Safety assessments for new arrivals included some identification of disability and health care interviews. Protocols that set out actions for staff to take if they became aware that a prisoner at risk may have been abused or injured while in custody were not clear. Staff we spoke to were not aware of formal protocols, but appeared focused on relevant issues and generally aware of their personal responsibility to protect prisoners at risk. Awareness training for staff had not been planned.
- 1.45 There were no formal links between the prison and community safeguarding board to develop safeguarding processes. Up-to-date local advice about safeguarding adults was not available and staff did not know how to make referrals.

Recommendation

- 1.46 The director 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).

- 1.47 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and not restrictive. Intelligence was well managed and generally responsive. Positive drug test results were low for a local prison but suspicion testing arrangements required attention. Closed visits were applied too frequently and some strip searching was unnecessary.
- 1.48 Security arrangements were well managed, broadly proportionate and did not restrict prisoner access to the regime unnecessarily. Security work was properly focused on reducing the availability of drugs and mobile telephones and on tackling violence.
- 1.49 Links between security and other departments were good. Dynamic security was underpinned by positive staff-prisoner relationships, and almost 4,000 security information reports (SIRs) had been submitted in the previous six months. SIRs were processed efficiently and target searches completed within timescales.
- 1.50 The year-to-date random mandatory drug test (MDT) positive rate was 7.25%, significantly below the target of 12%. The MDT programme was well resourced, including high levels of suspicion testing, but only 25% of these returned positive results and 172 requests for tests had not been met. Test results and finds were mainly for cannabis followed by Subutex (buprenorphine). Illicit use of Subutex had been a problem on G1, the recovery wing, in early 2012 but there had been appropriate measures to tackle this. Although in our survey 39% of respondents said that it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison, this was not supported by other evidence during the inspection and we also found little evidence of medication being diverted.
- 1.51 The security committee was given a high priority and was well attended. A comprehensive intelligence report informed appropriate security objectives, which were properly monitored.
- 1.52 Although closed visits were applied far less than at the previous inspection, they were still used too frequently and often for reasons not directly related to activity in visits (see paragraph 1.70). Reviews of closed visits were timely but not well recorded.
- 1.53 Some strip searching in reception, visits and on entry to the care and separation unit (CSU) was unnecessary and often in the absence of supporting intelligence

Recommendations

- 1.54 The prison should manage suspicion drug testing more effectively, ensuring tests take place within the required timescale, and investigate and understand the reasons for the low positive rate.
- 1.55 Closed visits should only be applied where there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits.
- 1.56 Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.57 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was used strategically to encourage responsible behaviour and operated consistently across the prison. There was a reasonable difference between the levels. The regime for prisoners on basic included targets and reviews. We were not assured that decisions to downgrade prisoners to basic were always justified.
- 1.58 The IEP policy document had been reviewed and published in early 2012. It described how the system worked, how prisoners could progress through the levels (basic, standard and enhanced), and the standards of expected behaviour. All prisoners had signed compacts. New arrivals were placed on standard level, unless they had earned enhanced status at a previous establishment. At the time of inspection, 25% of prisoners were on the enhanced level and about 3% on basic.
- 1.59 The scheme offered the usual differentials in access to private cash, computer games, visits and time out of cell, which seemed reasonable.
- 1.60 The scheme was used strategically to support the new approach to violence reduction, and there was some evidence that it had had an impact on encouraging responsible behaviour (see paragraph 1.25).
- 1.61 Prisoners were considered for immediate demotion to the basic level due to single acts of violence or alleged bullying following an investigation. All prisoners on basic were located in single cells on F1. The basic regime lasted for a minimum of three weeks. Prisoners moved through a three-tier system acquiring privileges as their behaviour improved. All were required to complete a formal programme – the 'back on track' course – that explored the reasons for antisocial behaviour and its impact on others through a series of exercises and group work sessions. Weekly behaviour targets were set and reviewed by F1 officers and, following successful completion, prisoners could gain extra periods of association until they completed the programme (usually within three weeks) and were returned to their normal residential wing. Although the regime was initially austere, all prisoners could attend work activities and had at least one period of evening association. They all had daily access to showers and telephones.
- 1.62 We were not convinced that demotion to basic was always justified, but noted that its application was usually well managed, and the quality of the reviews was good. Many prisoners reported that the scheme was not applied fairly, and we saw examples where decisions to demote prisoners following investigation of a single act were not justified. The quality of many investigations was poor, and there was little evidence of meaningful quality checks by managers (see paragraph 1.26). There was an appeals process, but documentation we examined was generally poor and did not show proper consideration of the issues raised. We found no evidence that appeals were ever upheld.

Recommendations

- 1.63 Decisions taken under the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme to demote prisoners to basic regime should be justified and based on evidence.
- 1.64 IEP appeals processes should be thorough, fair and credible, taking into account all relevant issues.

Housekeeping point

- 1.65 IEP management checks should be thorough and meaningfully support the fairness and credibility of the scheme.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.66 The number of adjudications was reasonably low but many records showed insufficient investigation, and quality assurance required improvement. There was some evidence of unofficial punishments. Use of force was lower than in similar prisons and mostly low level, but accountability for many aspects involving the use of force, including special accommodation, was poor. Throughput of prisoners in the care and separation unit was high. The environment had improved but the regime for most was limited. Young adults were over-represented in all areas of discipline.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.67 Between April and September 2012, there had been 1,052 adjudications, which was lower than in similar prisons, but young adults accounted for a disproportionately high number of these (see paragraph 2.37).
- 1.68 Prisoners had sufficient time to prepare their case and sought legal advice where requested. Records of hearings varied and many did not indicate sufficient investigation before a finding of guilt. Quality assurance measures lacked rigour.
- 1.69 Good data on adjudications were discussed at the quarterly segregation monitoring and review group (SMARG). The group was poorly attended but fed into the senior performance meeting where some trends and patterns were analysed.
- 1.70 We found some unofficial punishments, in the form of regime restrictions, in written records, and closed visits continued inappropriately for poor behaviour rather than security reasons (see paragraph 1.52 and recommendation 1.55).

Recommendations

- 1.71 All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached, and the quality assurance of adjudication records should be improved.
- 1.72 The application of all unofficial punishments should stop.

The use of force

- 1.73 Use of force was lower than in similar prisons but was used more against young adults (see paragraph 2.37). There had been 121 incidents in the previous six months but only about 20% included full use of control and restraint techniques and many involved only low level physical coercion. Use of handcuffs and relocation to the care and separation (segregation) unit (CSU) were not routine.
- 1.74 Documentation following the use of force was generally completed to a reasonable standard, but some lacked detail and efforts to de-escalate were not always properly recorded. Planned interventions were rarely filmed and never reviewed. The recordings we watched were poor and failed to support accountability.
- 1.75 Designated special accommodation lacked natural light and was oppressive and unsuitable. It was used infrequently, but in January 2012 it was used four times and there was no further scrutiny to establish the reasons for this increase. Documentation justifying and authorising use of special accommodation was poor and did not assure us of sufficient accountability for the use of such extreme custody. Prisoners were routinely left in strip clothing, without proper justification, and they stayed there for too long when records suggested they were calm. We also found evidence of an additional unfurnished cell in the CSU, described as a 'halfway house', which was used without proper authority and with no log to record how many times this had happened.
- 1.76 Use of force was only cursorily discussed at the security committee and did not include use of special accommodation. Quality assurance measures and accountability for all areas involving the use of force required improvement

Recommendations

- 1.77 The special accommodation cells should be modified to allow in natural light or be taken out of use.
- 1.78 Managerial oversight and accountability for all use of force, including the filming and reviewing of planned interventions and use of designated special accommodation and other unfurnished cells, should be improved.

Segregation

- 1.79 Throughput of the CSU was high at around 370 prisoners in the previous six months, and again young adults were over-represented (see paragraph 2.37), but prisoners did not appear to be seeking refuge there. The average stay was eight days, which was not excessive, but

two residents had been there for over two months. Comprehensive data on segregation were collated but not used by the SMARG meeting in any meaningful way to identify or act on any emerging trends.

- 1.80 The environment in the unit had improved since our previous inspection and communal areas were clean and bright, but showers still had insufficient privacy, and exercise yards remained stark. Cells were mostly clean and properly furnished. Special accommodation cells were grim (see paragraph 1.75).
- 1.81 Strip searching of new arrivals was routine and often in the absence of any robust risk assessment (see recommendation 1.56). Too many prisoners on ACCT documents were held in the CSU without proper justification to explain the exceptional reasons for this.
- 1.82 Most residents in the CSU had access to a consistent but basic daily regime, including a shower, exercise and a telephone call, although calls were restricted to five minutes. The regime was otherwise limited for most. Education staff visited the unit inconsistently. Most prisoners we spoke to had not seen the teacher, and those who had said the activities provided only occupied them for a short time. We were told that prisoners could leave the unit to go to the gym and religious services, but in practice few were permitted to do this. No one was allowed a television. There were generally no care plans, although we found a good example of one for a long-term resident who left the unit to attend support groups and association in health care. Although formal reintegration plans were nominal, the majority of prisoners returned to normal location within Forest Bank.
- 1.83 Multidisciplinary reviews were timely but resulting documentation was poorly completed and behaviour targets were perfunctory and not individualised. However, there was consistent input and support from the mental health team.
- 1.84 We saw good staff-prisoner relationships in the unit, although staff entries in prisoners' electronic case notes and daily history sheets did not reflect the good knowledge of the prisoners in their care.

Recommendation

- 1.85 Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should only be held in the care and separation unit when there are exceptional circumstances to justify this.

Housekeeping points

- 1.86 Segregation review documentation and care/reintegration plans should be completed thoroughly and include meaningful targets.
- 1.87 Segregation unit staff entries in daily history sheets and case notes should reflect constructive engagement with prisoners.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.88 The prison's focus was on recovery and the majority of prisoners prescribed methadone were reducing their dosage, but prescribing regimes lacked flexibility. A fully integrated substance misuse team provided good care, and prisoners could access designated units that offered an excellent range of support. There was good use of peer mentoring.
- 1.89 Approximately 15% of new arrivals required opiate substitute treatment. In the previous six months, 174 prisoners had completed alcohol detoxification and 428 were prescribed methadone. Screening was comprehensive, treatment started immediately and prisoners were safely managed on H1, the induction/stabilisation unit, but stabilisation regimes were too slow for some – for example, a prisoner on 80ml of supervised methadone in the community was still only receiving 40ml on his fifth day and clearly felt uncomfortable. Subutex was not offered as an alternative to methadone, even if previous treatment was confirmed. Substance misuse and recovery workers carried out five-day clinical reviews, but the two sessions a week input from the GP with special interest in substance misuse (GPSI) was insufficient to complete 28-day reviews on time.
- 1.90 The majority of the 227 prisoners currently in treatment (59%) were on reducing doses and could access an excellent range of support. All had a named nurse and recovery worker. Nurse-led clinics for dual diagnosis, alcohol, sleep/relaxation and naltrexone (opiate blocker) treatment had been introduced, and there were two designated drug treatment units – E1 provided motivational support and G1 was the recovery unit. A fully integrated substance misuse team ran a wide range of group work courses on both units, which had substance misuse nurses and recovery workers, and peer mentors were also actively involved. Out of 53 prisoners on the recovery unit, 27 had achieved abstinence.
- 1.91 The director chaired substance misuse strategy meetings, which reflected the importance of this work, and both a strategic and an operational lead were responsible for service development. The local drug and alcohol action team (DAAT) was due to undertake a needs analysis to inform the substance misuse strategy policy and its action plans. A detailed interventions needs assessment had been completed internally. The prison had not yet developed a mechanism for regular service user consultation, such as surveys or focus groups.
- 1.92 A well-resourced and enthusiastic recovery team was accessible throughout the week and also offered evening sessions. The active caseload of 334 clients included those with alcohol problems. In addition to structured one-to-one work, prisoners could undertake a series of workshops, but there was currently no group work provision for vulnerable prisoners. The team had introduced modules focusing on money management, relationships and self-esteem, in addition to the standard 28-day integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) package. Recovery mentors had been trained to co-facilitate some of this work (see also good practice 4.48). Innovative projects included a visiting theatre group, and a community rehabilitation organisation that offered a 12-week motivational programme on E1 and an abstinence-based course on the recovery unit. Prisoners could also undertake the building skills for recovery (BSR) and the alcohol related violence (ARV) programmes.

Recommendations

- 1.93 Prescribing regimes for opiate-dependent prisoners should be flexible and based on individual need. Sufficient specialist clinical input should be available to ensure timely assessments and reviews.
- 1.94 Substance misuse services should develop service user feedback to inform future developments, and the needs of vulnerable prisoners should be reviewed.

