

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Winchester

15–19 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	9
	Healthy prison summary	11
1	Safety	21
<hr/>		
2	Respect	33
<hr/>		
3	Purposeful activity	49
<hr/>		
4	Resettlement	55
<hr/>		
5	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	63
<hr/>		
	Appendices	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	71
	II Prison population profile	72
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	75

Introduction

Recent inspections have found HMP Winchester performing reasonably well and making good progress. This inspection found the prison had deteriorated sharply and was now of serious concern.

There are two parts to the prison. The main, larger site is a typical Victorian, category B local prison of radial design. A more modern annex, West Hill, was built in the 1960s and has had a variety of uses since then but now fulfils a category C training function. The prison suffered many of the problems typical of its type. It was seriously overcrowded and the resources to deal with a challenging and needy population were very stretched. At Winchester these problems had been exacerbated by a lack of stable leadership and outcomes were much worse than we usually see in comparable establishments.

The prison was inconsistent both in the way the regime was operated on different wings and in the relationships between individual staff and individual prisoners. A running theme of our inspection findings was that managers did not have the information and data they needed to identify and address these inconsistencies.

So it was not surprising that more than half the prisoners in our survey told us they had felt unsafe at some time. The prison did not have a full picture of either the nature or extent of violent incidents. Individual incidents were not investigated thoroughly, and there was insufficient action to address the behaviour of the perpetrators or support the victims. More than a third of prisoners, 35%, told us they had been victimised by other prisoners (against the comparator of 21%), and 45% by staff (against 25%).

The crucial first 24 hours of a prisoner's time in Winchester were badly managed. Reception was busy and congested but reasonably efficient. Prisoners were then placed wherever there was space on the main site. Cells for new arrivals were often dirty and badly prepared. Non-vulnerable prisoners were placed on the vulnerable prisoner wing, and some who needed detoxification services were not located on the relevant dedicated wing. Delays in canteen purchases left new arrivals vulnerable to debt and associated bullying. Evening and night staff did not systematically check on new arrivals.

The situation for vulnerable prisoners was worse. Almost four out of five said they had felt unsafe at some time, and almost three out of five said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. We witnessed foul abuse directed at vulnerable prisoners in their exercise yard from the adjacent general wing. Processes for locating prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wing were unclear. The neglectful management of vulnerable prisoners was also shown in their very poor access to activities – 70% were unoccupied at the time of the inspection.

However, the experience of prisoners on the West Hill site was much better, and throughout the prison, arrangements for supporting prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm were reasonable, use of force was low and the regime and relationships in the segregation unit were satisfactory.

The prison had recently taken action to combat the supply of drugs and alcohol in the prison. However, we were aware that drugs remained readily available. One third of prisoners told us they were easily available, and one in 10 told us they had developed a drug problem in the prison. These findings were supported by a high drug testing failure rate. Medicine queues were badly organised and supervised, which created opportunities for prescribed drugs to be misused.

The day-to-day experience of many prisoners was poor. The core day, which should have provided a predictable and consistent schedule of activities across the prison, was operated in a haphazard and inconsistent way on different wings. There were insufficient activity places for the population and even these were underused. A fully employed prisoner might have eight hours a day out of their cell but those for whom there was no activity available were limited to 30 minutes outside exercise and one hour of association each day.

Prisoners on the main site shared small, single cells, some with inadequately screened toilets. Prisoners on the West Hill site also shared cells but these were a little larger and prisoners had free access to toilets on the landings. The offensive display policy was not enforced and some material on display in cells on the vulnerable prisoner wing was a particular concern. Prisoners were issued with insufficient and poor quality prison clothing and bedding. Most of those who wore their own clothes did not have access to laundry facilities. Meals were unappetising and portions small.

Staff-prisoner relations were generally polite but distant. The personal officer scheme was ineffective. Diversity and equality issues were neglected and the prison had little idea about the prisoners from minority groups it held or what their needs might be. Very unusually, the chaplaincy was not operating effectively. Prisoners of different faiths could not readily access religious services in an appropriate venue. The chaplaincy was not well integrated into the life of the prison. Health care provision was weak in some areas. A health needs assessment had only recently been completed and partnership arrangements were only slowly developing. This had serious consequences: men were sometimes not issued their prescribed medication or unlocked in time to collect it, and provision for prisoners with chronic diseases and some mental health problems was inadequate.

Two older, severely disabled men who shared a small cell, built by the Victorians for one, were not untypical. The small window, high on the arched wall, was painted over so the men had a choice between keeping out the cold or shutting out the light. Neither man was able to work so they spent 23.5 hours a day in their cell. Although there was a shower on the landing, it had not been adapted for use by people with disabilities and so they were unable to use it. Neither had had a shower for months but did their best to wash in their cell. They relied on other prisoners for help with tasks such as collecting meals. Wing staff were unaware of these problems when we brought them to their attention. At least the accommodation on the West Hill site was better, and prisoners there spent less time locked in their cells.

A new senior manager had conducted a useful analysis of prisoners' learning and training needs throughout the prison and was making a good start on delivering these. However, there was much to do. The range and quality of work and training places were insufficient and did not adequately prepare prisoners for employment. This was of particular concern on the West Hill site, which was supposed to act as a training prison. Education provision was better and supported by very valuable volunteers from the local community.

As in other areas, effective resettlement provision was hindered by a lack of an effective analysis of needs. Offender management was badly managed so that there was a large backlog of risk assessments, and contact between prisoners and offender supervisors was inconsistent. There were insufficient offender behaviour programmes so prisoners found it difficult to make progress. Practical resettlement support was reasonable, although 15% of men were homeless on release. Visits provision was good and there were effective family support services. In our survey, 7% of respondents identified themselves as armed services veterans and there was very good support for them.

Until shortly before the inspection, HMP Winchester was neglected and drifting. There had been pockets of good practice and although many staff did their best, their efforts were often haphazard, inconsistent and badly coordinated. However, a new governor was appointed shortly before the inspection. The new leadership was aware of many of the problems and we saw early signs of a determined effort to tackle them. But the prison is just at the start of the process of putting things right again, and it will be a long, hard task to do so. We hope the recommendations in this report assist that process.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

January 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Winchester is a category B local adult male prison, with a separate category C unit known as West Hill.

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

Public

Region/Department

South Central

Number held

680

Certified normal accommodation

499

Operational capacity

Main prison: 578

West Hill: 129

Date of last full inspection

2007

Brief history

HMP Winchester was built in 1846 and is a typical Victorian prison of radial design. C wing was fully refurbished in 2008. A separate annexe was built in 1963 and housed young offenders. This changed in 1995 when it became West Hill Prison for adult women sentenced prisoners. In 2005, it was re-roled as an adult male training unit. The West Hill site has two residential units, West Hill and the smaller, newer, Hearn unit.

Short description of residential units

A wing: remand and convicted mixed wing

B wing: remand and convicted mixed wing

C wing: induction, first night, detoxification and IDTS remand and convicted wing

D wing: remand and convicted vulnerable prisoner wing

West Hill (and Hearn): category C training unit.

Name of governor/director

David Rogers

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: The SHIP cluster (Southampton City PCT, Hampshire PCT, Isle of Wight PCT and NHS Portsmouth)

Provider: Solent NHS Trust

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

John Teece

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.

HP5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

- recommendations: will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be checked for implementation at future inspections

- housekeeping points: achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines

- examples of good practice: impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.

Safety

HP6 Reception processes were good but took too long. The nominated first night accommodation was not routinely used and first night support was not reliable. Induction was reasonable. Too many prisoners on the main site, and especially vulnerable prisoners, felt unsafe, but those on the West Hill site felt safer. There were high levels of bullying. There was little done to improve safety by identifying and addressing patterns or trends in violent and bullying behaviour. Suicide and self-harm procedures were adequate for most and good for some complex cases. Security arrangements were generally proportionate. Drug use was relatively high and too few prisoners suspected of taking drugs were tested. There was little use of force and it was well governed. Physical conditions in segregation were poor but use of the unit was comparatively rare and stays were short. Treatment for drug and alcohol users was generally good but the range of interventions was inadequate. Outcomes for prisoners on the main site were not sufficiently good and on the West Hill site were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP7 Most prisoners had short journeys to the prison and were treated well by escort staff. All prisoners were handcuffed when disembarking and underwent a strip-search in reception without being subject to any form of risk assessment.

HP8 The reception area was clean and orderly. Staff were polite and friendly but prisoners often experienced long waits. High-quality risk assessments and first-stage induction procedures were carried out in private. Insider and Listener prisoners provided support in reception, on residential units and during induction.

HP9 First night arrangements were poor. The nominated first night accommodation on C1 was not routinely used, cells were not prepared adequately and night staff did not carry out any specific checks on new prisoners. Not all prisoners received a shower or telephone call on their first night. They were provided with limited reception grocery packs but a long wait for their first prison shop order left some vulnerable to debt.

Most prisoners underwent a high-quality second-stage induction on the day after arrival which included presentations from a wide range of departments and an assessment of resettlement needs.

- HP10 In our survey, over half of the population, and over three-quarters of the vulnerable prisoners, on the main site said that they had felt unsafe at the establishment at some time.¹ Prisoners reported comparatively high levels of bullying and victimisation; this was particularly true of vulnerable prisoners, and we observed high levels of abuse aimed at them on the exercise yard and in reception. Prisoners on the West Hill site felt safer and levels of reported victimisation were low.
- HP11 There was no local policy to address violence reduction. Safer custody meetings were poorly attended and considered an insufficient range of data. The number of violent incidents and bullying incidents reported by the prison was relatively low but not all bullying incidents were recorded. The investigation of and response to bullying incidents were not always adequate and left some antisocial behaviour insufficiently challenged. The only sanction for bullies was demotion to the basic regime.
- HP12 The number prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring procedures and the number of incidents of self-harm were similar to those at comparator prisons. Records generally showed an adequate level of care for prisoners on ACCT documents, with reasonable, multidisciplinary reviews and care plans, but night-time observations were repetitive and predictable. Some complex prisoners were managed well and with a high degree of care.
- HP13 Access to Listeners was generally good on the main site but at West Hill less than half of prisoners said that they could speak to a Listener when they needed to. The Listeners felt generally well supported. The two care suites were clean but poorly furnished and did not provide a supportive environment.
- HP14 Security arrangements were generally proportionate but there were some unnecessarily restrictive and controlled unlocking arrangements. Closed visits were used appropriately. The security department was sufficiently focused on the threats presented by drugs and mobile telephones but the supply reduction strategy was out of date and there was no drug strategy meeting to direct action. Survey results and high positive mandatory drug testing rates indicated that drugs were easy to obtain. Not all prisoners suspected of taking drugs were tested within the required timeframe.
- HP15 Prisoners and staff alike found the incentives and earned privileges system to be over-complicated; many did not understand it and had little faith in it. Prisoners on the basic level had insufficiently focused targets set to improve behaviour.