Good practice

- 1.95 *The prison had developed a substance misuse recovery pathway that gave prisoners access to an excellent range of support and interventions delivered on designated units by dedicated staff, and there was good use of peer and recovery mentors.*

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 Communal areas and cells were clean, and cells were adequately furnished with sufficient toilet screening. Access to showers was good but there was no privacy screening. Wings were relaxed and most prisoners felt safe. Prisoners could wear their own clothes and use the laundry facilities. The application system worked well.
- 2.2 Communal areas were clean, bright and allowed good sightlines for staff. Association equipment was in good condition. Staff supervised landings appropriately and most prisoners told us they felt safe on the wings. We observed calm and relaxed wings during the day and night.
- 2.3 Most cells were in a good condition and there was an ongoing programme of cell refurbishment. Some cells designed to hold one prisoner were used inappropriately to house two. Toilets in cells were partitioned with a full screen. All cells had adequate furniture, but prisoners in double cells did not have their own lockable cabinet. Many prisoners complained that cells were cold at night.
- 2.4 In our survey, 88% of respondents, against the comparator of 62%, said they could access cell cleaning materials weekly. There was a domestic hour every day for prisoners to clean their cells, and those we saw were clean.
- 2.5 The offensive display policy was generally adhered to but we did see graffiti in some of the older accommodation. Emergency cell call bells were answered quickly, and our survey responses on this were better than the comparator.
- 2.6 In our survey, 97% of respondents said that they could shower daily and access to showers was unrestricted. Shower areas were clean but there was no privacy screening. The paintwork and shower fabric in some was damaged.
- 2.7 All prisoners could wear their own clothes and each residential unit had its own laundry. Prisoners told us that the laundry procedures worked well. Prison clothing was in good condition.
- 2.8 In our survey, 90% of respondents, against the comparator of 81%, said that they received clean sheets weekly. All prisoners had a duvet, and the sheets we saw were clean and undamaged. The prison ran a mattress replacement scheme.
- 2.9 Most prisoners felt that the application system worked well and that staff dealt with issues informally. Notices on wings were relevant and up to date. Every wing had two kiosks that allowed prisoners to access their accounts, menu choices and notices through biometric

identification, and they appreciated this facility. Information on rules and routines was given during induction and displayed in residential wings, and staff enforced the rules fairly.

- 2.10 In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said they could access their stored property, and during the inspection there was no backlog of applications.
- 2.11 Prisoner access to telephones was satisfactory and the introduction of in-cell telephones on G wing was a positive initiative. There were no problems with prisoners' incoming and outgoing mail

Recommendations

- 2.12 Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two.
- 2.13 Communal showers should be refurbished and include privacy screening.

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.

- 2.14 Staff-prisoner relationships were generally good, but staff use of preferred names was not well embedded. Formal complaints against staff were not investigated thoroughly. The quality of the personal officer scheme was mixed. Prisoner consultation worked well.
- 2.15 In our survey, responses to questions about staff-prisoner relationships and respect were more positive than in similar prisons. Most prisoners we interviewed said that staff were helpful and courteous, and we observed staff who interacted positively.
- 2.16 There had been 98 formal complaints against staff in the previous six months. The investigations we reviewed were perfunctory and were not looked into with sufficient rigor (see paragraph 2.47).
- 2.17 Staff use of preferred names or titles to address prisoners was not well embedded and we heard use of surnames only. Documentation that we reviewed had too many examples where preferred names or titles were not used.
- 2.18 In our survey, 52% of respondents, against the comparator of 46%, said that they had a personal officer, and 68% of these said that their personal officer was helpful. The quality of written personal officer work was mixed and management checks were mechanistic.
- 2.19 The monthly prisoner consultation meeting was well attended by staff and prisoners. The minutes indicated a positive and meaningful meeting where prisoners could air their views and issues.

Recommendation

- 2.20 All formal complaints against staff should be thoroughly investigated.

Housekeeping point

- 2.21 Staff should always use prisoners' preferred names in documentation and when addressing them.

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 characteristic³ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.22 Insufficient coverage by the diversity and inclusion team affected outcomes for some groups of prisoners. The prison was not aware of all prisoners in minority groups or their needs, and many had limited support. Responses from Muslim, disabled and young adult prisoners in our survey were worse than the comparators across a range of indicators. Prisoner diversity representatives were not trained.

Strategic management

- 2.23 The diversity and inclusion policy was not based on a needs analysis of the population, and did not cover how prisoners would be supported. A member of the senior management team oversaw the daily management of diversity, supported by lead officers for each protected characteristics. However, in practice many of the leads were in name only. Because of the lack of management oversight of some protected characteristics, need was underidentified and outcomes were affected.
- 2.24 The diversity and inclusion action team (DIAT) only met quarterly and lacked sufficient strategic direction. Meetings focused primarily on statistical information and did not discuss all the protected characteristics. The committee considered SMART (systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment) monitoring data on race, and we saw reports submitted to explain any areas out of range. However, other protected characteristics were not monitored. SMART data were published on residential notice boards for both prisoners and staff to see.
- 2.25 Staff and prisoners were aware of when to submit discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs), which were readily available on all units. In 2012 to date, there had been 80 DIRFs submitted, which was comparable to the number in 2011. We found that investigations were

³ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

conducted sensitively and thoroughly, actions were taken where required and there was good internal quality assurance, although there was no external scrutiny of DIRFs.

- 2.26 The prison collected data about minority groups from self-assessment forms completed by new arrivals. It over-relied on this method of identification and, as a result, was not aware of all prisoners with protected characteristics. For example, we found evidence of some men who had disabilities about which the prison were unaware, primarily due to this method of reporting.
- 2.27 There were only three prisoner diversity representatives for the whole prison and they were expected to cover all the protected characteristics, even though they had received no training and were unclear about their role.
- 2.28 There were support groups for black and minority ethnic, older and Gypsy, Romany and Traveller prisoners, which varied in their effectiveness, but there were no comparable groups for prisoners with other protected characteristics

Recommendation

- 2.29 Consultation with prisoners from minority groups should be improved.

Housekeeping point

- 2.30 There should be external scrutiny of the quality of completed investigations into discrimination incident reports.

Protected characteristics

- 2.31 Black and minority ethnic prisoners accounted for around 16% of the population. Although their responses to our survey were generally more positive than we sometimes find, they were more negative than white prisoners in some key areas, especially staff-prisoner relationships. For example, 41%, against 28% said that they had been victimised by staff and only 10%, against 27%, said that staff spoke to them most of the time during association. There was a black and minority ethnic prisoner support group, although this was not well advertised, and prisoners we spoke to were unaware of specific support available to them. The senior manager overseeing diversity and inclusion was made aware of problems, but resulting actions were limited and not included in the DIAT agenda or action plan.
- 2.32 Our survey indicated that approximately 4% of the population were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background. An external member of the chaplaincy facilitated a support group, which was well attended, but it had no direct link with the DIAT and the needs of this group were not widely understood across the prison.
- 2.33 The prison held around 70 foreign national prisoners from 27 countries. The prison lead officer for this area dealt primarily with immigration processes rather than the needs of foreign national prisoners, and support was largely limited to that from the education department. The English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) course tutor assisted prisoners with their specific needs, and prisoners in this class said they were grateful for this support. However, many foreign nationals said that they felt isolated and victimised on the units. The prison had produced a pictorial book for prisoners with little English, which was a useful aid for communication, but induction staff had stopped issuing this some months previously and some foreign national prisoners did not know about it, although it was being reprinted. Foreign

national prisoners could exchange visiting orders for a monthly telephone call although, again, many were unaware of the facility.

- 2.34 In our survey, Muslim prisoners, who accounted for around 9% of the population, were negative about feelings of safety and staff victimisation – 24%, against 15% of non-Muslims, said they felt unsafe currently, and 45%, against 29%, said they had been victimised by staff. Although Muslim prisoners we spoke to were more positive, there was no forum where they could express their views and the prison was, generally, not focused on the issue.
- 2.35 New arrivals were invited to disclose disabilities, and we found evidence of some reasonable adjustments made, but this information was not routinely communicated to the disability lead nurse and we were not assured that the prison was aware of all prisoners who had disabilities. Personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) were not comprehensive and they were absent for some prisoners who required one. There was no paid carer or buddy scheme. In our survey, respondents with disabilities expressed more negative views than those without in half of all key indicators. In particular, they felt less safe and more likely to be threatened or intimidated by other prisoners. Many of the disabled prisoners we spoke to told us they felt unsupported by staff.
- 2.36 Older prisoners were quickly identified on arrival at the prison and there was an excellent support group. The minutes of this meeting informed the DIAT and its resulting action plan of issues raised. Many prisoners told us that the prison had made reasonable adjustments where required, and we found they had good access to the regime. Prisoners over 65, as well as any who were registered disabled, were unlocked during the core day, but there were no specific activities for them on wings. Both groups were paid £7.50 a week, which was comparable to wages across the prison.
- 2.37 Young adults made up 10% of the population. In our survey, they had more negative views than adults across a range of indicators, particularly about not being treated respectfully, and many told us they were treated less respectfully because of their age. There was no specific forum for them and their views were largely unknown by the prison. Young adults were over-represented in violent incidents, adjudications and use of force, but the reasons for this were not analysed at the DIAT and nobody from the team attended the violence reduction committee meeting.
- 2.38 In our survey approximately 3% of the population indicated they were gay or bisexual, but there was little or no support for this group. The prison was not aware of how large this group was or their needs. There was little positive gay imagery across the prison and although there was some appropriate literature in the library, it was not known if this met the needs of prisoners.

Recommendation

- 2.39 The prison should analyse prisoners' perceptions of their treatment at Forest Bank, including prisoners from all minority groups, and develop an action plan to resolve concerns, which should be reviewed frequently.

Housekeeping point

- 2.40 There should be personal emergency evacuation plans for all prisoners who require one.

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.

- 2.41 The chaplaincy was well integrated and delivered good provision for all faiths. Most prisoners said their religious beliefs were respected. A wide range of groups and courses was available.
- 2.42 The chaplaincy was active, highly visible and well integrated in the prison, delivering good provision for all faiths which had been tailored following a recent needs analysis. In our survey, black and minority ethnic and Muslim respondents were positive about their religious beliefs being respected and said they had good access to a faith leader.
- 2.43 The large multi-faith room was an excellent provision and could accommodate Muslim Friday prayers, which were regularly attended by around 80 men. The chaplaincy held separate services for vulnerable prisoners, which ensured equal access.
- 2.44 The chaplaincy facilitated an excellent range of courses, groups and support, including counselling, Arabic classes and 'out there', which enabled prisoners to report concerns about their family members – chaplaincy staff were able to facilitate interaction with those affected and help resolve issues.

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.

- 2.45 Prisoners were mostly positive about the complaints system and submitted fewer than in similar prisons. However, responses to many complaints were poor and quality assurance was ineffective.
- 2.46 In our survey, prisoners were positive about the handling of complaints. There had been 1,854 complaints in the previous six months, which was lower than similar prisons. Complaint forms and locked boxes were readily accessible.
- 2.47 Most replies to complaints were prompt. The quality of responses we sampled varied but most were just adequate and many required improvement. Most responses were not personally addressed, many were curt or brief, and some did not properly answer the issues raised. Regular quality assurance highlighted only some of the issues around poor practice, but it was difficult to see where improvements were made as a result and therefore we questioned its effectiveness.
- 2.48 Monthly data were collated and used by the senior management team to analyse and address trends and patterns.

Recommendation

- 2.49 The quality of responses to complaints should be improved.

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.

2.50 The legal services provision was reasonable but prisoners had insufficient access to telephones to contact legal representatives

2.51 A trained legal services and bail officer saw all newly remanded prisoners and was successful in achieving bail for almost 20% of those she saw. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said it was easy to communicate with their legal representative. Access to legal visits was good, and legal correspondence was handled properly, but prisoners did not have enough access to telephones to contact legal representatives during working hours, and this was also actively restricted by some staff. The legal texts in the library were out of date (see paragraph 3.36 and housekeeping point 3.39).

Housekeeping point

- 2.52 Prisoners should have better access to telephones for legal calls.

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.

2.53 A high level of health services was provided by a large team of staff that worked well together. Despite some negative prisoner opinions, our evidence indicated that they had access to a well-trained and professional team that delivered a wide range of clinics with minimal waiting times. There had been much investment in the development of day care and palliative care services in the large inpatient unit. Pharmacy services were generally well organised and the dental care was good. The mental health in-reach team offered good multidisciplinary care.

Governance arrangements

- 2.54 The majority of health services were commissioned and provided by Sodexo Justice Services. Relationships with Salford NHS Foundation Trust were very good and, despite the limited contractual arrangements, a partnership board met quarterly and was chaired by the prison

director and attended regularly by the health care manager. The health care department was represented at the weekly senior management team.