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*.)

- HP16 Adjudications were well managed. There was little use of force or of special accommodation. Governance arrangements were sound and there was good analysis to identify trends.
- HP17 Segregation was used relatively rarely but the segregation unit was oppressive. The caged exercise yard was bleak and lacked any seating for prisoners. Segregated prisoners received a high level of care, and staff on the unit were knowledgeable about them. Stays were mostly short but reintegration planning for the few prisoners with longer stays started too late. Segregation staff recorded an excellent range of data but these were not scrutinised or analysed.
- HP18 Clinical substance use services were good, prescribing was appropriately flexible and prisoners spoke positively of the care provided. Too many prisoners requiring treatment were not located on the dedicated integrated drug treatment system landing during their early days in custody, which meant that they were not adequately monitored. There was good joint working between clinical and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) staff. However, the range of psychosocial interventions for both alcohol and drug use was inadequate on both sites. There were no accredited programmes.

Respect

- HP19 External areas were generally clean. The quality of cellular accommodation varied widely but on the main site was mainly old and draughty, with little natural light. The newer accommodation was of better quality. Access to showers was good but to telephones on the main site was problematic for some. Prisoners viewed staff as unhelpful. Equality and diversity provision was neglected and undeveloped. The needs of prisoners with disabilities were not met. Complaints were well managed but prisoners lacked faith in the system. Health provision was deficient and compromised by delays in providing medication. There was insufficient primary mental health provision but secondary provision was good. Food was poor. Outcomes for prisoners on both sites were poor against this healthy prison test.
- HP20 Wings and external areas were generally kept clean. Showers were mostly clean, with adequate screening, and were available daily. The quality of accommodation varied widely, from new, high-quality accommodation in Hearn unit to grim Victorian accommodation which was cold, with little natural light and dirty, poorly screened toilets. Both sites had some single cells which were being shared by two prisoners; these were cramped and inadequately furnished. The offensive display policy was not enforced and there was offensive graffiti on all wings, and inappropriate sexual images on the vulnerable prisoner wing. Access to telephones for prisoners on the main site was compromised by restricted association times. Most prisoners did not have access to laundries to enable them to wash their own clothes, and not enough prison clothing and bedding was provided. There were sometimes unacceptable delays in accessing stored property.
- HP21 Most prisoners felt that applications were not dealt with fairly or quickly and we were not assured that there were responses to all applications.
- HP22 Fewer prisoners than at similar prisons told us that staff treated them with respect and some said that staff were often unhelpful. The personal officer scheme was

ineffective. Few prisoners said that they had a personal officer and case records indicated infrequent and poor-quality engagement.

- HP23 Equality and diversity work had been neglected and had deteriorated considerably. There was no functioning diversity committee. The sole diversity officer had not been trained and until recently had received little support from across the prison. Prisoners from minority groups were not identified properly on admission, so the prison was unsighted on the scale and range of need. In our survey, prisoners from minority groups reported more negatively than their counterparts about their treatment across many areas. No data were collected to monitor equality of access by, or treatment of, prisoners from any minority groups, there were no consultation opportunities and there was little activity or support. Prisoners who identified themselves as being from a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller background were particularly negative about their experience of custody, and the needs of this minority group were largely unrecognised.
- HP24 Foreign national prisoners represented a sizeable minority. The UK Border Agency visited regularly and independent legal advice was provided through the Detention Advice Service but no other support was provided and there was inadequate use of formal interpreting services or translated material.
- HP25 Provision for older prisoners was limited to a recently introduced social group and dedicated recreational PE sessions. The needs of prisoners with disabilities were not properly met. They endured particular hardships relating to access, and several men told us that they had not taken a shower for over four months. Personal emergency evacuation plans were generally up to date and available to wing staff, but care plans were not available on the wings and there were no formal identified carers.
- HP26 There was no identification of gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners and no identified support.
- HP27 The chaplaincy team provided pastoral support but there was little contact with the local community or resettlement provision. Prisoners were negative about access to faith leaders and services. Christian prisoners were unnecessarily required to register before they could attend religious services. Muslim prayers were carried out in the gym, which was an unsuitable venue.
- HP28 In spite of negative survey findings, we found the complaints system to be efficient and responses to complaints were usually prompt and appropriate.
- HP29 The designated legal services officer had insufficient time allocated to meet demand. Bail information services were well organised and effective.
- HP30 A draft health needs assessment had recently been prepared but there had been only one partnership board meeting in the previous year. In our survey, prisoners were more negative than at comparator prisons about both access to and the quality of health services. However, we noted that they had reasonable access to nurses and the GP but waited too long to see the dentist. There were limited clinics for men with chronic diseases. There were often delays in obtaining prescribed medication, and we found several men who had had gaps in necessary treatment because of medication being unavailable. We also came across men who had missed medication because of not being unlocked at the right time.

- HP31 The inpatient unit held men with a complex mix of mental and physical health problems and we observed constructive multidisciplinary care but an absence of educational or therapeutic activity for them and long periods locked up with variable access to association.
- HP32 There was insufficient primary mental health provision to meet prisoners' needs, and there were no counselling services. The mental health in-reach team provided a good service to prisoners with severe and enduring mental health problems and those we spoke to said that they had received appropriate support.
- HP33 Fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that the food was good and we received a high number of complaints during the inspection. We found the food to be unappetising and portion sizes small.

Purposeful activity

- HP34 Time unlocked was inadequate for most and particularly poor for unemployed prisoners. Far too many prisoners on the main site were locked up during the core day. The daily regime was unregulated and frequently curtailed. There were too few activity places for the population but even these were underused, particularly on the main site. The range of education provision was good, with sufficient progression opportunities available. There was insufficient vocational and employment-related work, particularly on the West Hill site. Opportunities to accredit work skills were missed. Many prisoners were underemployed in low-skilled work. Achievements were good but only for those who stayed long enough to complete courses. Library access was poor. Recreational PE was adequate. Outcomes for prisoners on the main site were poor and on the West Hill site were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP35 The amount of time out of cell on the main site was extremely poor, at a maximum of around eight hours for employed prisoners and as little as an hour and a half a day for the many unemployed. We found 44% of prisoners locked in their cells during the morning. At West Hill, prisoners were not locked in their cells but routinely confined to their landings during the evening and sometimes during the day if not in activities.
- HP36 Association was limited for all, but unemployed prisoners on the main site did not have routine access to evening association, which severely restricted their contact with family and friends.
- HP37 Prisoners were frustrated by the lack of predictability and consistency in the core day, and staff and prisoners alike told us that the day was regularly disrupted and curtailed by staff shortages, and inconsistent and unregulated practice between wings. Although exercise areas on both sites were suitable, the time available for outdoor exercise was inadequate.
- HP38 The learning and skills provision was based on an informed needs analysis and steps had been taken to make the necessary improvements. There were too few purposeful activity places for the population and even these were not fully utilised. On the main site, between 47% and 60% of the population were engaged in activity at any one time. The situation on the West Hill site was better, with around 90% engaged. The allocation process was insufficiently informed by sentence plans and sometimes took

too long. Learning sessions were often disrupted by prisoners being taken away for other regime activities.

- HP39 The variety and range of education programmes across the prison were good. However, there was insufficient vocational training and employment-related work, particularly on the West Hill site, which was intended to function as a training unit. There was good progression across most education programmes. Teaching and learning were generally good and well supported by external volunteers. Much of the contract work and wing work was at low level and often there was not sufficient work to occupy prisoners.
- HP40 For prisoners who stayed long enough, achievements were generally good, but some courses were too long for the short-term stays. There was some good development of work skills but these were not always recorded.
- HP41 The libraries on both sites provided a reasonable service but contained few resources aimed at employment and further education and training opportunities. Access was poor, particularly on the West Hill site.
- HP42 The range of recreational PE was adequate and access was reasonable, although levels of participation were low. There was good promotion of healthy living and personal fitness. A suitable range of vocational training provision and short courses was offered.

Resettlement

- HP43 The strategic management of resettlement was weak and not informed by an effective needs analysis. Offender management was underdeveloped. Too few prisoners had an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, a sentence plan or an offender supervisor. The quality of offender supervision was sometimes poor. The needs of remand and short-term prisoners were generally met. Public protection arrangements were appropriate. There were limited release on temporary license opportunities for prisoners on the West Hill site. Reintegration work was generally good. Accommodation; finance, benefit, debt; and employment, education and training services were comprehensive but the number of homeless prisoners helped to secure accommodation was not monitored. Work with children and families was well developed. There were insufficient offending behaviour courses to meet need. Outcomes for prisoners on both sites were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP44 There was no comprehensive needs analysis or action plan to support the draft reducing reoffending strategy. Strategic management was limited and governance meetings had not been held since January 2012. Few prisoners on the West Hill site were able to benefit from work outside of the prison, and release on temporary license (ROTL) on this site was not an integral part of the approach to reducing reoffending.
- HP45 The offender management unit was underdeveloped and did not have a high enough profile around the prison, leading to poor information exchange and a lack of formal joint working. Due to the large backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments, too few prisoners had a sentence plan, particularly on the West Hill

site, and this blocked prisoners' ability to progress. Not all prisoners who should have had an offender supervisor had been allocated one. The quality of offender supervisor work varied widely and in some cases was poor, exacerbated by high levels of cross-deployment and a lack of training. Although short-term and remand prisoners did not receive a formal custody plan, their needs were assessed and they were signposted appropriately to services. The number of prisoners released on home detention curfew was relatively low and timeliness was not routinely monitored.

- HP46 Processes for identifying public protection restrictions were appropriate but not always regularly reviewed, potentially leaving some prisoners subject to unnecessary restrictions. Contribution to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) meetings was good.
- HP47 Categorisation processes were proactive and well managed but some prisoners experienced delays in being transferred because of a lack of an OASys assessment.
- HP48 Although indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) received a good level of contact from offender supervisors, there was little offence-focused work. There were no consultation forums or family days specifically for ISPs.
- HP49 Reintegration work provided by benefits, employment, training and accommodation (BETA) staff was generally good. All prisoners had an initial needs assessment and a pre-discharge interview but the latter was sometimes too near release. A range of accommodation support was provided but outcomes were not monitored to demonstrate effectiveness and too many prisoners were released without accommodation to go to. A relatively high percentage of prisoners were released into employment, training and education. There were productive relationships between staff in resettlement, Jobcentre Plus and the National Careers Service. Good opportunities had developed with local employers, although these had not yet been fully utilised.
- HP50 There were no general health pre-discharge clinics. However, there was effective communication with local community mental health teams before discharge. There were links with local drug intervention programme teams and pre-discharge planning for those with substance use issues was good. The use of prescriptions for prisoners to take to local pharmacists was a successful initiative.
- HP51 Prisoners could access a good level of advice and support to resolve debts and other financial problems and a large number of prisoners had been supported to apply for bank accounts.
- HP52 The children and families pathway was well developed. The visitors centre and the work of Spurgeons were excellent and provided good support for families. High-quality family days were provided but were too infrequent to meet demand. Visitors experienced difficulties in booking visits and reported slow processes and delays in visits starting.
- HP53 There were minimal offending behaviour programmes delivered and no analysis or strategy to manage the needs of the current population, so prisoners, especially those at West Hill, found it difficult to progress. Most prisoners in denial of their sexual offence faced little challenge about their offending behaviour and no structured motivational work, resulting in a lack of progress and difficulties in securing a transfer.

Main concerns and recommendations

HP54 Concern: Too many prisoners, especially vulnerable prisoners, felt unsafe. Not all incidents of bullying and intimidation were acted on or reported. There was no local policy to address violence reduction, and insufficient data were considered in order to identify trends and improve safety.

Recommendation: All incidents of bullying should be acted on and reported. A local policy should be introduced and all data relating to violence should be collated and analysed to identify trends, and action taken to improve safety.

HP55 Concern: Equality and diversity provision was neglected and underdeveloped. In our survey, prisoners from minority groups reported less favourably about their treatment across a wide range of areas. There was evidence of the needs of many prisoners from minority groups not being identified or met, yet no data were collected to monitor the equality of their treatment or their access to the regime.

Recommendation: Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood.

HP56 Concern: Prisoners failed to receive necessary medical treatment through delays and interruptions in obtaining prescribed medication.

Recommendation: Prescribed medication should be available and prisoners should be unlocked at the right time to receive it.

HP57 Concern: Too many prisoners were locked up for too long. Access to association was unduly restricted and the published regime was unregulated and frequently disrupted and curtailed.

Recommendation: The core day should be reviewed to reduce long periods of lock-up. All prisoners should be able have some evening association. Any changes to the published core day should be kept to a minimum, appropriately authorised and communicated to prisoners.

HP58 Concern: There were insufficient activity places available and those available were underused so too many prisoners were unoccupied. There was too little employment-related work and too few vocational training opportunities, particularly at the category C training site at West Hill.

Recommendation: The total number of activity places should be increased and places should be fully utilised to allow more prisoners to be employed. The amount of employment-related work and vocational training should be increased, particularly at the West Hill site.

HP59 Concern: The large backlog of OASys assessments meant that many prisoners did not have a sentence plan. This was particularly problematic for prisoners on the West Hill site as it stopped them progressing by blocking their ability to access courses, programmes, transfers and ROTL.

Recommendation: All eligible prisoners should have an OASys assessment and a review within the required timescales.

HP60 Concern: There were no routine offending behaviour programmes to meet the needs of the population and too many prisoners, including sex offenders in denial of their offending, were unable to progress or were released without their behaviour being sufficiently challenged.

Recommendation: The offending behaviour needs of the population should be analysed and suitable offending behaviour courses introduced.

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Most journeys to the prison were short and prisoners were treated well. All prisoners were handcuffed when disembarking. The prison did not always receive the full criminal records of new arrivals. Preparation for court appearances was good and video-conferencing was used effectively.
- 1.2 Most prisoners had short journeys to the prison. In our survey, 85% reported journey times of two hours or less, which was considerably better than at comparator prisons. Although 68% said that they had been treated well by escort staff, which was in line with the comparator, only 72%, worse than the 78% comparator, said that they had felt safe on their journey. When questioned further about this, prisoners told us that it was because of the nature of the cellular compartments and lack of seat belts. All prisoners were handcuffed to escort staff when disembarking in the secure area for the short walk up to reception, which was unnecessarily restrictive.
- 1.3 Although the person escort records which we examined were completed adequately, full criminal records were often not provided, which impeded the collection of full and accurate cell sharing and public protection assessments.
- 1.4 Prisoners going to court were able to change into suitable clothing and to have it washed in reception. Good use was made of the video-link system, with 549 court hearings taking place via this facility in the six months before the inspection, and we saw prisoners being released who had made successful bail applications by video link.

Recommendations

- 1.5 **Prisoners should only be handcuffed during disembarkation when justified by an individual risk assessment.**
- 1.6 **A full criminal record should accompany all new prisoners being received at the prison.**

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.

- 1.7 Reception staff were polite but prisoners were often kept in reception too long. The full searching of all new arrivals was done in private but was disproportionate. Vulnerable prisoners could experience some abuse from others. Conditions and support for prisoners in reception were good. There was nominated first night accommodation that was not routinely used and there were no structured procedures. Induction was comprehensive; it started in reception and continued on the following day for most prisoners. The long delay in receiving shop orders left prisoners vulnerable to debt.
- 1.8 Reception was extremely busy, with an average of 58 new prisoners a week arriving, as well as releases and court appearances. There were up to 60 movements a day and they were not evenly spread. This led to congestion during busy times at the end of the day, and this contributed to some long waits in reception, especially as prisoners were not taken to residential units as soon as reception processes were completed. In our survey, only 34% said that they had been in reception for less than two hours, which was considerably worse than the 49% comparator.
- 1.9 On arrival, all prisoners underwent a strip-search (even those who had come directly from another establishment and had not spent any time in public areas) and scanning for secreted items. Searching was carried out in private.
- 1.10 The reception area was clean and well decorated, and holding rooms contained written information about safety. Staff were polite but busy and process driven. This was mitigated by the use of Listener and Insider prisoners in reception who spent time with new arrivals. Vulnerable prisoners were kept apart from others but the two holding rooms were separated by unscreened windows, which led to abuse being directed at them. However, we saw this being dealt with promptly by staff.
- 1.11 The reception process was good, with cell sharing risk assessments and a first-stage induction interview, which included an enquiry about the prisoner's emotional state, taking place in private. Written information about the basic prison rules was provided and was available in five languages other than English. There was also written information about available services but this was in English only.
- 1.12 Prisoners were provided with food and drinks in reception, if required. There were good showering facilities and a telephone for prisoners' use but, while we were assured that both facilities were offered and used, we met prisoners who had been moved from reception before they had had the chance to take a shower, and others who had wanted to make a telephone call but been unable to do so as their access to the PIN system had not been activated. In our survey, only 13%, against the 33% comparator, said that they had been offered a shower on their first night, and 28%, against the 57% comparator, had been offered a free telephone call.
- 1.13 There was nominated first night accommodation that was not routinely used and prisoners were housed where there was a space on any wing of the main site. We found that non-vulnerable prisoners were lodged on the vulnerable prisoner wing and that some requiring detoxification services were not placed on the dedicated landing (see section on substance misuse). Those arriving on the wings at the end of association did not get the chance to take a shower or make a telephone call. The cells we saw were not adequately cleaned or prepared, and prisoners said that cells did not always have basic requirements such as pillows. There were no procedures for evening or night staff to check on or support new arrivals through their first night and staff we spoke to did not know who their new prisoners were.

- 1.14 On the day after arrival, prisoners attended a reasonably comprehensive second-stage induction, except for vulnerable prisoners, for whom an induction session was held on one designated day per week. In our survey, 88%, higher than the 78% comparator, said that they had attended induction. This consisted of presentations by Insider prisoners and representatives from an appropriate range of prison departments and took place in a dedicated area. Resettlement needs were assessed and referrals made to services.
- 1.15 Prisoners received a small reception pack of groceries and tobacco (if required) but could wait for up to three weeks after arrival to receive goods from the prison shop. There was a complicated system for issuing emergency grocery packs but these were limited and left prisoners vulnerable to incurring debt.
- 1.16 Most prisoners on the West Hill site went through reception and induction on the main site. When they moved to the West Hill site, they received a comprehensive induction.

Recommendations

- 1.17 **Prisoners should only be subject to a strip-search when justified by an individual risk assessment.**
- 1.18 **Written information for new prisoners should be available in appropriate languages other than English.**
- 1.19 **Thorough first night procedures should be applied to ensure that accommodation is prepared, a shower and a telephone call are available and appropriate support and checks are carried out on new arrivals through the night.**
- 1.20 **Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.21 The holding rooms used for vulnerable prisoners should be adequately screened.

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.

- 1.22 Too many prisoners, especially vulnerable prisoners on D wing, reported feeling unsafe, with high levels of victimisation and threatening behaviour. The prison reported relatively low levels of violence but not all incidents were recorded. An insufficient range of violence-related data was identified or analysed. There was no violence reduction or vulnerable prisoner strategy.
- 1.23 There was no specific violence reduction policy. Violence reduction was an agenda item at the poorly attended monthly safer custody meetings, but almost no data were presented to, or

considered by, this meeting to provide an adequate picture of the levels of violence at the prison and few attempts were made to make the prison safer (see main recommendation HP54).