- 2.55 A health needs assessment had been completed in 2011 and had recently been updated. The assessment was used to inform the health care action and delivery plan. The health care manager provided an operational lead for the services and she was supported by three clinical leads for primary care, inpatient care and IDTS services. The large health care team was fully staffed with a very stable workforce. In our survey, prisoners were generally satisfied with access to and the quality of health care, apart from that provided by the GPs and the dentist.
- 2.56 The health care centre had all its facilities on the ground floor. Despite some limited natural lighting, the decoration and furnishing of rooms had been much improved since our previous inspection, including the inpatient day care centre and palliative care suite. There was a large waiting room with access to treatment and consultation rooms.
- 2.57 There had been much investment in the professional development of staff to ensure a good range of appropriate clinics delivered by appropriately trained specialists. Training opportunities for staff were well managed and all were in date for the mandatory elements. Clinical supervision was also provided one-to-one and in groups, but there were no records of events or attendance. Health care guidance provided by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) and the relevant national service frameworks were distributed to health care professionals and discussed at team meetings as required.
- 2.58 Emergency resuscitation equipment, including automated external defibrillators, was located in the health care centre, G and H wings and the main wing hub. All equipment was well maintained and checked regularly.
- 2.59 Prisoners attended consultative groups and there was an older prisoner forum, both of which included health care as agenda items, but there was no dedicated health care forum. Patients used the prison complaints process to complain about health care, and there were approximately 35 health care complaints a month, mainly about appointment times or choice of medicines prescribed. Those we sampled had been dealt with swiftly and appropriately. However, health care complaints lacked sufficient confidentiality as they were not dealt with separately.
- 2.60 The health care manager provided the lead for health promotion with an action group that included a range of other prison departments. There was a robust strategy with much available for prisoners to maintain a healthy lifestyle. Health promotion information was provided on the wings and throughout the prison, apart from the health care waiting area, and additional information was available on national campaign days. There were policies and procedures for the management of communicable diseases.

Recommendation

- 2.61 Prisoners should have access to a dedicated health care forum.

Housekeeping points

- 2.62 All clinical supervision events should be recorded.
- 2.63 The process for managing complaints about health care should allow sufficient patient confidentiality.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.64 All new arrivals received an initial health care screen carried out by two health care assistants who regularly worked in reception. They referred to nurses and a GP who were available until all prisoners had been processed. The reception health care room was large and suitably equipped with access to SystmOne (the electronic clinical information system) and a telephone. All prisoners received a comprehensive secondary screen within 72 hours.
- 2.65 Health care staff were available to prisoners over 24 hours, and included GP cover until 9pm on weekdays. One lead GP provided over half the GP clinics and was supported by a further five regular GPs. Prisoners had access to two GP clinics on weekdays and one each weekend day. Out-of-hours cover was provided by the same service as that in the local community.
- 2.66 The health care application process was confidential and there were health care boxes on the wings. Applications were seen by triage-trained nurses who saw the patients on their wings in the first instance and either provided care or referred, as appropriate. All those allocated to a GP clinic were seen within 48 hours, or sooner if urgent. The range of clinics reflected the needs of the prison population. Attendance rates were poorer for the GP and triage clinics.
- 2.67 Health promotion clinics and advice for prisoners were good with regular liaison with the gymnasium staff who provided smoking cessation courses. Condoms were available on request from the health care centre but there was no information for prisoners about their availability.
- 2.68 A nurse saw all prisoners in the care and separation unit daily, and additionally if they required medication. A GP visited the unit three times a week and saw all segregated prisoners.
- 2.69 Patient records were effectively maintained on SystmOne. The clinical records that we sampled were well written and included the care of mental health patients. Remaining paper records were stored appropriately.
- 2.70 The inpatient unit comprised 10 single cells, one double observed cell and two four-bedded wards. One of the wards was being converted to provide medical assessment and palliative care facilities. The 10 single-cell beds were occupied at the time of our inspection. A small team of mental health nurses and discipline staff provided care on the unit. All cells were adequately equipped and two prison orderlies assisted in keeping the unit clean. Inpatients had access to a newly refurbished day room, where they spent a large part of the day. The facility was used for therapeutic care from one of the education staff, as well as for association and communal dining. There was also a garden/exercise yard. Care on the unit was well organised and documented, with most inpatients very complimentary about the staff and the facility.
- 2.71 There were two escorts a day, and often more, for patients attending outside hospital appointments. It was very rare for escorts to be cancelled, and patients could be held at the prison to keep their appointment when necessary.

Housekeeping point

- 2.72 Clinic attendance rates should be examined to reduce the non-attendance rate.

Pharmacy

- 2.73 A pharmacist and two registered technicians were available on weekdays, and the pharmacist provided medicines use reviews for patients. Medicines were supplied by a community pharmacy.
- 2.74 The pharmacy rooms were clean and in good order. No temperature logs were maintained and the health care suite was very warm and could exceed the recommended temperature for medicines storage during warm weather. Medicines were administered in the morning, lunchtime and early evening, with the latest supplied at approximately 6pm.
- 2.75 Medicine administration in the health care suite and IDTS was through a secure barred hatch. Security at the hub administration was through a gated stable door. To allow administration, one side of the gate was left open during medicines rounds and security staff were present. Patients could be counselled but, with the exception of the IDTS room, these conversations were not confidential.
- 2.76 Risk assessments for patients in possession of medicines were recorded. Approximately 70% of medicines were supplied in possession, but those with established diversion/abuse potential were not. A wide range of patient group directions enabled nurses to administer more potent medicines, and a limited range of remedies were available through the prison shop.
- 2.77 The pharmacy had no electronic recording and labelling system and could not supply accurate prescribing and usage data, although the pharmacist could estimate drug use for the medicines management committee. Drug stocks were well managed, secure and audited appropriately. All prescriptions were paper based with standard issue prescription and administration charts. These were retained and filed in the pharmacy until the prisoner's release.
- 2.78 Medicines, including controlled drugs, were stored appropriately, and appropriate records were kept. Controlled drugs registers met current regulatory standards. The medicines management committee met every two months, was attended by relevant stakeholders and had developed a formulary. The prescribing that we saw was appropriate for the population.

Housekeeping points

- 2.79 Temperatures in the pharmacy rooms should be monitored to ensure that medicines are not stored inadvertently outside the recommended limits.
- 2.80 The pharmacy should have an effective patient medical record labelling system to allow more accurate usage information.

Dentistry

- 2.81 Dental services were provided by a dentist from a local practice with a dental nurse employed by Sodexo Justice Services. The dentist had worked in the prison for over 10 years and provided four sessions a week, but there was limited provision when the dentist was absent or on holiday.

- 2.82 Access to the dentist was very good. At the time of our inspection, there were 150 patients on the waiting list with the longest wait of four weeks. Patients receiving treatment were cared for respectfully, but the surgery door remained open throughout all treatments, which compromised their privacy. We observed a good level of interaction with the dental team, and patients were given appropriate written information. The patients we spoke to were very complimentary about their care and treatment.
- 2.83 The dental suite was large and included a separate newly fitted room for decontamination. The suite was very clean and all equipment was well maintained. Dental records and appointments were maintained by the dental team, but storage facilities were not secure enough to protect patient confidentiality.

Housekeeping points

- 2.84 Dental patients should be given adequate privacy during their treatment.
- 2.85 Dental records should be stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act and Caldicott guidelines on the use and confidentiality of personal health information.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.86 Primary mental health care was supported by two mental health nurses who each carried a caseload in addition to working with the inpatient team. Secondary mental health care was provided by Greater Manchester West Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust and delivered by an in-reach team of five senior mental health nurses based at the prison. Each nurse had a caseload of about 15 patients. The patients we spoke with were very satisfied with their care and support. The team had recently won a staff excellence award 2012 from the trust.
- 2.87 There was an open referral system, although prisoners could not self-refer to the in-reach team. The team provided duty cover Monday to Friday and responded to enquiries and requests for advice or information. In-reach staff worked closely with registered mental health nursing staff in primary care. Prisoners also had access to a large professional counselling team managed by the chaplaincy.
- 2.88 There was a weekly single point referral meeting, attended by staff from the in-reach team and primary mental health care team, a GP, probation, safer custody staff and staff from the IDTS. The meeting considered prisoners' mental health needs, including self-harm issues, non-compliance with medication and treatment, their vulnerability and presentation on prison wings and any plans, if necessary, to move prisoners to hospital. The joint and collaborative working with the in-reach mental health team across the prison meant that there were further measures to safeguard vulnerable prisoners. A psychiatrist visited the prison each week seeing patients as required. There were a few transfers to secure mental health units, and all had been moved promptly.
- 2.89 There had been mental health awareness training for over 100 prison staff in the previous 18 months, with priority to staff working in the care and separation unit.

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.

- 2.90 The range and standard of food were reasonable but unpopular with some prisoners. The system for ordering food and the training kitchen were good initiatives. Consultation arrangements were limited.
- 2.91 The food that we saw and tasted was of a reasonable quality and met the needs of different diets, including halal, vegan and vegetarian. However, many prisoners said that portions were small. There had been 102 complaints about food in the previous six months and many were about this issue. Despite this, in our survey, 29% of respondents said the food was good against the comparator of 23%.
- 2.92 The menu operated over a four-week cycle and prisoners could select their choices, up to two weeks in advance, using a computer terminal on their unit. They could alter their choices up to the evening before the meals. New arrivals could order food for the following day. Breakfast was served on the day it was eaten. Prisoners could dine out on all units.
- 2.93 The kitchen, wing serveries and food trolleys were clean and well maintained, and halal food was stored, prepared and served separately. There was a separate training kitchen where prisoners undertook national vocational qualifications (NVQs), and also prepared food for family days.
- 2.94 Consultation arrangements were limited to a twice yearly food survey and a servery workers' meeting. There was no consultation about the food at the prisoner consultative meeting, and the food comments books on the units were completed by staff on behalf of prisoners, which limited their effectiveness. Catering staff did not consistently respond to comments in servery books or the issues raised in the survey.

Recommendation

- 2.95 There should be better communication and consultation with prisoners about the food, and the catering department should respond to issues raised consistently.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.96 Arrangements for prisoners to make purchases from the shop were better than we usually see but the list of goods was relatively small and prisoners could not shop from catalogues. Consultation arrangements were responsive.

- 2.97 Most prisoners could use the shop within 24 hours of arrival and after that could buy items twice a week, which was better than we normally see. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator felt that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods, and the list of items was smaller than we usually see, but regular consultation resulted in some changes to the list. Prisoners could not shop from catalogues, but there was a small stock list of popular items, including bedding and a DAB radio. However, prisoners could have clothes and trainers sent in.

Housekeeping point

- 2.98 Prisoners should be able to shop from catalogues.

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.⁴

- 3.1 Most prisoners got at least five to six hours out of cell per weekday, association was rarely curtailed and the regime at weekends was particularly good. However, too many prisoners were locked in their cells during the middle of the working day with little to occupy them.
- 3.2 The published activity schedule indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve just over 12 hours a day out of their cell on weekdays. In practice, it was less for a significant number of unemployed prisoners (about 40% of the population) or those who worked part time. An unemployed prisoner could expect about five to six hours out of cell on weekdays. This included three hours' association and an additional hour's exercise and domestic periods in the morning and sometimes in the afternoon. We estimated that part-time employed prisoners received about six to seven hours out of cell on weekdays. The weekend regime was good, and most prisoners got about six or seven hours out of cell on Saturdays and Sundays.
- 3.3 Association was rarely curtailed and there was no evidence that the routine day was hampered by late unlocking or slippage in the regime. However, at a roll check during the morning of the core day, we found about 43% the population locked in their cells. The following afternoon, about 40% were locked up.

Recommendation

- 3.4 All prisoners should be able to access activities during the core day.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.5 The leadership and management of learning and skills were inadequate. There was a lack of direction on education and no way of knowing if outcomes were meaningful. The quality of teaching had declined and required improvement. The lack of data analysis and quality assurance remained a concern, and there had been no full training needs analysis. Despite

⁴ 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.

clear strategic focus on establishing a working week in industries, this had only been implemented in one workshop. Industrial workshops and vocational training were well managed and provided useful basic employability skills, and a few prisoners gained vocational qualifications. Vulnerable prisoners and young adults had limited education, vocational training, work and library opportunities.

3.6 Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities:	required improvement
Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:	required improvement
Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:	inadequate

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.7 There was a clear strategic focus on establishing a full-time working week, but this had only taken effect in one workshop and strategic plans did not include the education provision. There was a much-needed draft revision of the education programmes and a draft learning and skills policy, but neither had been implemented.
- 3.8 The education provision lacked clear direction, curriculum development to keep the provision up to date was inadequate, and teaching standards had declined since the 2010 inspection. Staff attended professional development activities but their individual development needs were not clearly identified and there were not enough opportunities for them to share good practice.
- 3.9 The industries area had been unsuccessful in meeting the prison's challenging 2011/12 strategic target of at least three workshops operating a 40-hour working week with a minimum of 60 prisoners. Managers had been unable to source adequate external contract work to occupy prisoners fully and reflect busy industrial work conditions to prepare men appropriately for work on release.
- 3.10 Industry workshops and vocational training were well managed. Internal verification was well planned for vocational training, and there were regular observations of assessments, sometimes including evaluation of training. Contract work produced work of a good quality to meet external standards and timescales.
- 3.11 While workshops were dominated by adult prisoners, allocation to activities was generally fair and equitable, except that vulnerable prisoners could only work in the separate electrical assembly workshop and the prison gardens. Waiting lists were generally well managed, but few young adults worked in the workshops. Pay was not a disincentive to attending education.
- 3.12 Quality assurance arrangements, including training needs analysis, monitoring of the quality of teaching and learning activities, the use of achievement data and self-evaluation, were inadequate. Managers did not have accurate information on which to base their decisions and for quality improvement planning.

⁵ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

Provision of activities

- 3.13 There were approximately 800 activity places on core weekdays and 176 at weekends. Places were available to remand and convicted prisoners. Around 525 prisoners were unemployed, of whom a third were remand prisoners. Generally prisoners were only unemployed for short periods.
- 3.14 Approximately 243 full-time places were in industry contract workshops. Most work was repetitive and mundane, including packing goods, electric parts assembly and books recycling. There were around 300 full-time-equivalent places on wing cleaning/food servery duties and as painters and orderlies. In our survey, only 34% of respondents thought their prison job would help them on release, much lower than the comparator of 42%.
- 3.15 Vocational training had 58 places. Catering courses at levels 1 and 2 and the level 1 gym assistant and level 2 gym instructors' awards related directly to progression into employment on release. The Timpson's workshop provided training for the company's own accredited shoe repair award. Construction introductory courses, level 1 awards in painting and decorating and construction multi-skills (woodwork, plumbing and painting) did not prepare for skilled employment on release.
- 3.16 Education had 100 places at a time in classrooms, and outreach work in total provided 287 part-time and 25 full-time places daily. There was literacy and numeracy outreach support for around 30 prisoners in cell and in workshops each week. Nineteen Toe-by-Toe reading scheme mentors supported 10 prisoners. Two prisoners were on distance learning courses.
- 3.17 Main education offered a variety of levels of accredited awards in a few subjects. Morning classes were mostly level 1 accredited subjects, including family relationships, conflict awareness, citizenship, healthy lifestyle and art. Music was unaccredited. There were afternoon classes in literacy, numeracy and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) at entry levels 1 to 3; key skills levels 1 and 2 in application of number and communications; and information technology (IT) and self-employment courses at levels 1 and 2.
- 3.18 It was not always clear why prisoners had been allocated to certain activities, and education and activity work placements did not work in harmony to effect the best possible outcomes for prisoners (see main recommendation HP48). Education, vocational training and work provision for vulnerable prisoners was not equitable with other prisoners (see main recommendation HP47).

Recommendation

- 3.19 **A broader range of level 1 and 2 vocational qualifications should be available.**

Quality of provision

- 3.20 Vocational training and prison work provided good individual coaching, and group training was well planned. Individual learning plans were used appropriately and prisoners' progress was well recorded. Vocational catering courses used realistic kitchen work environments to prepare food for family days and visits and other external events.
- 3.21 In education, too much teaching required improvement. Better classes had been carefully planned to meet individual needs and make learning interactive, engaging and motivating for

prisoners, who increased in confidence and learned new skills. Revised education lesson plans and schemes of work planned learning sequentially but failed to take sufficient account of the differing needs and abilities of individual learners. There was insufficient initial assessment to ensure prisoners were in the correct level of class and plan learning to support future employment.

- 3.22 Learning resources were limited. Too many classrooms were austere, and some had poor sightlines for the whiteboards. Learning strategies were narrow, overly focused on paper resources, unimaginative and not sufficiently stimulating. Teachers had poor access to information technology to enhance learning. There was not enough recording of individual prisoners' learning in each class, which affected their progress, particularly when there were different teachers, as it was unclear exactly what they had learned and what they needed to focus on next.
- 3.23 Outreach support for prisoners was very good, including for dyslexia. Prisoners in work received good support to develop their English and mathematics skills. Surprisingly few prisoners received extra support for learning, even though initial assessments showed that on arrival 83% had literacy levels and 75% had numeracy levels below entry level 3, equivalent to a primary school pupil.
- 3.24 Prisoners' initial assessments, including any learning difficulties/disabilities, were not given systematically to staff to enable them to support prisoners effectively. We saw prisoners who were very frustrated and occasionally left classrooms. In our survey, only 37% of respondents thought that the education they received in the prison would help them on release, against the comparator of 59%.
- 3.25 Attendance was generally good, but learners were sometimes removed to attend other regime activities, although most returned once the activity was completed. Classes were sometimes delayed through regime slippage.
- 3.26 Standards of behaviour were good, and prisoners and staff had a high standard of mutual respect in all learning and skills and work areas.

Recommendations

- 3.27 Teaching and learning should be improved, and include better learning resources and environments, and planning and recording of learning to improve prisoner progress.
- 3.28 Prisoners' progress should be recorded at the end of each education class and appropriate learning targets set for the next session to meet their individual needs.
- 3.29 Prisoners with learning difficulties and disabilities should be accurately identified and this information shared promptly with staff in vocational training and workshops to support prisoners in learning new skills.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.30 Achievement of accredited qualifications on the few vocational courses was good and most prisoners who completed their course were successful. In vocational workshops, prisoners generally produced good standards of work, particularly in construction skills, painting and decorating, shoe repair and catering. Prisoners took pride in their work, and understood and applied good health and safety in their working practices.

- 3.31 In some prison contract workshops, prisoners developed a work ethic, improved their employability skills and developed teamworking. Prisoners worked to commercial deadlines and quality standards. Most employability skills developed were recognised and recorded to prepare for employment. The book recycling workshop allowed prisoners to work a realistic 40-hour week. Vulnerable prisoners working in the prison gardens had constructed a high standard sensory garden.
- 3.32 The majority of prisoners who were entered for examinations in education passed, but there was no way of knowing if outcomes were meaningful. Data were not kept to judge achievement rates against the number of prisoners starting courses. Initial assessments were insufficient in assuring prisoners studied for appropriate levels of awards. The performance of different groups was not analysed sufficiently well to identify underperformance.

Recommendation

- 3.33 **Data on the success rates of all prisoners who start courses should be accurately kept and analysed to enable effective evaluation of education and training courses, and identify and address any gaps in the achievement rates of different groups of prisoners.**

Library

- 3.34 The library provided a suitable service for mainstream prisoners, but access was inequitable for vulnerable prisoners, who were not given the weekly 30-minute session offered to other prisoners (see main recommendation HP47). There was no evening or weekend service. Vulnerable prisoners also had a poor library on their wing, as stock was not regularly renewed and they did not have access to library catalogues from which to order. The librarian visited health care weekly to refresh stock, and there were a few texts for prisoners in the care and separation unit.
- 3.35 An experienced librarian was supported by a library assistant, two orderlies and a part-time librarian, whose role was to promote literacy to prisoners. The librarian responded to prisoners' views through regular surveys and a comments box.
- 3.36 The library stock met the needs of mainstream prisoners and included fiction and non-fiction, textbooks to support vocational training, graphic novels, easy-reads and foreign language books. Legal texts and Prison Service instructions were available but not all were up to date. Prisoners could book additional visits to research legal texts. The range of newspapers was good.
- 3.37 The library services were promoted at induction, and new books and events, such as black history month, were well publicised. The library was used for advice and guidance interviews, and it supported Storybook Dads (enabling prisoners to record stories for their children). A creative writing group and poetry groups were successful in promoting literacy, but vulnerable prisoners did not have access to them.

Recommendation

- 3.38 **A weekend and evening library service should be introduced.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.39 Legal texts and references should be up to date and available.

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.

- 3.40 Prisoners had very good access to recreational PE and facilities were good. Accredited courses helped prepare prisoners for employment in the fitness industry. PE staff promoted healthy living well, but prisoners did not have health assessments before undertaking strenuous exercise, and the shower area needed maintenance.
- 3.41 PE provision was good and included an all-weather outdoor sport pitch, cardiovascular rooms and a wide range of gym equipment in a large sports hall, although this limited the possibility for team games.
- 3.42 Prisoners had good access to recreational PE. Facilities to monitor gym use had recently been introduced, but were not yet used to assess participation by different groups of prisoners. The gym was open from early morning until late evening every weekday and all day at weekends. Prisoners had at least three sessions a week and most had more. Vulnerable prisoners had two sessions a week in the main gym. In our survey, 44% of respondents, against the comparator of 30%, said that they went to the gym at least three times a week. Inter-wing tournaments and personal fitness challenges were popular.
- 3.43 The range of vocational qualifications was satisfactory and included a level 1 course in assisting health-related activity sessions, and fitness instructor at level 2. The achievement of qualifications was good for the few prisoners who had taken these courses. The number of courses with unit accreditation had significantly increased.
- 3.44 Staff were appropriately qualified and excellent role models, promoting good nutrition and cardiovascular exercise. Health promotion included a motivational prison-accredited course in substance misuse, health awareness, sexual health, team building, first aid, lifestyle choices, fitness testing and football coaching. The regular smoking cessation groups had good success rates. However, health care staff did not assess new arrivals to ensure they were fit to participate in strenuous exercise.
- 3.45 The gym had limited shower facilities and most prisoners used the showers on their wings. The shower area needed improved maintenance to keep it in good repair, the installation of modesty screens and improved facilities for prisoners with physical disabilities. Appropriate records were kept of accidents and incidents in the gym. The number of recorded incidents and assaults was very low.

Recommendation

- 3.46 All prisoners should be assessed by health care staff before they participate in new programmes of strenuous exercise. Gym staff should review individual prisoners' progress on their exercise programmes regularly and record health benefits and skills development.

Housekeeping point

- 3.47 The gym shower area should be kept in good repair and be installed with shower screens, and adjustments to enable safe use by prisoners with physical disabilities should be investigated.

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 prison had a basic reducing reoffending strategy but its objectives were too broad and there was no policy outlining the function of the offender management unit. A needs analysis was used effectively to plan services. The prison's approach to offender management was broadly appropriate, and the links with community partners were positive and dynamic.
- 4.2 The head of criminal justice and partnerships had overall responsibility for resettlement, including offender management and public protection, and had close links with the head of offender management for the day-to-day management of the service and broader strategic development.
- 4.3 An overarching reducing reoffending strategic plan covered the resettlement work of all Sodexo prisons but also had its own action plan identifying objectives for each resettlement pathway, as well as offender management. While generally appropriate, the objectives were very broad and some were out of date. A detailed public protection policy identified how the prison would manage the wider national framework of such work, but there was no equivalent for the work of the offender management unit (OMU).
- 4.4 A reducing reoffending strategy group met monthly. Meetings were generally well attended with representation from each resettlement pathways, along with offender management. Communication and information sharing in this group were generally good.
- 4.5 There was an annual needs analysis, with the most recent completed in March 2012. The analysis was based on prisoner questionnaires and focus groups and it covered all aspects of offender management and resettlement needs. There was evidence that information from the needs analysis was used to inform service provision, including the development of debt management services and a domestic violence programme (see reintegration planning section).
- 4.6 As a private prison, there was no requirement for Forest Bank to adopt recent national changes in the organisation of offender management, but we were concerned that it would struggle to manage its prisoner population effectively as further national changes were implemented. Nevertheless, the prison's overarching model of offender management and resettlement was positive and outward-facing and incorporated a range of partnerships with community service providers, particularly on the strategic development of integrated offender management (IOM). The fact that around 90% of its prisoners lived within 20 miles of the prison helped this model,

Recommendation

- 4.7 The prison should develop a clear policy that outlines the function of offender management and how this will be implemented and developed.

Housekeeping point

- 4.8 The prison's resettlement strategic objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.9 Prisoners serving less than 12 months, and those on remand, received no structured custody planning although assessments against key pathway needs were undertaken during induction. Offender management work was generally appropriate, but support from community-based offender managers for some high risk offenders was limited. Quality assurance arrangements were underdeveloped. Despite this, the expansion of integrated offender management work was particularly impressive, but ongoing evaluation of effectiveness was still needed. While there was little offending behaviour work available at the prison for sex offenders, systems for managing public protection arrangements were generally good.
- 4.10 At the time of the inspection 34% of prisoners (452) were unsentenced and a further 15% (205) were serving sentences of less than 12 months. Of these prisoners, 87 were linked to community IOM projects (see paragraph 4.18) and had some contact with offender management, but there was no custody planning for the rest. However, all prisoners saw someone from the housing department and substance misuse team, although there was no structured planning across resettlement pathways.
- 4.11 About half of the population (672) were serving over 12 months and were allocated to an offender supervisor. In our survey, 65% of respondents, against the comparator of 61%, said they had an offender manager and 34%, against 29%, said they had an offender supervisor. Approximately half this population were assessed as the highest risk cases (tier four), and were managed by community-based offender managers, supported by offender supervisors. The rest were the responsibility of a prison offender supervisor. The OMU consisted of 13 offender supervisors, three seconded from Greater Manchester probation service and the rest officer grades.
- 4.12 The prison had a significant backlog of OASys (offender assessment system) assessments in early 2012, but this had been reduced and there were now no delays. However, some prisoners continued to be moved before completion of their initial OASys assessment.
- 4.13 Sentence planning arrangements were reasonable but attendance was usually limited to the prisoner and offender supervisor, with contributions from personal officers or other

departmental staff rare. Planning reviews for tier four cases were also attended by offender managers, sometimes via video or telephone conferencing. As most prisoners came from within a 20-mile radius, attendance for offender managers was easier than we often see. In our survey, 67% of respondents, against the comparator of 56%, said they were involved in the development of their sentence plans.