- 1.24 The number of incidents of bullying or violence reported by the prison was relatively low. All reported incidents of violence or bullying (suspected or otherwise) triggered a violence information report (VIR); 165 such reports had been raised in the six months before the inspection. Most of these were based on suspicion and, although a few had resulted in robust action, too many of the responses had been minimal, failed to demonstrate any depth of investigation and left some antisocial behaviour insufficiently challenged. We also noted incidents recorded in wing observation books that had not resulted in VIRs (see main recommendation HP54).
- 1.25 The incentives and earned privileges system was used to manage bullying behaviour and any prisoners found to be, or suspected of being, involved in bullying behaviour were downgraded to the basic regime. This was a new initiative and it was too soon to assess its effectiveness (see section on incentives and earned privileges). There were no other interventions for either bullies or victims.
- 1.26 In our survey, over half of the prisoners on the main site said that they had felt unsafe at the establishment at some time, which was considerably higher than in similar prisons. Prisoners reported high levels of victimisation and threatening and intimidating behaviour from prisoners, and 45% of prisoners said that they had been victimised by staff. Prisoners on the dedicated vulnerable prisoners unit (D wing) felt even less safe, with 78% saying that they had felt unsafe at some time and 29% that they currently felt unsafe (see main recommendation HP54). Many D wing prisoners also reported negatively about victimisation from other prisoners and, despite managers' attempts at rearranging the regime to negate abuse from prisoners on the adjacent C wing, we observed some particularly foul abuse aimed at D wing prisoners on the exercise yard and in reception. Prisoners constantly told us that there was little regulation of who was located onto the unit, and there was no specific vulnerable prisoner policy or collective data on why prisoners were housed there
- 1.27 The experience of the West Hill site prisoners was much better; few prisoners said that they felt unsafe and levels of reported victimisation were low.

Recommendations

- 1.28 **The abusive behaviour directed at vulnerable prisoners in general, but especially during exercise, should be challenged.**
- 1.29 **There should be a specific policy to manage the vulnerable prisoner population.**

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.

- 1.30 The number of incidents of self-harm was in line with that of comparator prisons. The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents was generally reasonable, as was the analysis of data at safer custody meetings. The prison managed some complex prisoners well and a weekly care meeting further considered levels of care for prisoners subject to ACCT procedures. Arrangements for Listeners and their support were reasonable.
- 1.31 There had been 304 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents opened during 2012, which was similar to the number in 2011 and to that at other local prisons. The number of acts of self-harm was also similar to that at comparator prisons. While there had been some notably complex cases that had been well managed over a long period, most ACCT documents were only active for short periods.
- 1.32 The standard of ACCT documents was mostly reasonable and there was evidence of management checks, with remedial action identified where appropriate. The quality and organisation of some of the ACCT documents that had been open for longer periods was in some cases poor and it was difficult to identify key elements of the document, such as up-to-date care maps and trigger points. Daily entries were reasonable and gave a qualitative account of interaction with prisoners, their mood and their general demeanour but most night-time entries were meaningless, repetitive and predictable. Reviews were timely and we observed an impressive, well-attended weekly case review meeting where all prisoners subject to ACCT conditions were discussed and multidisciplinary management plans were agreed. The safer custody meetings focused on an appropriate range of data.
- 1.33 Only approximately 74% of contact staff were in-date for ACCT refresher training, and night staff were unaware of the location of anti-ligature knives to use in an emergency.
- 1.34 There had been two self-inflicted deaths and three deaths due to natural causes since the previous inspection. The prison had identified immediate actions required from the most recent death in custody; these had been acted on and shared at regional and national level. However, there was no review of any action plans, either operational or clinical, in relation to any of the deaths in custody at the safer custody meeting.
- 1.35 Access to Listeners was similar to that at comparator local prisons but at the West Hill site only 46% of prisoners, against the 58% comparator, said that they could speak to a Listener when they needed to. The team of 10 Listeners told us that they were well supported by the safer custody team and by the Samaritans. There were two care suites on the main site. Both were clean but, with only basic furniture and little equipment, failed to provide a supportive environment.

Recommendations

- 1.36 **The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) observations, interaction and entries by night staff should be improved.**
- 1.37 **All discipline staff should be issued with and trained in the use of anti-ligature knives.**
- 1.38 **Care suites should be properly furnished and equipped to provide an appropriately supportive environment.**

Housekeeping points

- 1.39 ACCT documents should be maintained and organised to enable key issues to be identified.
- 1.40 Action plans from deaths in custody should be reviewed at the safer custody meetings.

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

- 1.41 There was no specific safeguarding policy or procedures.
- 1.42 The prison did not have a specific policy or procedures in relation to safeguarding. Staff were not aware of, or trained in, their responsibilities regarding adult safeguarding, except those in the health care department, where procedures had been developed by the Trust.

Recommendation

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

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.44 Physical security arrangements were appropriate, with the exception of some unnecessary locking-up procedures. Intelligence was well managed, although attendance at security meetings was poor. Illegal drugs were easily available. Drug testing arrangements were mostly reasonable, although too few requested suspicion tests were completed.
- 1.45 Physical security arrangements were generally appropriate at both sites. The notable exception was the disproportionate procedure of locking prisoners up for relatively short periods between regime activities and the unnecessary controlled unlocking of half a landing at a time, for collecting meals and for association.

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).

- 1.46 The monthly security meetings considered an effective range of data, identified emerging issues and produced security objectives for the coming month. However, these meetings were poorly attended by key managers responsible for delivering the strategic actions in the wider establishment, and the objectives set were vague and not sufficiently action focused or publicised to staff.
- 1.47 The flow of information into the security department was good, with around 250 security information reports (SIRs) received and well analysed each month. Key themes were appropriately identified and consisted of drugs, mobile telephones, threatening behaviour and, more recently, illicitly brewed alcohol. The responses to these issues were well considered and some successful operations had been conducted in the prison to meet these threats. However, the supply reduction strategy was out of date and there was no drug strategy meeting to direct action.
- 1.48 In our survey, over a third of prisoners said that it was easy to get illegal drugs and almost one in 10 prisoners said that they had developed a drug problem while at the establishment. These survey results and the relatively high mandatory drug testing (MDT) failure rate also indicated that drugs were easily available in the prison.
- 1.49 With one exception, drug testing quotas had been met each month, but there were insufficient monitoring data and we were not assured that testing was adequately resourced or spread across each month. The establishment's year-to-date random MDT positive rate was high, at 12.5%, and it was unlikely to meet its yearly target of 7.5%.
- 1.50 There was insufficient suspicion drug testing and monitoring was poor; over a six-month period, 41% of requested suspicion tests had not been completed. Of those completed, there had been a 34% positive rate.
- 1.51 Visits restrictions were used appropriately and reviews were expedient, resulting in reductions in sanctions when appropriate.

Recommendations

- 1.52 **The unnecessary regime-based locking-up procedures should cease.**
- 1.53 **An up to date supply reduction strategy should be in place, supported by monitoring data and a drug strategy meeting to direct action.**
- 1.54 **Drug testing should be adequately resourced to allow for mandatory and suspicion testing to be appropriately spread and completed on time.**

Housekeeping points

- 1.55 Attendance at the security committee should reflect those listed in the terms of reference.
- 1.56 Monthly security objectives should be action based and appropriately publicised to staff.

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 process was over-complicated and inconsistently applied. Target setting for those on the basic level was insufficiently focused.
- 1.58 In our survey and in our groups, prisoners reported more negatively than at comparator prisons about being treated fairly or encouraged to change their behaviour by the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) process. Prisoners and staff we spoke to said that the current system was over-complicated and many did not understand it. We were told by many prisoners on the main site that it was almost impossible to achieve enhanced status because of the lack of input from staff and the 'punitive' manner in which the system was applied, and only 93 prisoners (17%) on the main site were on the enhanced level.
- 1.59 The prison's zero-tolerance policy (see section on bullying and violence reduction) accounted for most of the six prisoners on the basic level at the time of the inspection. Reviews of their wing files demonstrated that most lacked targets to improve behaviour.
- 1.60 A recent drive to improve the frequency and quality of IEP wing file entries had resulted in an improvement in some areas but too many files showed a complete lack of personal officer contributions.

Recommendation

- 1.61 **The incentives and earned privileges policy should be reviewed, made fit for purpose and uniformly implemented across the prison, with assurances made of staff and prisoner understanding and confidence in the system.**

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.

- 1.62 Adjudications were well managed. There was little use of force and monitoring arrangements were good. Segregation conditions were clean but oppressive. Prisoners on the unit received a high level of care.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.63 The number of adjudications was low, at around 400 in the previous six months, with the most common offences being unauthorised possession (mainly drugs), threatening behaviour and

damaging property. Adjudications took place in the segregation unit office and were conducted in a relaxed manner, with processes being thorough and data collection effective. However, there was no scrutiny of adjudication paperwork and no standardisation meeting.

Recommendation

- 1.64 **Adjudication paperwork should be scrutinised by a senior manager and there should be regular standardisation and monitoring meetings.**

The use of force

- 1.65 There was little use of force, at around 13 incidents per month. Recording was generally good, with the exception of health care contributions, and demonstrated a high degree of de-escalation of incidents. Monitoring arrangements were good, with all use of force documentation being scrutinised within seven days of the incident and then analysed with other data at the quarterly use of force committee meeting. Planned interventions were video-recorded but the quality of some of the filming was poor, broken down into small individual stages and did not adequately record incidents. There was very little use of special accommodation, with only one use in 2012, for a short period of time. Staff training facilities were excellent and most frontline staff were up to date with their training.

Housekeeping points

- 1.66 F213 injury to prisoner forms should be fully completed whenever use of force documentation is required.
- 1.67 Video recordings of use of force incidents should be continuous and of a high enough quality to evidence proceedings.

Segregation

- 1.68 The segregation unit was clean but oppressive, with limited natural light and a bare caged exercise yard. Use of segregation was infrequent and most prisoners stayed for relatively short periods. There had been a few long stays and, while these prisoners had been subject to reintegration planning, this had started after 30 days, which was far too late. Segregated prisoners received a high level of care, with a satisfactory regime, and staff on the unit were knowledgeable about the prisoners located there.
- 1.69 Safety algorithms were well completed and considered, and had resulted in a number of prisoners being located elsewhere in the prison. The segregation of a prisoner subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring procedures had resulted in an enhanced review, and an appropriate range of departments, including the mental health team, had been involved in his care planning.
- 1.70 Rule 45 (good order and/or discipline) review boards were timely but some of the paperwork was incomplete and target setting was ineffectual.
- 1.71 Although there had been no effective monitoring of the use of the unit for some time, the unit staff continued to collate an excellent range of data.

Recommendations

- 1.72 **Prisoners segregated for good order or discipline should have completed Rule 45 paperwork and effective behavioural targets.**
- 1.73 **A segregation monitoring and review group (SMARG) should meet regularly to analyse and act on segregation-related data.**

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.

- 1.74 There was good joint working between clinical and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) staff. There were insufficient psychosocial interventions. Clinical services were of high quality but too often prisoners requiring services were not located on the dedicated wing. Prescribing practice was good but supervision of medication queues was inconsistent.
- 1.75 All clinical and psychosocial drug and alcohol services had been retendered to an alternative provider and this process had slowed the development of psychosocial interventions.
- 1.76 There was good joint working between clinical and counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) staff, with daily meetings that ensured consistency of support. However, the range of psychosocial interventions on both sites was inadequate and limited to the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) programme, a brief alcohol intervention and one-to-one cell work. There were insufficient peer support workers at both sites. There were no accredited programmes and staff were waiting for training to be able to offer further interventions.
- 1.77 On the West Hill site many groups were cancelled as there were insufficient officers to unlock prisoners. Narcotics Anonymous had not been established and Alcoholics Anonymous meetings were frequently cancelled.
- 1.78 Clinical services delivered a high standard of care and prisoners spoke highly of them. However, records showed that, over a six-month period, more than half of the IDTS prisoners had not been located on the designated unit for their first five days at the prison. We also observed this during the inspection, where a prisoner detoxifying from alcohol was located on an inappropriate unit, which carries a heightened risk. We also noted delays in treatment because of the unsuitable locations. Remedial action was being taken, but there were times when treatment was delayed because of prisoners' unsuitable location, and some vulnerable prisoners were not being adequately monitored. This was not in line with the organisational policy or joint working protocol, which identified that 'all new referrals must be admitted to the stabilisation wing'.
- 1.79 Prescribing was good, in line with national guidance, and took into account the needs of the prisoner. There was excellent access to a substance misuse specialist and evening locum medical staff. There were reasonable links with out-of-hours medical services for faxed prescribing of symptomatic relief, although there were some delays in receiving treatment at

weekends as nurses did not have training in patient group directions (see section on health services).

- 1.80 An 'inner life' pilot project had just started. Prisoners with a history of injecting heroin, and who had been in prison for less than three months, were offered naloxone (a drug that counters the effects of opiate overdoses) when they were released from prison.
- 1.81 There was inconsistent monitoring of the medication queues. While the system was sometimes well organised, at other times the environment was chaotic and noisy, and compromised confidentiality and made it difficult to ensure medication was taken as intended (see also section on health services).
- 1.82 There were no drug strategy meetings (see section on security), although issues were discussed informally with the security lead and at security meetings.

Recommendations

- 1.83 **There should be sufficient peer workers to provide substance use support across both sites in line with local operational policies and protocols.**
- 1.84 **Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission.**
- 1.85 **There should be a full range of psychosocial interventions. These should not be cancelled as a result of a shortage of discipline officers.**

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 Residential units and external areas were clean. The older accommodation on the main site was of poor quality and the single cells being shared were too small. The standard of accommodation on the West Hill site was mostly good. There were offensive displays in some cells. There were sufficient telephones on most units but access on the main site was poor. Clothing was of poor quality and most prisoners on the main site did not have access to laundry facilities for washing their own clothes. Prisoner applications were poorly managed. There was inadequate access to stored personal property.
- 2.2 All accommodation was clean and external areas were kept free of litter. There were pleasant, well-kept gardens around the West Hill site. Three residential wings on the main site were of Victorian construction and were shabby and difficult to maintain. They provided cellular accommodation that was stark and most had little natural light. Toilets were often dirty and in some shared cells were inadequately screened. C wing had been rebuilt and was more open and light, but all wings had single cells being shared by two prisoners. These had insufficient space and lacked adequate furniture for two people. We saw graffiti and offensive displays on all wings, and displays of a sexual nature on the vulnerable prisoner wing, which accommodated sex offenders.
- 2.3 The standard of accommodation on the West Hill site was better, although shared accommodation on Alfred spur was poor. Most prisoners on this site were in single rooms, with their own keys, and prisoners on the West Hill unit had free access to shared toilet and shower facilities on the landings. The Hearn unit was exceptionally clean and bright and all cells had integral showers and toilets. Prisoners on both the main site and at West Hill complained that it was cold on residential units, and we found broken windows on both sites.
- 2.4 There were sufficient showers on all wings, on both sites, and they were available daily. They were mostly clean, with adequate screening in stainless steel enclosures, but there were problems with drainage and damp in the older units.
- 2.5 Cleaning materials were freely available on all wings and prisoners were encouraged to keep their cells clean. Prisoners on the enhanced wing or on remand could wash their own clothes, but there were no laundry facilities to enable prisoners to do this on the main site, except on C wing, so they had to either hand them out to visitors for washing or use basins in their cells. Laundry facilities were good on the West Hill site.
- 2.6 Prison clothing was of poor quality, and in our survey only 36%, against the 53% comparator, said that they were offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week. Only two pairs of socks and two pairs of underwear were provided each week. Some prisoners complained to us that they did not have sufficient bedding to keep warm at night.

- 2.7 There were sufficient telephones on all but B wing on the main site. However, the restricted association time led to poor access to them, and in our survey 61%, against the 34% comparator, said that they had problems getting access to telephones (see main recommendation HP57). On C wing there were telephones without adequate privacy hoods. Prisoners on the West Hill site had access to telephones at all times.
- 2.8 Application forms were available on all wings, either in racks or from wing cleaners. Prisoners on both sites had little confidence in the system, with only 46% of respondents to our survey, against the 57% comparator, saying that they were dealt with fairly, and 28%, against the 47% comparator, that they were dealt with quickly. Applications were logged and prisoners provided with a copy, but the facility to record when a response was received was not being operated and we were not assured that all were responded to.
- 2.9 Access to personal property was erratic and depended on the availability of the sole staff member responsible, for whom there was no absence cover. When she was absent, access to property could be delayed for up to two weeks. In our survey, only 13% of prisoners, against the 27% comparator, said that they could get their stored property. During the inspection there were no outstanding applications and only property sent in on the previous day was awaiting distribution.

Recommendations

- 2.10 **Cells should have clean, adequately screened toilets, adequate furniture and sufficient natural light.**
- 2.11 **Problems with drainage and damp in showers in older units should be rectified.**
- 2.12 **Prisoners should be provided with sufficient clothing of adequate quality and the facility to launder their own clothes.**
- 2.13 **Prisoners should have daily access to telephones, and all wings should have at least one telephone to every 20 prisoners and they should all have privacy hoods or enclosures.**
- 2.14 **The timeliness and quality of responses to prisoner applications should be monitored and improvements made where required.**
- 2.15 **Prisoners should have reliable access to their stored property.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.16 An appropriate offensive displays policy should be enforced.

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.

- 2.17 Prisoners on both sites were negative about relationships with staff. The personal officer policy was not operating. Prisoner consultation had been established.
- 2.18 In our survey on the main site, only 64% of prisoners, worse than the 71% comparator, said that staff treated them with respect and only 14%, against the 18% comparator, that staff normally spoke to them during association. West Hill site prisoners responded in line with the comparator about being treated with respect but more negatively about interaction with staff during association. In our groups, prisoners told us that many staff were not prepared to help with difficulties. We observed generally polite interactions and during association staff mixed with prisoners, although there was little proactive engagement. Only a few prisoners were addressed by their first name or their title.
- 2.19 There was a comprehensive personal officer policy but it was not being followed. In our survey, only 34% on the main site and 63% on the West Hill site, against the 47% and 75% comparators, respectively, said that they had a personal officer. Names of personal officers were displayed on the residential units but we found few examples of them introducing themselves to prisoners and little constructive contact in the case records we examined. Entries in case records generally were limited and did not provide a rounded account of the prisoner.
- 2.20 A prisoner council had met twice in the six months before the inspection and, although the range of issues discussed reflected prisoners' concerns, records of the meetings did not reflect progress with matters raised.

Recommendations

- 2.21 **There should be an effective system for ensuring that prisoners know whom to ask for help with problems, for checking on their well-being and for supporting them in achieving progress.**
- 2.22 **Consultation with prisoners should be regular, consistent and accountable.**

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.

- 2.23 Equality and diversity was a neglected area, and performance had deteriorated considerably since the previous inspection. There was little management oversight of equality and diversity, and any constructive work carried out tended to be done informally, on an individual basis.

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

Relevant data were not gathered systematically, the diversity committee did not function effectively and the policy was not a useful working tool.

Strategic management

- 2.24 Equality and diversity was a neglected area, and performance had deteriorated considerably since the previous inspection. Prisoners from minority groups were not all identified accurately on admission, so the current profile of the population was unclear.
- 2.25 The diversity policy was a generic document which did not reflect the distinctive characteristics of the establishment. Meetings about diversity took place on an ad hoc basis and action points were not followed up. The most recent meeting had taken place shortly before the inspection. The record of this meeting showed that there was no monitoring of the equality of access and treatment of prisoners from minority groups and nothing done to establish if discrimination was taking place (see main recommendation HP55).
- 2.26 The sole diversity officer, who until recently had frequently been required to cover operational tasks, had not received any training. Diversity was poorly promoted and staff showed little interest in, or knowledge of, the subject. In general, staff had limited awareness about the distinctive needs of individuals from minority groups, so all prisoners tended to be treated in the same way regardless of their individual needs, and as a result some prisoners were severely disadvantaged.
- 2.27 There were no opportunities for prisoners from minority groups to meet each other and there were no active prisoner representatives.