- 4.14 Overall, tier four cases were managed reasonably well, and offender supervisor were active in supporting prisoners meet their sentence plan targets. However, for many of these cases, the support and contact from community-based offender managers was limited and sometimes led to delays in work undertaken and cases reviewed effectively. Prisoners classified as tiers one to three (low to medium risk) tended to have little contact with their offender supervisor beyond sentence planning.
- 4.15 Frequency of contact was variable for all prisoners subject to offender management. We saw evidence of regular contact in some cases, but this was often driven by specific issues or need and, except for some one-to-one work by probation offender supervisors with the more complex cases, there was little offence-focused work with any prisoners. Despite this, the prison had a good range of work to address offending behaviour, which made up most sentence plan targets (see paragraph 4.61), and in our survey 76% of respondents, against the comparator of 62%, said they could meet some or all of their targets at Forest Bank.
- 4.16 There were quality assurance arrangements for OASys but little else. Probation offender supervisors received some supervision from a senior probation officer, also responsible for work in two other prisons, but this rarely focused on casework management. Officer offender supervisors had group supervision regularly but this was about practical issues rather than work with prisoners.
- 4.17 The prison held a significant number of sex offenders, approximately 10% of the population. Although they had initial assessments of need (RM2000), there was little work to address the needs of this group. Most who were serving relatively long sentences were transferred to other establishments, although there could be delays in this, but several on shorter sentences were regularly released without completing offence-focused work.
- 4.18 Nine districts in Greater Manchester had developed models of IOM, or 'spotlight' projects, providing a range of community support to prisoners on release, such as accommodation and substance misuse services. Access to these projects was open to prisoners who were serious or frequent offenders but not prolific and priority offenders (PPOs), Offender supervisors were a single point of contact for each project, with prisoners allocated to the named offender supervisor. There were regular surgeries at the prison for those due to be released, and each offender supervisor also spent some time in the community following up prisoners with whom they had worked in custody. At the time of the inspection, 241 prisoners were subject to IOM, an almost fourfold increase in the previous two years. Two offender supervisors were funded jointly by the prison and community IOM projects and spent half their time in the community. However, a recent decision to change the prison allocation of offenders from the Wigan court meant that prisoners from that area were now sent to Liverpool Prison, which had effectively rendered the IOM model redundant for prisoners from this area. Although IOM was an effective approach to integrated support to reduce reoffending, there had been no research to quantify its impact on prisoners.
- 4.19 Home detention curfew (HDC) arrangements were generally reasonable. The prison ensured that information from prisoners about their application was received in good time, and the process was started eight to 10 weeks before the potential date of release. There were some delays, mainly because of problems in receiving reports from community-based probation staff,

but the scale of this problem was not clear, and there was also no information on the number of applications that were successful (although staff estimated this to be about 40%). Data on the work were not consistently monitored and there were no quality assurance checks.

Recommendations

- 4.20 The prison should introduce a system for all prisoners serving sentences of less than 12 months to monitor any resettlement needs identified on induction and review them before release.
- 4.21 Initial OASys (offender assessment system) assessments and sentence plans should be completed for all prisoners serving over 12 months before they transfer from Forest Bank.
- 4.22 The prison should develop a strategy to ensure there is appropriate offence-focused work with all sex offenders before their release.
- 4.23 The prison should work with any partners to evaluate the effectiveness of the integrated offender management models working across the Greater Manchester area.

Housekeeping point

- 4.24 Data on home detention curfew should be evaluated to ensure the process is effective.

Public protection

- 4.25 Public protection arrangements were generally well managed. All cases were appropriately screened on arrival and information was shared across all relevant departments. At the time of the inspection, there were 18 multi-agency public protection arrangement (MAPPA) level two and five level three cases, with a further 289 prisoners identified as level one. All MAPPA two and three cases were allocated to one of the probation offender supervisors. All MAPPA cases, including level ones, were reviewed by the monthly inter-departmental risk management team (IDRMT) following arrival, and reviewed subsequently. Offender supervisors regularly attended MAPPA meetings in the community and/or produced detailed reports.
- 4.26 Despite the good structures for public protection work, eight of the 17 high risk of harm cases that we reviewed had risk management plans that were not robust enough, and there was sufficient management oversight in only three out of 10 cases. While the community-based offender manager had management responsibility in all these cases, there was insufficient oversight by prison managers while the prisoner remained in custody. The prison and Probation Trust needed an agreement to ensure the appropriate management of these high risk prisoners.
- 4.27 The IDRMT also reviewed prisoners identified as a risk to children (94) or subject to harassment restriction (143). The prison had good tracking arrangements to identify any breaches of restraining orders etc. The IDRMT was appropriately constituted, well attended, had detailed discussions and identified action points.

Recommendations

- 4.28 Risk management plans should be completed in all relevant cases and should describe how objectives in the sentence plan will address risk of harm issues, including risks of harm the prisoner poses while in custody.
- 4.29 The prison should develop a protocol with the Greater Manchester Probation Trust to improve communication and resolve operational problems.

Categorisation

- 4.30 Although most prisoners (679) were categorised as C, a few had successfully been recategorised to D (34 at the time of the inspection). All prisoners were subject to automatic recategorisation reviews and the process was well organised. Prisoners could make their own representation themselves or through a solicitor, and arrangements for appeals were appropriate.
- 4.31 Although category D prisoners were regularly transferred, most wanted to stay within the geographic area and there could be delays in transfer of up to six months. Facilities for category D prisoners were limited, although some jobs were reserved for them, including five in the prison stores. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) to work outside the prison was also limited to category D prisoners, although only two prisoners had taken up such arrangements in the previous 12 months.

Recommendation

- 4.32 The prison should increase the use of release on temporary licence to support appropriate training or resettlement for prisoners before their release.

Indeterminate sentenced prisoners

- 4.33 At the time of the inspection, there were 29 indeterminate-sentenced prisoners. There were no specific arrangements for this group, although all were allocated an offender supervisor. Multi agency (lifer) risk assessment panel (MALRAP/MARAP) meetings were undertaken on time, and those for prisoners on indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPPs) took place in the community with offender supervisors attending. Most lifers were transferred to more appropriate establishments quickly after these meetings.
- 4.34 Although there were information booklets for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners explaining how their sentences would be managed, there was no forum for them. This issue had been raised during focus groups as part of the most recent needs analysis and was being considered, but no plans were yet in place.

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.

4.35 Arrangements for release were good for prisoners subject to integrated offender management but not consistent for others, especially those serving less than 12 months. Pathway work was generally good. Accommodation and substance misuse services were well integrated. Finance, benefit and debt management had improved and there were good links into the community for employment, training and education work. The children and families pathway was developing positively, and there was a good range of offending behaviour programmes, although little for sexual offenders.

4.36 The prison released an average of 185 prisoners a month. There was no formal pre-release planning for prisoners serving less than 12 months, unless they were on one of the integrated offender management projects across Greater Manchester (see also paragraph 4.18). For this group of prisoners, pre-release planning was good with regular monthly surgeries. This model was enhanced significantly by single points of contact for each project in the accommodation and substance misuse departments. Pre-release arrangements for prisoners not subject to IOM were more variable. Those serving over 12 months had pre-release OASys assessments but these were sometimes drawn up too close to release to arrange any necessary community provision.

Recommendation

4.37 Pre-release planning should be improved so that all prisoners, regardless of their sentence, are given an effective assessment of need before their release and these needs are met.

Accommodation

4.38 The accommodation team consisted of a full-time manager and five full-time-equivalent staff. All new arrivals were seen individually during their induction, regardless of whether they had an accommodation problem. A detailed database of all prisoners outlined any housing issues and was used to plan work, in particular to consider potential homelessness at the point of release. In our survey, one in five respondents indicated that they had a housing problem. Work by the department focused primarily on managing outstanding tenancies or housing arrears for new arrivals, or securing accommodation for those on release.

4.39 Prisoners with a housing problem were usually picked up around three months before their discharge. There were also regular surgeries across the prison to advise and support prisoners, as well as to identify any changes in circumstances. The team had links with community housing support groups across the region and could offer a good range of support. Each member of the team also linked to one of the IOM projects and attended appropriate surgeries. Communication with the OMU was also generally good and we saw examples of contact by housing workers logged on the unit's prisoner contact log. The no fixed

accommodation rate for the prison was 2.8% in 2012 to date, which was very low, especially for a local prison.

- 4.40 Available hostel places in the area had recently diminished and the department was focusing more on private landlords. There was much work to build up the number of places, supported by a 'tenancy ready' workshop to help prisoners increase their chances of securing accommodation and improve their understanding of what makes a good tenant.

Education, training and employment

- 4.41 There was a good preparation for work course, which included CV building, job application, healthy living, citizenship, family relationships, budget and finance. The 'get out, stay out' course in education provided valuable learning to support prisoners gain employment on release. Two Jobcentre Plus staff gave prisoners useful information on how to access their employment services and benefits on release.
- 4.42 The employment advocacy worker and employment coordinator provided effective information, advice and guidance support for prisoners due for release. There had been work to build good links with a large number of external agencies, which were used effectively to support prisoners seeking employment and training on release. Approximately a quarter of prisoners released into the community had secured employment and about 30% continued into training, which was an increase since the previous inspection and in a different economic climate.
- 4.43 Prison staff had a good understanding of employer needs in the area and had developed some good employer links. An increasing number of employers had been persuaded to keep open employment for prisoners serving short sentences. Between January 2011 and September 2012, 20% of prisoners who left the prison with secure employment returned to their previous job.

Recommendation

- 4.44 Data should be collected about prisoners' progression into employment, training and education on release to measure the effectiveness of the service for all groups of prisoners and support development planning.

Health care

- 4.45 Pre-release health planning for prisoners was good with adequate preparations for any continuing care and treatment. Prisoners attended pre-discharge clinics and were given medicines when required and information for their GP. The care programme approach was used for patients with enduring mental health problems. A palliative care team had been established and the Liverpool care pathway used for patients at the end of their lives.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.46 The substance misuse team was fully integrated and had good joint working arrangements with other departments. Links with community drug services enabled treatment continuation on release, and an alcohol nurse was available to set up community appointments. Prisoners started preparation work six weeks before release, and designated link workers from local drug

intervention programme (DIP) teams regularly visited the prison to meet recovery/substance misuse workers and their clients.

- 4.47 A local rehabilitation service offered support on the recovery wing and in the community, which included residential treatment. We spoke to a recovery mentor who was still in regular contact with the prison's programmes team following his release four months previously. He gave talks in the prison and the community, was preparing to co-facilitate the 'greater well-being' course and was working towards a diploma in mentoring. He described the support he received as 'exceptional'.

Good practice

- 4.48 *A local rehabilitation service provided help to prisoners on the recovery wing and in the community, and the programmes team continued to support and involve a recovery mentor post-release.*

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.49 The most recent needs analysis indicated that most groups experienced some problems with finance management and debt, including 40% of prisoners on remand. In response to some of these concerns, and in comparison with findings at our previous inspection, there had been considerable effort to improve provision.
- 4.50 A budgeting and finance course was available through the education department as part of the pre-release course and also as a stand-alone programme. Debt management was provided by the same tutor as the budgeting course, with around 32 individual support sessions offered each month. Prisoners could open bank accounts before release.
- 4.51 All prisoners could see representatives about Jobcentre Plus and benefit information. In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator said they knew who to speak to at the prison for benefit advice.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.52 Work on this pathway had been recently revised, with a new full-time lead coordinator and a new contract with PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust), which managed the visitors' centre and supported several initiatives. Work was generally developing well.
- 4.53 A families steering group had recently been set up, with representatives from across the prison, to identify and plan a range of initiatives. These included work with local authorities across Greater Manchester and other community groups around 'troubled families', identifying how the prison could work with individuals in custody and link better to the range of support in the community.
- 4.54 The 'time for families' parenting course, involving prisoners and their partners, continued to be delivered six times a year, and the education department provided a further, although more basic, parenting programme, as well as access to and support with Storybook Dads (see paragraph 3.37). There were four family visits (extended visits specifically orientated toward prisoners with children to support and encourage family ties and engagement) a year, with positive feedback for the most recent event in August 2012, but only enhanced-status prisoners were eligible for this, as well as the twice monthly 'family meals' in the NVQ kitchen.

- 4.55 Arrangements for domestic visits were generally good. Remand prisoners did not need visiting orders and could receive a half-hour visit every day or combine these for a two-hour visit once a week. Sentenced prisoners could have a weekly visit of up to two hours. The visits hall was open until 7.30pm on weekdays and 4.30pm at weekends.
- 4.56 The visitors' centre was bright and was open until half an hour after visits finished. PACT staff were available to offer advice and guidance to visitors. Visitors we spoke to were very positive about their experiences. In our survey, more respondents than the comparator said it was easy for family and friends to get to the prison.
- 4.57 The visits hall was large and bright and could accommodate up to 50 prisoners at a time. Seating was relaxed and appropriate, and we observed good interaction and engagement with staff. There was a children's play area, which was regularly staffed by PACT workers or volunteers, and a snack bar was also available. There were few delays in visits and the time available for prisoners did not start until they entered the room, even if there were delays in getting them to visits or in their visitors being searched and processed. Enhanced prisoners could have their visits on a sofa, which was more comfortable, and could wear a discrete armband for identification. Given this, it was unnecessary for other prisoners to wear bibs during visits.

Recommendation

- 4.58 Family visits and meals should be extended to all prisoners.

Housekeeping point

- 4.59 Prisoners should not have to wear bibs during visits.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.60 The prison provided only two accredited programmes – alcohol related violence (ARV) and building skills for recovery (BSR). Both programmes were well organised and there were few delays to go on them for prisoners who met the criteria. In our survey, 29% of respondents, against the 19% comparator, said that it was easy to access offending behaviour programmes.
- 4.61 The programme team had developed an impressive number of programmes covering key issues of offending that widely reflected the needs analysis. The 'inner strength' programme, addressing domestic violence, provided 26 sessions over a 12-week period, and the 'great well-being' programme looked at motivational enhancement and goal setting. Other programmes included a range of substance misuse workshops, partly facilitated by prisoners who had completed various programmes, and one-off programmes focusing on managing home life and managing violence. The Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme was also provided through the chaplaincy five times a year. In our survey, 60% of respondents said that they had been involved in offending behaviour programmes at Forest Bank. While these programmes were welcome, none of the non-accredited programmes, except for the inner strength programme, had been evaluated and their effectiveness was not yet clear.
- 4.62 Despite this positive work, sex offenders were not able to access any offending behaviour programmes (see recommendation 4.22)

Recommendation

- 4.63 Non-accredited offending behaviour programmes should be evaluated to establish their effectiveness.

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 director

-
- 5.1 The needs of all prisoners with a protected characteristic should be reflected and addressed in the prison's strategic approach to managing diversity. The identification of such needs should be improved and there should be measurable improvement in the perceptions of, and outcomes for, minority groups. (HP46)
 - 5.2 The quality of activities, including the learning and skills, work and library provision, offered to vulnerable prisoners should be improved. (HP47)
 - 5.3 There should be a clear strategy, underpinned by a thorough review of prisoners' learning needs, to ensure activities and learning offered will support prisoners to gain employment on release. All activities should be monitored by effective quality assurance that provides accurate information about outcomes and quality. (HP48)

Recommendations

To the director

Early days in custody

-
- 5.4 Induction information should be provided in a variety of languages and formats. (1.17)

Bullying and violence reduction

-
- 5.5 Investigations into incidents of violence should be thorough and include a full examination of all available evidence. Effective quality checks should be introduced. (1.33)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

-
- 5.6 Staff entries in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should be improved. (1.42)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

-
- 5.7 The director should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.46)

Security

- 5.8 The prison should manage suspicion drug testing more effectively, ensuring tests take place within the required timescale, and investigate and understand the reasons for the low positive rate.(1.54)
- 5.9 Closed visits should only be applied where there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits. (1.55)
- 5.10 Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.56)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.11 Decisions taken under the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme to demote prisoners to basic regime should be justified and based on evidence. (1.63)
- 5.12 IEP appeals processes should be thorough, fair and credible, taking into account all relevant issues. (1.64)

Discipline

- 5.13 All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached, and the quality assurance of adjudication records should be improved. (1.71)
- 5.14 The application of all unofficial punishments should stop.(1.72)
- 5.15 The special accommodation cells should be modified to allow in natural light or be taken out of use. (1.77)
- 5.16 Managerial oversight and accountability for all use of force, including the filming and reviewing of planned interventions and use of designated special accommodation and other unfurnished cells, should be improved. (1.78)
- 5.17 Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should only be held in the care and separation unit when there are exceptional circumstances to justify this. (1.85)

Substance misuse

- 5.18 Prescribing regimes for opiate-dependent prisoners should be flexible and based on individual need. Sufficient specialist clinical input should be available to ensure timely assessments and reviews. (1.93)
- 5.19 Substance misuse services should develop service user feedback to inform future developments, and the needs of vulnerable prisoners should be reviewed. (1.94)

Residential units

- 5.20 Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two. (2.12)

- 5.21 Communal showers should be refurbished and include privacy screening. (2.13)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.22 All formal complaints against staff should be thoroughly investigated. (2.20)

Equality and diversity

- 5.23 Consultation with prisoners from minority groups should be improved. (2.29)
- 5.24 The prison should analyse prisoners' perceptions of their treatment at Forest Bank, including prisoners from all minority groups, and develop an action plan to resolve concerns, which should be reviewed frequently. (2.39)

Complaints

- 5.25 The quality of responses to complaints should be improved. (2.49)

Health services

- 5.26 Prisoners should have access to a dedicated health care forum. (2.61)

Food

- 5.27 There should be better communication and consultation with prisoners about the food, and the catering department should respond to issues raised consistently. (2.95)

Time out of cell

- 5.28 All prisoners should be able to access activities during the core day. (3.4)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.29 A broader range of level 1 and 2 vocational qualifications should be available. (3.19)
- 5.30 Teaching and learning should be improved, and include better learning resources and environments, and planning and recording of learning to improve prisoner progress. (3.27)
- 5.31 Prisoners' progress should be recorded at the end of each education class and appropriate learning targets set for the next session to meet their individual needs. (3.28)
- 5.32 Prisoners with learning difficulties and disabilities should be accurately identified and this information shared promptly with staff in vocational training and workshops to support prisoners in learning new skills. (3.29)
- 5.33 Data on the success rates of all prisoners who start courses should be accurately kept and analysed to enable effective evaluation of education and training courses, and identify and address any gaps in the achievement rates of different groups of prisoners. (3.33)

- 5.34 A weekend and evening library service should be introduced. (3.38)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.35 All prisoners should be assessed by health care staff before they participate in new programmes of strenuous exercise. Gym staff should review individual prisoners' progress on their exercise programmes regularly and record health benefits and skills development. (3.46)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.36 The prison should develop a clear policy that outlines the function of offender management and how this will be implemented and developed. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.37 The prison should introduce a system for all prisoners serving sentences of less than 12 months to monitor any resettlement needs identified on induction and review them before release. (4.20)
- 5.38 Initial OASys (offender assessment system) assessments and sentence plans should be completed for all prisoners serving over 12 months before they transfer from Forest Bank. (4.21)
- 5.39 The prison should develop a strategy to ensure there is appropriate offence-focused work with all sex offenders before their release. (4.22)
- 5.40 The prison should work with any partners to evaluate the effectiveness of the integrated offender management models working across the Greater Manchester area. (4.23)
- 5.41 Risk management plans should be completed in all relevant cases and should describe how objectives in the sentence plan will address risk of harm issues, including risks of harm the prisoner poses while in custody. (4.28)
- 5.42 The prison should develop a protocol with the Greater Manchester Probation Trust to improve communication and resolve operational problems. (4.29)
- 5.43 The prison should increase the use of release on temporary licence to support appropriate training or resettlement for prisoners before their release. (4.32)

Reintegration planning

- 5.44 Pre-release planning should be improved so that all prisoners, regardless of their sentence, are given an effective assessment of need before their release and these needs are met. (4.37)
- 5.45 Data should be collected about prisoners' progression into employment, training and education on release to measure the effectiveness of the service for all groups of prisoners and support development planning. (4.44)
- 5.46 Family visits and meals should be extended to all prisoners. (4.58)

- 5.47 Non-accredited offending behaviour programmes should be evaluated to establish their effectiveness. (4.63)

Housekeeping points

Courts, escorts and transfers

To Prison Escort and Custody Services

- 5.48 Escort vans should be clean. (1.4)

Early days in custody

- 5.49 All new arrivals should be able to shower on their first night in custody. (1.18)
- 5.50 Notices in reception holding rooms should be relevant and up to date. (1.19)
- 5.51 The induction fast-track arrangements should ensure that prisoner needs are met. (1.20)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.52 IEP management checks should be thorough and meaningfully support the fairness and credibility of the scheme. (1.65)

Discipline

- 5.53 Segregation review documentation and care/reintegration plans should be completed thoroughly and include meaningful targets. (1.86)
- 5.54 Segregation unit staff entries in daily history sheets and case notes should reflect constructive engagement with prisoners. (1.87)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.55 Staff should always use prisoners' preferred names in documentation and when addressing them. (2.21)

Equality and diversity

- 5.56 There should be external scrutiny of the quality of completed investigations into discrimination incident reports. (2.30)
- 5.57 There should be personal emergency evacuation plans for all prisoners who require one. (2.40)

Legal rights

- 5.58 Prisoners should have better access to telephones for legal calls. (2.52)

Health services

- 5.59 All clinical supervision events should be recorded. (2.62)
- 5.60 The process for managing complaints about health care should allow sufficient patient confidentiality. (2.63)
- 5.61 Clinic attendance rates should be examined to reduce the non-attendance rate. (2.72)
- 5.62 Temperatures in the pharmacy rooms should be monitored to ensure that medicines are not stored inadvertently outside the recommended limits. (2.79)
- 5.63 The pharmacy should have an effective patient medical record labelling system to allow more accurate usage information. (2.80)
- 5.64 Dental patients should be given adequate privacy during their treatment. (2.84)
- 5.65 Dental records should be stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act and Caldicott guidelines on the use and confidentiality of personal health information. (2.85)

Purchases

- 5.66 Prisoners should be able to shop from catalogues. (2.98)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.67 Legal texts and references should be up to date and available. (3.39)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.68 The gym shower area should be kept in good repair and be installed with shower screens, and adjustments to enable safe use by prisoners with physical disabilities should be investigated. (3.47)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.69 The prison's resettlement strategic objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.70 Data on home detention curfew should be evaluated to ensure the process is effective. (4.24)

Reintegration planning

- 5.71 Prisoners should not have to wear bibs during visits. (4.59)

Examples of good practice

- 5.72 The prison had developed a substance misuse recovery pathway that gave prisoners access to an excellent range of support and interventions delivered on designated units by dedicated staff, and there was good use of peer and recovery mentors. (1.95)
- 5.73 A local rehabilitation service provided help to prisoners on the recovery wing and in the community, and the programmes team continued to support and involve a recovery mentor post-release. (4.48)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Kieron Taylor	Team leader
Andy Lund	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Hayley Cripps	Senior researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Alice Reid	Researcher
Nalini Sharma	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Stan Brandwood	Pharmacist
Kathleen Byrne	Care Quality Commission
Krystyna Findley	Offender management inspector
Keith Humphreys	Offender management inspector
Chris Simpson	Offender management inspector
Julia Horsman	Ofsted inspector
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Stephen Miller	Ofsted inspector
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector

Guests

Danielle Pearson	HMIP
Joanna Saul	

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	28	738	57.6
Recall	7	110	8.8
Convicted unsentenced	37	111	11.1
Civil prisoners	0	2	0.2
Detainees	0	3	0.2
Other	68	225	22.0
Total	140	1,189	100

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	107	345	34.0
Less than 6 months	12	119	9.9
6 months to less than 12 months	2	72	5.6
1 year to less than 2 years	6	152	11.9
2 years to less than 3 years	5	148	11.5
3 years to less than 4 years	3	108	8.4
4 years to less than 10 years	5	187	14.4
10 Years or more and less than life	0	29	2.2
Lifer	0	29	2.2
Total	140	1,189	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	140	10.5
21 years to 29 years	577	43.4
30 years to 39 years	366	27.5
40 years to 49 years	170	12.8
50 years to 59 years	51	3.8
60 years to 69 years	19	1.4
70 plus years: <i>maximum age=76</i>	6	0.5
Total	1,329	100

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	127	1,094	91.9
Foreign nationals	10	60	5.3
Not stated	3	35	2.9
Total	140	1,189	100

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Cat B	0	29	2.2
Cat C	0	679	51.1
Cat D	0	24	1.8
Uncategorised sentenced male	1	0	0.1
Unclassified	106	383	36.7
Unsentenced	12	70	6.2
YOI Closed	21	4	1.9
Total	140	1,189	100

Ethnicity		18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White:	Irish	1	14	1.1
	Any other	3	25	2.1
	Eng/Welsh/ Scot/N Irish/ British	106	967	80.7
	Total	110	1,006	84
Mixed:	Any other	2	4	0.5
	White and Asian	0	2	0.2
	White and black African	0	4	0.3
	White and black Caribbean	3	10	1.0
	Total	5	20	1.9
Asian or Asian British	Asian/Asian British/Any other	4	22	2.0
	Asian/Asian British/Bangl adeshi	1	6	0.5
	Asian/Asian British/Indian	0	12	0.9
	Asian/Asian British/ Pakistani	4	50	4.1
	Total	9	90	7.4
Black or black British	Black/Black British/Africa n	4	11	1.1
	Black/Black British/Any other	3	9	0.9
	Black/Black British/ Caribbean	5	17	1.7
	Total	12	37	3.7
Chinese or other ethnic group	Other ethnic group	0	5	0.4
	Total	0	5	0.4
Not stated		4	31	2.6
Total		140	1,189	100

Religion	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	1	0.1
Church of England	17	289	23
Roman Catholic	39	292	24.9
Other Christian denominations	7	48	4.1
Muslim	13	105	8.9
Sikh	0	2	0.2
Hindu	0	1	0.1

Buddhist	0	9	0.7
Jewish	0	2	0.2
Other	0	1	0.1
No religion	61	414	35.7
Total	140	1,189	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	15	1.1	166	12.5
1 month to 3 months	11	0.8	236	17.8
3 months to 6 months	7	0.5	180	13.5
6 months to 1 year	0	0.0	208	15.7
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	46	3.5
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	6	0.5
4 years or more	0	0.0	1	0.1
Total	33	2.5	844	63.5

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	40	8.8	106	23.5
1 month to 3 months	40	8.8	128	28.3
3 months to 6 months	18	4	75	16.6
6 months to 1 year	9	2.0	32	7.1
1 year to 2 years	0	0	4	0.9
Total	107	8.1	345	26.0

Main offence - *not available*

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 9 October 2012, the prisoner population at HMP Forest Bank was 1,307. The sample size was 230. Overall, this represented 18% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

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

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

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 204 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 16% of the prison population. The response rate was 89%. In addition to the 10 respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 11 questionnaires were not returned and five were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 34 local prisons since April 2007.
- The current survey responses in 2012 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Forest Bank in 2010.
- 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 the responses of Muslim 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.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those aged 21 and under and those over 21.