Recommendations

- 2.28 **Prisoners from minority groups should be identified accurately.**
- 2.29 **The diversity officer should be suitably trained.**
- 2.30 **Dedicated forums and prisoner representatives from minority groups should be introduced.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.31 Approximately 14% of the population were from a black and minority ethnic background. In our survey these prisoners reported less favourably than white prisoners across a number of areas, including safety, food, the prison shop and victimisation by staff (see main recommendation HP55). The number of racist complaints made was low and the quality of the investigations carried out was adequate and improving.
- 2.32 In our survey, approximately 10% of prisoners identified themselves as being from a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller background and almost half of these said that they had been victimised by staff because of this. Apart from a specialist magazine, which was ordered regularly through the library, the needs of this distinctive minority group had been almost completely unrecognised.

- 2.33 Foreign national prisoners represented 9% of the prison population and were located throughout the prison. The administrative arrangements to manage these prisoners were reasonably efficient. However, there were no support groups and no formal arrangements to provide them with support on the wings. Representatives from the UK Border Agency and the Detention Advice Service visited the prison and interviewed prisoners regularly. A clerk ensured that foreign national prisoners who were entitled to a free telephone call received it. Limited use was made of translation/interpreting services and some foreign national prisoners in our groups said that they did not understand certain prison procedures.
- 2.34 There was no monitoring of the religious affiliation of prisoners in the establishment.
- 2.35 In our survey, 31% of prisoners on the main site regarded themselves as having a disability. Apart from a lift on C wing and a further adapted cell on the West Hill site, there were no facilities for those with disabilities. A few such prisoners had care plans, which were held in the health care unit, but this information was not shared with staff on the wings. Prisoners with obvious physical disabilities had personal emergency evacuation plans. These were kept on the wings and also centrally, and staff were aware of them.
- 2.36 Prisoners with disabilities endured particular hardships and many were unable to wash properly. There were no baths in the prison and several men told us that they had been unable to take a shower for over four months, as there were no grab rails. When we spoke to members of staff about this, they were completely unaware of the problem. Some prisoners acted as carers for prisoners with a disability and carried out tasks such as pushing wheelchairs, but they received no training or formal support.
- 2.37 Older prisoners (over 50 years of age) represented a large proportion of the population, at just under 13%. Apart from a small social group, there was no specialist provision for these prisoners. The feedback we received from older prisoners was that they were generally more content with their circumstances than most of the other minority groups.
- 2.38 In our survey, 6% of prisoners on the main site identified themselves as either gay or bisexual. Prison staff had not sought out this type of information and there was no specific support for these individuals (see main recommendation HP55).

Recommendation

- 2.39 **Prisoners with disabilities should have multidisciplinary care plans, which are available on the wings to identify any additional support required.**
- 2.40 **Prisoners who have been allocated responsibility for carrying out diversity work should be suitably trained and supported.**

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 Prisoners were negative about faith and religious activity. They were not able to attend the chapel without registering. Muslim Friday prayers were held in an unsuitable venue. Chaplains

played an active role in the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring process and provided good pastoral support.

- 2.42 In our survey, prisoners on the main site gave consistently negative responses in relation to how they could practise their faith. Only 42%, against the 54% comparator, said that their religious beliefs were respected; only 45%, against the 55% comparator, that they were able to speak to a faith leader when they wanted to; and only 39%, against the 46% comparator, that it was easy to attend religious services. The responses to these questions from prisoners on the West Hill site were even more negative. Some of these negative findings were reinforced by feedback we received from prisoners in our groups. In particular, some Christian prisoners objected to the fact that they had to 'register' in order to attend chapel on a Sunday, as well as to participate in discussion and prayer groups.
- 2.43 The absence of a coordinating chaplain appeared to be having an adverse impact on the way the chaplaincy service was organised. Members of the team were not well integrated into the life of the prison. Communication between members of the team and prison staff was not always good and there were unresolved conflicts about practical matters, such as the scheduling of religious services and whether or not Muslim prisoners were entitled to have a shower before Friday prayers.
- 2.44 Members of the chaplaincy team played a prominent role in the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring process and routinely attended reviews. They also provided pastoral support to prisoners who were suffering bereavement.
- 2.45 There was a well-equipped chapel, where two Christian services were held at the weekend, one of which was an ecumenical service attended by some of the vulnerable prisoners. Between 30 and 40 Muslim prisoners regularly attended Friday prayers. There was no mosque and the multi-faith room was too small to cater for this number of worshippers, so Muslim worship was carried out in the gym, which was an unsuitable venue to conduct a religious service.
- 2.46 The number of prayer and study classes had reduced since the previous inspection and there was less input from visiting religious groups.

Recommendations

- 2.47 **Prisoners should be able to attend religious services and activities without registering.**
- 2.48 **Muslim Friday prayers should be conducted in a suitable venue.**

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.

2.49 Despite negative survey findings in this area, the complaints system was well organised and administered efficiently. Responses to complaints were good but there was no analysis of patterns and trends.

2.50 Complaints boxes were located in all of the main residential areas and were easily accessible to prisoners. Supplies of complaint forms were available in most, but not all of these areas. The boxes were normally emptied each day by the complaints clerk, who was a civilian member of staff. He logged the complaints centrally, allocated them to an appropriate member of staff to respond to and compiled a weekly statistical report which provided a simple analysis of the types of complaint made and the locations of the complainants. We were told that this information was discussed at a weekly managers meeting but no minutes were taken of this discussion. There was no further analysis of patterns and trends.

2.51 Approximately 40 complaints were made each month. Over the previous three months, most of the complaints had related to pay and various aspects of the regime. The responses we examined were prompt, addressed personally to the complainant and generally provided full explanations. However, in our survey fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that complaints were dealt with quickly, and more said that they had been prevented from making a complaint, although we did not find any evidence to confirm either of these assertions.

Recommendation

2.52 **Complaints should be analysed in order to determine relevant patterns and trends.**

Housekeeping point

2.53 Complaint forms should always be readily available.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or remand, both on arrival and release. Prisoners are supported by the prison staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

2.54 Bail information services were well organised and prisoners who needed guidance and advice in relation to bail were well supported. Prisoners who needed help with their legal rights were also offered a good service but they were not always seen quickly enough.

2.55 All prisoners eligible to be considered for bail were interviewed by one of the bail information officers shortly after arrival at the prison, and on average 60–100 bail interviews were completed each month. The staff involved were experienced civilian workers, who had a detailed knowledge of their subject and had developed strong links with relevant community-based agencies. Most of their work involved producing reports for the court. They also provided detailed assessments for supported housing providers.

2.56 Newly admitted prisoners who required assistance with their legal rights were told how to obtain this during induction and had to complete a questionnaire outlining the assistance they

required. Follow-up support was provided by a designated member of staff; however, because of the additional duties that he had to cover, this did not take place until two or three days later.

- 2.57 In our survey, prisoners' responses to questions about access to legal representatives, legal visits and bail information were all worse than those at comparator prisons, although we found that the support was mostly adequate.
- 2.58 Legal visits took place on each weekday morning. There were six interview rooms and staff told us that they were often unable to offer professional visitors a free choice of appointments because of the high level of demand. Sometimes interviews could be delayed for around a week.

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.

- 2.59 Health care provision was weak in some areas. The partnership board had met only once in the previous year. Prisoners had reasonable access to nurses and the GP but waited too long to see the dentist. There were limited clinics for men with chronic diseases. Delays in obtaining prescribed medication were common and some men did not receive their medication because of not being unlocked at the right time. Prisoners in the inpatient unit had a complex mix of both mental and physical health problems and we observed constructive multidisciplinary care but an absence of educational or therapeutic activity for them, with long periods locked up and variable access to association. There was insufficient primary mental health provision and no counselling services. The mental health in-reach team provided a good service to a small number of men, and those we spoke to said they had received helpful support.

Governance arrangements

- 2.60 Health services were commissioned by the SHIP cluster (Southampton City Primary Care Trust (PCT), Hampshire PCT, Isle of Wight PCT and NHS Portsmouth) and provided by Solent NHS Trust.
- 2.61 The governance structure was developing and there was a quarterly health care operational group meeting, informed by monthly departmental meetings. However a draft health needs assessment had been completed only recently in July 2012, the commissioning and health delivery plan related to 2010/11 and there had been only one partnership board meeting in the previous year.
- 2.62 Clinical incidents were reported through the Trust's governance process. Prisoners handed their complaints directly to health services staff or into the main applications box. Responses were respectful, with appropriate apologies.
- 2.63 New nursing staff completed prison and Trust induction and all nursing staff had completed mandatory training, including infection control and safeguarding of vulnerable adults. Use of agency staff was high and some prisoners told us that they always saw different nurses.

Recruitment of permanent staff was in progress. Staff had access to a wide range of Trust policies. There was a prison-specific communicable diseases policy and prisoners were offered hepatitis B vaccinations routinely on arrival.

- 2.64 There was an information-sharing protocol and consent was sought at the reception screening. Health promotion work and literature were limited but there were plans to train prisoners in providing health promotion advice. Health services staff attended the main prison consultative forum (see section on staff–prisoner relationships).
- 2.65 The main health care environment was reasonable. An infection control audit had been completed. Several of the wing treatment rooms were grubby, with a lack of storage facility.