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

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

Summary

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

No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages to certain responses within the summary, for example 'Not sentenced' options across questions, may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data 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.

Survey summary

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	22 (11%)	
	<i>21 - 29</i>	73 (36%)	
	<i>30 - 39</i>	66 (33%)	
	<i>40 - 49</i>	30 (15%)	
	<i>50 - 59</i>	6 (3%)	
	<i>60 - 69</i>	4 (2%)	
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)	
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	113 (56%)	
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	27 (13%)	
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	35 (17%)	
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	25 (12%)	
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	2 (1%)	
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	62 (32%)	
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	22 (11%)	
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	16 (8%)	
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	20 (10%)	
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	37 (19%)	
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	26 (13%)	
	<i>10 years or more</i>	2 (1%)	
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	4 (2%)	
	<i>Life</i>	4 (2%)	
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (9%)	
	<i>No</i>	182 (91%)	
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	199 (99%)	
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)	
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	199 (98%)	
	<i>No</i>	4 (2%)	
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	149 (75%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>
	<i>White - Irish</i>	10 (5%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>
	<i>White - other</i>	8 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean...</i>
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>
			1 (1%)

<i>Asian or Asian British -</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Indian</i>			
<i>Asian or Asian British -</i>	17 (9%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Pakistani</i>			
<i>Asian or Asian British -</i>	1 (1%)		
<i>Bangladeshi</i>			

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?
 Yes..... 8 (4%)
 No..... 183 (96%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?
None..... 64 (33%) *Hindu*..... 1 (1%)
Church of England..... 49 (25%) *Jewish*..... 2 (1%)
Catholic..... 37 (19%) *Muslim*..... 25 (13%)
Protestant..... 5 (3%) *Sikh*..... 0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination..... 8 (4%) *Other*..... 1 (1%)
Buddhist..... 2 (1%)

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?
Heterosexual/straight..... 195 (97%)
Homosexual/gay..... 2 (1%)
Bisexual..... 4 (2%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?
 Yes..... 41 (21%)
 No..... 159 (80%)

Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?
 Yes..... 7 (4%)
 No..... 193 (97%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?
 Yes..... 50 (25%)
 No..... 150 (75%)

Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?
 Yes..... 104 (52%)
 No..... 95 (48%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?
Less than 2 hours..... 166 (81%)
2 hours or longer..... 30 (15%)
Don't remember..... 8 (4%)

Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?
My journey was less than two hours..... 166 (82%)
 Yes..... 5 (2%)
 No..... 28 (14%)
 Don't remember..... 3 (1%)

Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?
My journey was less than two hours..... 166 (82%)
 Yes..... 4 (2%)
 No..... 31 (15%)

	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (0%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	107 (53%)
	No.....	77 (38%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	18 (9%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	162 (81%)
	No.....	35 (17%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	51 (25%)
	<i>Well</i>	83 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i>	53 (26%)
	<i>Badly</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	137 (67%)
	Yes, I received written information	5 (2%)
	No, I was not told anything.....	54 (27%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (4%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	161 (81%)
	No.....	36 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	93 (47%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	93 (47%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (7%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	153 (77%)
	No	39 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (3%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	<i>Very well</i>	37 (18%)
	<i>Well</i>	91 (45%)
	<i>Neither</i>	47 (23%)
	<i>Badly</i>	19 (9%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	7 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Loss of property</i>	20 (10%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	41 (21%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Physical health</i>	31 (16%)
	<i>Mental health</i>	34 (17%)
	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	9 (5%)

Contacting family	32 (16%)	Getting phone numbers.....	37 (19%)
Childcare.....	2 (1%)	Other	4 (2%)
Money worries.....	42 (21%)	Did not have any problems.....	64 (32%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	31 (16%)		

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

Yes.....	41 (21%)
No.....	91 (46%)
Did not have any problems.....	64 (33%)

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

Tobacco.....	168 (83%)
A shower	39 (19%)
A free telephone call.....	153 (76%)
Something to eat.....	136 (67%)
PIN phone credit.....	105 (52%)
Toiletries/ basic items.....	103 (51%)
Did not receive anything.....	5 (2%)

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

Chaplain	110 (56%)
Someone from health services	130 (66%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	66 (34%)
Prison shop/canteen.....	72 (37%)
Did not have access to any of these	30 (15%)

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.....	93 (49%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	89 (47%)
How to make routine requests (applications).....	90 (48%)
Your entitlement to visits.....	88 (47%)
Health services	92 (49%)
Chaplaincy.....	92 (49%)
Not offered any information.....	41 (22%)

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

Yes.....	166 (83%)
No.....	25 (13%)
Don't remember	8 (4%)

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

Have not been on an induction course.....	37 (19%)
Within the first week	141 (71%)
More than a week.....	11 (6%)
Don't remember	9 (5%)

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

Have not been on an induction course.....	37 (19%)
Yes.....	107 (55%)
No.....	35 (18%)
Don't remember	15 (8%)

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

<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	72 (38%)
<i>Within the first week</i>	48 (25%)
<i>More than a week</i>	52 (27%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	20 (10%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	39 (20%)	71 (36%)	20 (10%)	33 (17%)	15 (8%)	18 (9%)
<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	49 (27%)	76 (42%)	23 (13%)	11 (6%)	1 (1%)	23 (13%)
<i>Get bail information?</i>	22 (13%)	31 (18%)	28 (16%)	29 (17%)	21 (12%)	41 (24%)

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

<i>Not had any letters</i>	22 (11%)
<i>Yes</i>	76 (39%)
<i>No</i>	99 (50%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	73 (39%)
<i>No</i>	16 (8%)
<i>Don't know</i>	100 (53%)

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

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	127 (65%)	65 (33%)	3 (2%)
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	190 (97%)	4 (2%)	1 (1%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	178 (90%)	15 (8%)	4 (2%)
<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	173 (88%)	18 (9%)	6 (3%)
<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	107 (55%)	72 (37%)	16 (8%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	146 (76%)	46 (24%)	1 (1%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	60 (31%)	83 (42%)	53 (27%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

<i>Very good</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Good</i>	49 (25%)
<i>Neither</i>	52 (26%)
<i>Bad</i>	51 (26%)
<i>Very bad</i>	40 (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>	11 (5%)
	Yes	82 (41%)
	No	108 (54%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	
	Yes	120 (61%)
	No	15 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	63 (32%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	103 (52%)
	No	21 (11%)
	<i>Don't know/N/A</i>	76 (38%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	119 (60%)
	No	12 (6%)
	<i>Don't know/N/A</i>	68 (34%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	60 (30%)
	Very easy	51 (26%)
	Easy	41 (21%)
	Neither	11 (6%)
	Difficult	7 (4%)
	Very difficult	4 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	24 (12%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	153 (78%)
	No	33 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (5%)
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?	41 (22%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	41 (24%)
		93 (50%)
		64 (38%)
		52 (28%)
		65 (38%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	114 (63%)
	No	23 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	43 (24%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints:	
	<i>(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>	
		Not made one
		Yes
		No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	87 (46%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	87 (47%)
		42 (22%)
		46 (25%)
		60 (32%)
		53 (28%)

Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes.....	29 (16%)
	No.....	150 (84%)
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>	94 (49%)
	Very easy.....	14 (7%)
	Easy.....	22 (12%)
	Neither.....	27 (14%)
	Difficult.....	26 (14%)
	Very difficult.....	7 (4%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	35 (18%)
	Yes.....	95 (48%)
	No.....	47 (24%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	20 (10%)
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>	35 (18%)
	Yes.....	88 (46%)
	No.....	49 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	18 (9%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes.....	18 (9%)
	No.....	180 (91%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	155 (82%)
	Very well.....	4 (2%)
	Well.....	6 (3%)
	Neither.....	11 (6%)
	Badly.....	7 (4%)
	Very badly.....	5 (3%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	160 (81%)
	No.....	37 (19%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	141 (73%)
	No.....	53 (27%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	57 (29%)
	No.....	141 (71%)

Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>Never</i>	39 (20%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	40 (20%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	60 (30%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	22 (11%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	27 (14%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	96 (48%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	50 (25%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	31 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	22 (11%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/ her</i>	96 (49%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	32 (16%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	35 (18%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (9%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	4 (2%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	60 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	139 (70%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	30 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	163 (84%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	139 (73%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	14 (7%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	14 (7%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	12 (6%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	12 (6%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> ...	14 (7%)
	<i>At work</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>During movement</i>	23 (12%)
	<i>At education</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>At health services</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	17 (9%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	12 (6%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	12 (6%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	4 (2%)
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	55 (28%)
	<i>No</i>	140 (72%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	24 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	30 (15%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Debt</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	3 (2%)

Your nationality	2 (1%)
You are from a different part of the country than others.....	3 (2%)
You are from a traveller community	2 (1%)
Your sexual orientation	1 (1%)
Your age.....	4 (2%)
You have a disability	3 (2%)
You were new here.....	7 (4%)
Your offence/crime	10 (5%)
Gang related issues	2 (1%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	59 (30%)
No.....	136 (70%)

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

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends).....	21 (11%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....	8 (4%)
Sexual abuse.....	2 (1%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated.....	18 (9%)
Medication.....	11 (6%)
Debt	6 (3%)
Drugs	7 (4%)
Your race or ethnic origin	5 (3%)
Your religion/religious beliefs.....	5 (3%)
Your nationality	8 (4%)
You are from a different part of the country than others.....	2 (1%)
You are from a traveller community	3 (2%)
Your sexual orientation	2 (1%)
Your age.....	4 (2%)
You have a disability	7 (4%)
You were new here.....	4 (2%)
Your offence/crime	8 (4%)
Gang related issues	3 (2%)

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

Not been victimised	114 (63%)
Yes.....	15 (8%)
No.....	51 (28%)

Section 9: Health services

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

	Don't know	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
The doctor	30 (16%)	11 (6%)	29 (15%)	27 (14%)	53 (28%)	42 (22%)
The nurse	27 (15%)	22 (12%)	62 (34%)	25 (14%)	31 (17%)	17 (9%)
The dentist	33 (18%)	5 (3%)	13 (7%)	13 (7%)	36 (19%)	85 (46%)

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

	Not been good	Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
The doctor	38 (20%)	15 (8%)	57 (30%)	28 (15%)	26 (14%)	26 (14%)
The nurse	29 (16%)	27 (14%)	61 (33%)	33 (18%)	19 (10%)	18 (10%)
The dentist	55 (30%)	6 (3%)	21 (11%)	26 (14%)	28 (15%)	48 (26%)

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

Not been	24 (13%)
Very good	11 (6%)

<i>Good</i>	51 (27%)
<i>Neither</i>	37 (20%)
<i>Bad</i>	34 (18%)
<i>Very bad</i>	32 (17%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes.....	81 (42%)
No.....	114 (58%)

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

Not taking medication	114 (59%)
Yes, all my meds.....	27 (14%)
Yes, some of my meds.....	16 (8%)
No.....	37 (19%)

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

Yes.....	55 (29%)
No.....	132 (71%)

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)

Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	132 (69%)
Yes.....	19 (10%)
No.....	39 (21%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

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

Yes.....	60 (31%)
No.....	136 (69%)

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

Yes.....	54 (28%)
No.....	138 (72%)

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

<i>Very easy</i>	50 (26%)
<i>Easy</i>	25 (13%)
<i>Neither</i>	12 (6%)
<i>Difficult</i>	11 (6%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Don't know</i>	88 (46%)

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

<i>Very easy</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Easy</i>	10 (5%)
<i>Neither</i>	14 (7%)
<i>Difficult</i>	22 (11%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	38 (20%)
<i>Don't know</i>	101 (52%)

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

Yes.....	12 (6%)
No.....	179 (94%)

- Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?**
 Yes..... 19 (10%)
 No..... 170 (90%)
- Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?**
Did not/do not have a drug problem..... 125 (66%)
 Yes..... 41 (22%)
 No..... 24 (13%)
- Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?**
Did not/do not have an alcohol problem..... 138 (73%)
 Yes..... 30 (16%)
 No..... 20 (11%)
- Q10.9 Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?**
Did not have a problem/did not receive help..... 138 (73%)
 Yes..... 42 (22%)
 No..... 10 (5%)