Recommendations

- 2.66 **Health promotion should be developed and literature readily available.**
- 2.67 **Wing treatment rooms should be kept clean and equipped, with adequate storage.**

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.68 Prisoners were given a comprehensive health screening on arrival. We observed the sensitive handling of the screening of two men entering their first prison sentence, with appropriate referrals made. The secondary health assessment was done at the same time as the reception screening, which limited the opportunity for a separate and further assessment and identification of undisclosed or undiagnosed health conditions.
- 2.69 Prisoners reported very negatively about health provision. In our main site survey, only 23% rated the overall quality of health care as good, which was considerably less than the 39% comparator. Fewer on the main site (46%) than at comparator establishments (52%) said that it was easy to see a nurse. Although prisoners could see a nurse at the daily wing clinics, the timing of these often overlapped with medication administration times and it was sometimes difficult to see a nurse in private. In our survey, the number of prisoners on both the main site (16%) and the West Hill site (21%) who said that it was easy to see a doctor was lower than the respective comparators (27% and 36%). There were daily GP clinics at the main prison, except on Sundays, and weekly clinics at West Hill, and we noted that prisoners could usually see a GP within a week for a routine appointment and that those with an urgent need could be seen on the same day; men at West Hill with an urgent need could be taken to the main prison.
- 2.70 There was an adequate range of primary care services. Prisoners waited up to six weeks for a podiatry appointment and over six weeks to see the optician. Physiotherapy services were available at the neighbouring hospital. There were some serious gaps in chronic disease management but an asthma clinic, a high blood pressure clinic and an over-50s clinic had been introduced. SystmOne (the electronic clinical record) recording was appropriate and reflected evidence of follow-up on health problems. There was 24-hour nursing cover, with one registered nurse on duty between 9pm and 7.30am. The out-of-hours provider for emergency GP services was the same as in the community.
- 2.71 Condoms were available on request at wing treatment rooms or via the sexual health clinic; some prisoners told us of intrusive questioning from nurses when requesting condoms but we were assured that men could access condoms readily. There was good access to smoking cessation clinics.

- 2.72 The inpatient unit had 17 cells, including two safer cells. There was an admission protocol, and occupancy was usually high. During the inspection, there were 17 prisoners on the unit with a complex mix of physical and mental health problems. There was constructive collaboration between the prison and health care professionals through a daily multidisciplinary review meeting, which ensured good use of the spaces and that care was planned and appropriate. Nursing care on the unit was professional and helpful, and care plans reflected individual needs.
- 2.73 The inpatient environment was functional and the association room was cold, with some books, a pool table and a broken television. Men spent most of their day locked up as a result of a regular lack of discipline staff to unlock them and were only unlocked for approximately an hour each day for outside exercise and showers. There was no supportive therapeutic activity, and education was limited to in-cell packs.
- 2.74 Adaptations in shower facilities were insufficient to meet all the needs of older and disabled prisoners. We met one young prisoner with a spinal cord injury who had been there for some weeks. He had a special bed and a wheelchair, and a hoist was used to transfer him, but he had difficulty in reaching the basin from his chair and the call bell was out of his reach during the day.
- 2.75 Secondary external appointments mostly took place at the neighbouring hospital. There were few cancellations.

Recommendations

- 2.76 **A separate secondary health assessment should be completed within 72 hours of arrival.**
- 2.77 **Chronic disease management should be developed, to include regular clinics for prisoners with diabetes, coronary heart disease and epilepsy.**
- 2.78 **Prisoners located on the inpatient unit should be provided with a suitably therapeutic environment and activity.**
- 2.79 **There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.80 Prisoners should be able to consult with medical staff in private.

Good practice

- 2.81 *A daily multidisciplinary meeting, which included wide representation from the prison and health care professionals, was held to discuss and plan the care of inpatient prisoners.*

Pharmacy

- 2.82 Pharmacy services were provided by Lloyd's Pharmacy. A pharmacist visited the prison twice a week and medicines were delivered daily by a dispenser. Almost all medication was supplied to named patients. Methadone, paracetamol and ibuprofen were supplied as stock.
- 2.83 A medicines and therapeutics committee was supposed to meet quarterly but some of these meetings had not take place and the Lloyds pharmacist was not always invited.
- 2.84 There was an in-possession policy and risk assessment but the latter was not available to the pharmacist during dispensing. The risk assessment did not adequately assess the risk of both the patient and the medicine. Most prisoners received their medication as weekly or monthly in possession and there was work in progress to expand the list to provide for daily in-possession medicines, which would support more men moving to West Hill from the main prison.
- 2.85 There were four medicines administration sessions a day, which enabled regular dosing and appropriate night-time doses; however, these took up a lot of nurses' time. All prescribing and administration, except integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) medications, was electronic and some agency staff were unfamiliar with SystmOne. There were regular problems, such as gaps in recording and the duplication of repeat prescriptions.
- 2.86 Prisoners were sometimes not unlocked in time to collect prescribed medication. We spoke to one man who had not been unlocked to collect his epilepsy medication.
- 2.87 There was little supervision at the hatches by prison staff, and nursing staff said that it was difficult to maintain appropriate vigilance and confidentiality, and to ensure medication was taken as intended.
- 2.88 A large number of men had experienced problems in obtaining necessary treatment because of medication being unavailable. Some men we spoke to had gone several days without a prescribed medicine, including a man who had had no antibiotics for three days and another who had not had his antidepressant for 11 days, and we were particularly concerned that men on antipsychotic medication had experienced delays in getting their medications. One man at West Hill had been unable to have a joint injection on two occasions due to medication or appropriate equipment not being available (see main recommendation HP56).
- 2.89 There were patient group directions for some commonly used medicines but agency staff were unable to use them. There was a formulary but prescribers sometimes deviated from it. There was good use of a 'sleep ladder' to inform sedative prescribing. Prisoners did not have access to pharmacist advice and there were no minor ailments or medicines use reviews. Nurses inappropriately carried out secondary dispensing from stocks in the out-of-hours emergency cupboard.
- 2.90 Most medicines were stored securely, except on C wing, where the cupboards were not attached to the wall and the fixings for the IDTS controlled drugs cabinet were not compliant with regulations.

Recommendations

- 2.91 **The in-possession risk assessment should adequately reflect and assess the risk of the individual patient and the specified medicine.**

- 2.92 **There should be adequate supervision of medication queues by prison staff.**
- 2.93 **Pharmacist-led clinics and medicines use reviews should take place.**
- 2.94 **Arrangements for the storage, administration, disposal and recording of controlled drugs should comply with regulations and infection control requirements.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.95 The drugs and therapeutics committee should meet quarterly as planned and include representation from the supplying pharmacy.
- 2.96 In-possession risk assessments should be available to the pharmacist during dispensing.
- 2.97 All staff working in the health care department should be proficient in the operation of SystemOne.
- 2.98 All nursing staff should be able to use patient group directions.
- 2.99 Use of medicines from the out-of-hours cupboard should reflect Nursing and Midwifery Council guidance on the administration of medicines by nurses.

Dentistry

- 2.100 The dental service was provided by Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust. There were four dental sessions per week. In our survey, fewer prisoners on the main site (7%) than at comparator prisons (10%) said that it was easy or very easy to see the dentist. Prisoners usually had to wait for six weeks for a routine dental appointment but men with urgent problems could sometimes be seen on the same day.
- 2.101 Surgery equipment had up-to-date servicing certificates and an audit of X-rays had been conducted recently. A combination of reusable and disposable equipment was used. Storage space for equipment was very limited and temperature control of the room was variable.
- 2.102 The dentist recorded narrative records on SystemOne, and dentition charting on a separate dental system. The narrative records we reviewed were factual and appropriately recorded.
- 2.103 Infection control arrangements met with current guidance but were not compliant with future Medicines Health Regulatory Agency requirements.

Recommendation

- 2.104 **Clean and dirty areas should be separated to meet best practice guidelines.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.105 There should be adequate storage space for equipment and consumables.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.106 Primary mental health services were provided by Solent NHS Trust and secondary mental health in-reach by Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust.
- 2.107 Referrals could be made by any member of the prison staff or by prisoners, and were triaged by the in-reach team; those appropriate for mental health input were reviewed at the weekly multidisciplinary mental health meeting, for allocation to either primary care or in-reach. Prisoners with pre-existing mental health conditions were referred directly to the in-reach team, either before or on arrival, by local criminal justice schemes or sending prisons.
- 2.108 The dedicated time allotted to primary mental health was insufficient to meet prisoners' needs. At the time of our inspection, there were just three men on the caseload and no talking or counselling services for men with anxiety and depression, or similar. Registered primary mental health nurses were being recruited.
- 2.109 The in-reach service met the needs of the small number of prisoners with severe and enduring mental health problems, and those we spoke to said that they had received helpful support. The team caseload was 45 prisoners, and those with non-urgent needs were seen within 7–10 days. The forensic psychiatrist visited three times a week.
- 2.110 Prisoners were given an initial assessment and treatment was planned. Risk assessments, care and treatment plans, and reviews were recorded on the RiO system (the electronic mental health-based record) and copied onto SystmOne. Consultations we observed appeared clinically appropriate, with good patient engagement and suitable follow-through. There were effective links with the GPs, including specialist prescribing for individual patients.
- 2.111 There were two transfers out to secure mental health hospitals during the inspection. There had been 16 such transfers during the previous year, of which 12 had waited more than two weeks from their second assessment; the longest wait had been approximately eight weeks.
- 2.112 The mental health team had provided mental health awareness training to the wider prison but attendance had been poor.

Recommendations

- 2.113 **Primary mental health services should meet the needs of the prison population.**
- 2.114 **Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training.**

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.

- 2.115 Prisoners made strong complaints about the standard of the food. The consultation arrangements were poor.

- 2.116 The prison kitchen was well equipped, reasonably tidy and clean. However, the fabric of the building was poor and it was due to be replaced.
- 2.117 The menu was based on a standard four-week cycle. A breakfast pack was issued on the night before it was due to be consumed and other meals were served too early, at around 11.30am and 4.30pm. Halal meals were prepared separately and delivered to the wings in self-contained foil packs, avoiding any problems of cross-contamination.
- 2.118 In our survey, only 13% of prisoners on the main site and 5% of those at West Hill said that the food was good or very good, both figures being considerably worse than the 24% and 29% comparators, respectively. Prisoners on both sites consumed the same food but the particularly negative result from West Hill might have been explained by the fact that this site was further away from the prison kitchen, so the food served there stayed longer on the heated trolleys. Prisoners across the whole prison complained to us repeatedly about both the quality and quantity of the food, and our findings concurred with this; the food we sampled was unappetising and we found the portions to be small.
- 2.119 We were told that food comment books had been removed from serveries three months earlier because they were being abused by prisoners. A food survey had been completed in February 2012 but we could find no evidence that the findings had been acted on. A meeting involving prisoner representatives had been convened in September 2012 to discuss catering issues but the minutes lacked detail and could not be used to track progress.