Section 11: Activities

- Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?**
- | | Don't know | Very easy | Easy | Neither | Difficult | Very difficult |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Prison job | 23 (12%) | 18 (9%) | 62 (32%) | 19 (10%) | 44 (23%) | 26 (14%) |
| Vocational or skills training | 41 (23%) | 12 (7%) | 49 (27%) | 26 (14%) | 30 (17%) | 23 (13%) |
| Education (including basic skills) | 34 (19%) | 16 (9%) | 64 (35%) | 29 (16%) | 23 (13%) | 17 (9%) |
| Offending behaviour programmes | 46 (25%) | 12 (6%) | 43 (23%) | 20 (11%) | 29 (16%) | 37 (20%) |
- Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Not involved in any of these | 54 (30%) |
| Prison job | 90 (49%) |
| Vocational or skills training | 8 (4%) |
| Education (including basic skills) | 38 (21%) |
| Offending behaviour programmes | 16 (9%) |
- 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 | 37 (24%) | 41 (26%) | 57 (36%) | 22 (14%) |
| Vocational or skills training | 51 (42%) | 19 (16%) | 32 (26%) | 20 (16%) |
| Education (including basic skills) | 47 (34%) | 34 (24%) | 36 (26%) | 23 (16%) |
| Offending behaviour programmes | 51 (40%) | 28 (22%) | 28 (22%) | 20 (16%) |
- Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?**
- | | |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Don't want to go | 36 (19%) |
| Never | 57 (29%) |
| Less than once a week | 32 (16%) |
| About once a week | 62 (32%) |
| More than once a week | 7 (4%) |

Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	
	<i>Don't use it</i>	72 (38%)
	Yes.....	45 (24%)
	No.....	73 (38%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	35 (18%)
	0.....	39 (20%)
	1 to 2.....	34 (18%)
	3 to 5	67 (35%)
	More than 5	16 (8%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	36 (19%)
	0.....	35 (18%)
	1 to 2	51 (26%)
	3 to 5	25 (13%)
	More than 5.....	46 (24%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	5 (3%)
	0.....	8 (4%)
	1 to 2	6 (3%)
	3 to 5	17 (9%)
	More than 5	155 (81%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	20 (10%)
	2 to less than 4 hours.....	46 (24%)
	4 to less than 6 hours.....	41 (21%)
	6 to less than 8 hours.....	27 (14%)
	8 to less than 10 hours.....	14 (7%)
	10 hours or more.....	30 (16%)
	Don't know	14 (7%)

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.....	59 (32%)
	No.....	128 (68%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes.....	79 (42%)
	No.....	110 (58%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes.....	31 (16%)
	No.....	157 (84%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	24 (13%)
	Very easy.....	42 (22%)
	Easy.....	54 (28%)
	Neither.....	27 (14%)
	Difficult.....	33 (17%)

Very difficult	6 (3%)
Don't know	4 (2%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	62 (32%)
	Yes	84 (44%)
	No	45 (24%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/N/A</i>	107 (57%)
	No contact	30 (16%)
	Letter	20 (11%)
	Phone	11 (6%)
	Visit	40 (21%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	62 (34%)
	No	120 (66%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	62 (33%)
	Yes	48 (26%)
	No	78 (41%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	140 (74%)
	Very involved	18 (10%)
	Involved	14 (7%)
	Neither	7 (4%)
	Not very involved	1 (1%)
	Not at all involved	8 (4%)
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>	140 (75%)
	Nobody	16 (9%)
	Offender supervisor	20 (11%)
	Offender manager	16 (9%)
	Named/personal officer	5 (3%)
	Staff from other departments	8 (4%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	140 (75%)
	Yes	35 (19%)
	No	6 (3%)
	Don't know	5 (3%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	140 (75%)
	Yes	11 (6%)
	No	28 (15%)
	Don't know	7 (4%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?

Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced 140 (75%)
 Yes..... 15 (8%)
 No..... 17 (9%)
 Don't know 14 (8%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes 15 (8%)
 No..... 83 (47%)
 Don't know 80 (45%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

Yes..... 27 (16%)
 No..... 147 (84%)

Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	51 (31%)	32 (20%)	79 (49%)
Accommodation	49 (30%)	50 (30%)	66 (40%)
Benefits	41 (25%)	66 (40%)	57 (35%)
Finances	47 (30%)	32 (21%)	77 (49%)
Education	51 (32%)	34 (21%)	75 (47%)
Drugs and alcohol	56 (34%)	48 (29%)	61 (37%)

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

Not sentenced 62 (33%)
 Yes..... 58 (31%)
 No..... 67 (36%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Forest Bank 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 Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		204	5461	204	193
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	11%	6%	11%	8%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	69%	68%	69%	71%
1.3	Are you on recall?	13%	9%	13%	16%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	20%	20%	20%	16%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	3%	2%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	12%	9%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	98%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	16%	25%	16%	20%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	5%	4%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	13%	11%	13%	10%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	21%	20%	21%	18%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	7%	4%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	25%	29%	25%	25%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	52%	54%	52%	60%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	15%	19%	15%	16%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	14%	43%	14%	14%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	9%	11%	11%
2.4	Was the van clean?	53%	68%	53%	53%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	81%	77%	81%	81%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	66%	66%	56%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	68%	69%	68%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	3%	6%	3%	3%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81%	82%	81%	76%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	47%	47%	47%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	75%	77%	67%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	59%	64%	46%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	68%	75%	68%	66%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	10%	15%	10%	8%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	21%	24%	21%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	7%	4%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	16%	33%	16%	29%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	7%	1%	7%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	21%	22%	21%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	16%	22%	16%	17%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	16%	17%	16%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	17%	18%	17%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	5%	9%	5%	10%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	19%	30%	19%	27%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	31%	41%	31%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	83%	86%	83%	91%
3.6	A shower?	19%	33%	19%	13%
3.6	A free telephone call?	76%	56%	76%	82%
3.6	Something to eat?	67%	79%	67%	72%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	52%	54%	52%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	51%	58%	51%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	56%	49%	56%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	66%	75%	66%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	34%	39%	34%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	37%	13%	37%	27%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	50%	48%	50%	51%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	47%	48%	47%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	48%	39%	48%	42%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	47%	45%	47%	49%
3.8	Health services?	49%	52%	49%	57%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	49%	48%	49%	51%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	72%	83%	79%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	77%	81%	85%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	68%	58%	68%	66%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	63%	74%	63%	
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?	56%	41%	56%	45%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	68%	57%	68%	63%
4.1	Get bail information?	31%	23%	31%	22%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	39%	40%	39%	38%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	39%	38%	39%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	65%	53%	65%	48%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	79%	97%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	90%	81%	90%	93%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	88%	62%	88%	89%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	55%	37%	55%	50%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	76%	63%	76%	68%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	31%	27%	31%	22%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	29%	23%	29%	26%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	46%	41%	31%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	58%	61%	56%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	54%	52%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	55%	60%	55%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	47%	45%	47%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	78%	82%	78%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	64%	57%	64%	53%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	50%	47%	50%	36%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	63%	59%	63%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	41%	31%	41%	22%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	47%	35%	47%	32%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	16%	16%	16%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	19%	22%	19%	16%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	48%	49%	48%	50%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	46%	44%	46%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	7%	9%	8%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	30%	39%	30%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	72%	81%	65%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	73%	73%	68%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	34%	29%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	25%	18%	25%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	52%	46%	52%	66%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	68%	64%	68%	53%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	30%	41%	30%	37%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	17%	16%	15%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	28%	22%	28%	20%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	10%	12%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	7%	5%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	15%	15%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	5%	3%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	5%	5%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	4%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	3%	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	6%	4%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	5%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	4%	1%	6%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	30%	26%	30%	22%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	12%	11%	9%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	5%	4%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	14%	9%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	6%	6%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	1%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	5%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	3%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	6%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%	2%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	23%	34%	23%	37%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	27%	21%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	46%	52%	46%	42%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	10%	10%	10%	8%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	47%	44%	47%	41%
9.2	The nurse?	56%	58%	56%	50%
9.2	The dentist?	21%	32%	21%	23%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	38%	39%	38%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	42%	51%	42%	45%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	54%	69%	54%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	29%	34%	29%	31%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	33%	42%	33%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	31%	36%	31%	36%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	28%	27%	28%	29%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	39%	28%	39%	39%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	9%	15%	9%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%	6%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	10%	8%	10%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	63%	65%	63%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	60%	57%	60%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	81%	78%	81%	77%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	42%	30%	42%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	34%	26%	34%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	44%	41%	44%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	29%	19%	29%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	49%	44%	49%	47%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	4%	10%	4%	5%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	21%	27%	21%	20%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	9%	8%	9%	8%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	76%	69%	76%	58%
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%	42%	34%	39%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	58%	54%	58%	36%
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?	27%	51%	27%	38%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	66%	66%	66%	48%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	37%	59%	37%	45%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	60%	52%	60%	34%
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?	37%	48%	37%	40%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	36%	36%	36%	40%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	24%	37%	24%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	44%	30%	44%	51%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	37%	38%	37%	49%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	81%	47%	81%	89%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	16%	10%	16%	8%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	32%	35%	32%	23%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	42%	47%	42%	51%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	34%	17%	27%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	51%	30%	51%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Forest Bank 2012	Local prisons comparator	HMP Forest Bank 2012	HMP Forest Bank 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	65%	61%	65%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	37%	41%	37%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	24%	29%	24%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	14%	16%	14%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	49%	34%	49%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	34%	29%	34%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	38%	40%	38%	40%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	67%	56%	67%	59%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	34%	45%	34%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	43%	30%	43%	
13.6	Offender manager?	34%	30%	34%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	11%	17%	11%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	17%	22%	17%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	76%	62%	76%	65%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	24%	26%	24%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	33%	32%	33%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	8%	6%	8%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	16%	15%	16%	10%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	29%	31%	29%	
13.12	Accommodation?	43%	45%	43%	
13.12	Benefits?	54%	46%	54%	
13.12	Finances?	29%	27%	29%	
13.12	Education?	31%	34%	31%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	44%	49%	44%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	46%	46%	46%	41%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Forest Bank 2012

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		32	167	25	169
1.3	Are you sentenced?	60%	72%	60%	71%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	9%	17%	8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	96%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	96%	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)?			96%	5%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	0%	5%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	74%	1%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	21%	8%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	4%	0%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	31%	24%	40%	23%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	65%	67%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	58%	69%	64%	69%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	69%	78%	72%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	62%	68%	62%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	66%	68%	68%	67%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	60%	67%	58%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	85%	74%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	87%	80%	91%	80%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	48%	57%	52%	57%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	66%	65%	65%	64%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	98%	96%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	64%	53%	58%	54%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	29%	35%	29%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	41%	50%	41%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	64%	59%	54%	59%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	71%	48%	75%	48%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	60%	67%	59%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	63%	81%	62%	81%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	64%	61%	63%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	52%	48%	50%	48%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	55%	46%	50%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	9%	12%	9%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	86%	80%	78%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	72%	70%	72%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	10%	27%	9%	26%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	41%	53%	44%	52%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	30%	35%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	15%	24%	15%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	32%	28%	36%	27%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	18%	15%	18%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	1%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	41%	28%	45%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	10%	9%	14%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	3%	4%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	10%	3%	14%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	21%	24%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	39%	47%	43%	46%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	41%	43%	41%	43%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	22%	31%	20%	32%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	29%	41%	19%	42%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	52%	49%	40%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	4%	5%	5%	5%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	26%	20%	30%	20%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	11%	9%	10%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	43%	35%	45%	35%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	46%	43%	38%	44%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	25%	39%	32%	36%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	84%	59%	85%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	4%	17%	0%	17%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	46%	42%	33%	44%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27%	15%	33%	15%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, under 21) HMP Forest Bank 2012

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		41	159	22	179
1.3	Are you sentenced?	70%	69%	55%	72%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13%	8%	14%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	95%	99%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	13%	17%	24%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	3%	9%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	15%	15%	13%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			9%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	4%	0%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	22%	26%	27%	25%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	66%	32%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	66%	68%	76%	67%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	61%	81%	67%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	63%	55%	64%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	82%	64%	53%	70%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	66%	66%	33%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	86%	77%	85%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	85%	81%	77%	82%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	28%	63%	63%	56%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	55%	68%	55%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	98%	96%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	65%	52%	36%	57%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	32%	28%	27%	28%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	53%	39%	32%	42%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	61%	60%	64%	60%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	55%	51%	32%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	55%	61%	57%	60%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	68%	81%	57%	81%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	70%	61%	44%	66%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	46%	50%	33%	50%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	43%	48%	28%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	9%	14%	9%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	82%	63%	83%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	67%	74%	65%	74%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	23%	25%	14%	26%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	51%	52%	19%	55%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	27%	35%	30%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	23%	13%	25%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	43%	25%	25%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	25%	14%	15%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	1%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	1%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	6%	1%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	8%	0%	0%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	26%	40%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	9%	15%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	2%	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	3%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	2%	4%	5%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	1%	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	8%	2%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	20%	22%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	63%	41%	24%	48%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	73%	34%	15%	45%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	74%	20%	16%	31%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	38%	39%	25%	41%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	45%	50%	22%	53%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	6%	0%	5%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	20%	22%	33%	20%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	10%	0%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	34%	37%	20%	37%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	22%	49%	25%	46%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	29%	39%	40%	36%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	81%	82%	84%	81%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	11%	17%	20%	15%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	47%	41%	35%	43%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	12%	17%	11%	17%