Recommendation

- 2.120 **Prisoners' should be consulted on their views on food and action taken to improve quality and quantity.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.121 Food should be served at recognised meal times.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.122 The range of goods available to purchase did not meet the needs of black and minority ethnic prisoners. Goods were delivered two weeks after an order had been placed, causing difficulties for new arrivals.

- 2.123 Prisoners could make weekly orders from a list of more than 300 items, which included religious items and modelling materials. Newspapers and magazines were available. Although, in our survey, a similar number of prisoners at the main site to that at comparator prisons said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, only 29% of black and minority ethnic prisoners responded positively to this question, compared with 50% of white prisoners (see section on equality and diversity and main recommendation HP55). Consultation with prisoners on items to be included on the list had started.

- 2.124 Prison shop purchases were not delivered until two weeks after the order had been submitted, which had serious implications for new arrivals (see section on early days in custody and recommendation 1.20).
- 2.125 A wide range of catalogues was available for mail order purchases. No administration fee was charged. Orders were sometimes delayed in reception if there were not sufficient staff to deliver items to the wings (see section on residential units).

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 The amount of time out of cell was poor for prisoners on the main site, particularly for unemployed prisoners who did not get evening association. The core day was not reliably delivered. The amount of time given for outdoor exercise was insufficient.
- 3.2 Prisoners in full-time employment on the main site could access about eight hours out of cell, and those in part-time employment up to five hours 30 minutes. However, unemployed prisoners were limited to 30 minutes' outdoor exercise and approximately one hour of afternoon association on weekdays. Although two hours was available for afternoon association, only half of the men on a wing were unlocked at any one time, for one hour, to ensure equivalence with the association time for employed prisoners. We also found that association for vulnerable prisoners was disrupted by the unlocking of non-vulnerable prisoners lodging on their wing. In our survey, only 9% of those on the main site said that they went on association more than five times a week, which was considerably worse than the 49% comparator. Such limited time unlocked severely restricted prisoners' ability to take a shower, contact family and friends, and submit applications (see main recommendation HP57).
- 3.3 Prisoners were frustrated by the lack of predictability and consistency in the core day, and staff and prisoners alike told us that the day was regularly disrupted and curtailed by staff shortages, and inconsistent and unregulated practice between wings (see main recommendation HP57).
- 3.4 A large number of prisoners were in part-time activity or unemployed, and in our roll check one morning we found 274 prisoners (44%) locked in their cells on the main unit. Prisoners at West Hill were not locked in their cells and had access to telephones and showers at all times (see also section on residential units). At night, and often during the day if they were not at activities, they were locked on their landings with no access to association areas.

Recommendation

- 3.5 **Prisoners should be given the opportunity for one hour of exercise in the open air every day.**

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.

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.

- 3.6 There were too few activity places for the population but even these were underused, particularly on the main site. The number of activity places on the West Hill site was much higher and most prisoners there were engaged in some form of activity. The range of external contract work was mostly low skill and many contract workshops had insufficient work for prisoners. The variety and range of education programmes were good across both sites and offered good progression. Most places in education were full time. There was insufficient employment-related work and vocational training, and insufficient formal accreditation in some areas. Achievements were good but only for those who stayed long enough to complete programmes. Library resources were adequate on both sites but access was poor, particularly on the West Hill site, and there was insufficient careers information available.
- 3.7 Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
- Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: requires improvement
Quality of learning and skills and work provision: requires improvement
Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: requires improvement

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.8 The prison had recently recruited permanent senior managers following a period of instability. Based on a detailed and informed needs analysis, they had recognised the need to improve the quantity and quality of learning and skills and work activities. Steps had been taken to make these improvements, which included shorter educational programmes and accreditation for catering and barbering. Cluster arrangements for Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) funding had yet to be fully developed and implemented. Few learning and skills sessions were cancelled.
- 3.9 Induction to learning and skills was adequate, enabling prisoners to make an informed choice of activity. However, links between sentence planning and allocation to activities were weak, allocation to activity was rarely informed by sentence planning, learning and skills staff rarely attended sentence planning sessions, and insufficient weight was given to learning and skills. Allocation to activities sometimes took too long – in some cases up to three weeks. Learning sessions were often interrupted and disrupted by learners being taken away for other regime activities.

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>.

- 3.10 Self-assessment processes for the OLASS provision were well established and informative, but for other provision had only recently been established. The establishment had yet to implement a prison-wide self-assessment. Senior managers and the head of learning and skills had developed a comprehensive and realistic three-year action plan for progressing learning and skills and work activities, informed by the needs analysis and self-assessment. Structures for the observation of teaching, training and learning had been introduced into vocational training and work areas but the processes to promote and support continuous improvement were underdeveloped.

Recommendations

- 3.11 **Sentence planning should link effectively with the allocation process, and regime interruptions to learning and skills and work activities should be reduced.**
- 3.12 **A prison-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work, which includes all activities and fully informs action planning for improvement, should be developed and implemented.**
- 3.13 **The session observation scheme to improve the quality of teaching and learning and assessment should be developed further.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.14 Learning and skills staff should attend the sentence planning reviews of prisoners known to them.

Provision of activities

- 3.15 Over 230 prisoners were unemployed. There were far too few activity places for the population, particularly on the main site, but even these were underused. Approximately 412 places were available across the prison (305 on the main site and 107 at West Hill) and these were fulltime. Between 47% and 60% of prisoners on the main site and approximately 90% at West Hill were engaged in some form of activity. The range of work across the prison was inadequate, with most engaged in wing activities such as the servery and kitchen, cleaning work and painting. Contract workshops provided work places, but these involved low-skill activities which did not provide prisoners with useful skills for employment on release, and many of them did not have any contract work at the time of the inspection. The provision of purposeful activity for vulnerable prisoners was particularly poor and around 70% were unoccupied during the inspection (see main recommendation HP58).
- 3.16 The variety and range of education programmes offered were good across both sites and included literacy, numeracy, information and communications technology (ICT), English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), art, creative writing, music technology, cookery, and some business studies and employability programmes. Most places in education were full-time, although some part-time places were available. There were opportunities for progression and programmes were offered from entry to level 2 on most programmes and up to level 3 in ICT. Some programmes offered unit accreditation, which was useful for those serving short sentences, but some programmes required longer periods of study and were inappropriate for many learners. Learners studying or wishing to study higher-level Open University (OU) and distance learning courses were facilitated and supported by the prison.

- 3.17 The range of employment-related work and vocational training was inadequate, particularly on the West Hill site, which was supposed to function as a training prison. Industrial cleaning and horticulture were offered at level 1 and offered no progression to higher levels. Carpentry training offered learners the opportunity to develop good employability skills but these were not accredited. Prisoners engaged in painting around the prison were not given recognition or credit for their skills. Short courses in manual handling, food hygiene and first aid were provided. Insufficient use was made of release on temporary licence to engage prisoners in employment-related work in the community (see section on strategic management of resettlement).

Recommendation

- 3.18 **All work and training opportunities should be formally accredited to national standards, and skills not formally accredited should be recognised and recorded to support prisoners' employment needs.**

Quality of provision

- 3.19 Teaching, learning and assessment on both sites were mostly good. Sessions were generally well planned and provided constructive and challenging activities. Learners were enthusiastic, and clearly enjoyed the sessions. Behaviour was well managed and effective support was provided by volunteers from the community, who worked closely with teaching staff. Many learners progressed well and understood what they needed to do to progress further through their learning. Attendance and punctuality were adequate. Learning resources were satisfactory and good use was made of information technology (IT) to support learning in some sessions. The virtual campus was underdeveloped and used primarily to support job search in employability programmes.
- 3.20 Learning plans were generally used appropriately. ESOL provision was adequate but the prison had not developed an appropriate ESOL qualification, using only adult literacy qualifications. The quality of some paper-based learning materials was poor.
- 3.21 The prison collected a great deal of data about specific groups to analyse participation and achievement. However, some groups received insufficient attention – for example, Travellers. The prison was unaware of the number of Travellers in the prison and so was unable to determine whether their needs were being met (see also section on equality and diversity). Data were not analysed or used to determine the achievements of learners on the main site, West Hill or the vulnerable prisoner unit, to identify any discrepancies.

Recommendations

- 3.22 **Appropriate English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) qualifications should be introduced.**
- 3.23 **The analysis and use of data should be improved, to identify the achievements of different groups of learners and ensure that all their needs are identified and met.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.24 The quality of paper-based learning materials should be improved.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.25 The number of prisoners staying on learning and skills programmes was often below 50% and many did not stay in the prison long enough to complete their learning programmes. Those who completed education and vocational training programmes generally achieved well. Learners on programmes that offered unit accreditation toward full awards achieved well. However, achievement of full awards in IT and some creative techniques programmes was not sufficiently good. The prison had recently successfully managed to retain some prisoners to enable them to finish their learning programmes.

Recommendation

- 3.26 **Prisoners' learning and skills outcomes should be appropriately tailored towards a short-term population and achievement rates should be improved.**

Library

- 3.27 The library resources on the main site were reasonably good. Opening times were published and all wings had access opportunities during afternoon sessions. However, the number of prisoners accessing the library was highly variable, as it was dependent on officers escorting prisoners, and these arrangements were inconsistent. Access for those in education or employment was poor, as the library opened on only two evenings a week and was closed at weekends.
- 3.28 Access to the library on the West Hill site was also poor. Opening hours were similarly dependent on the availability of orderlies and it was only open on two evenings a week and two half-days at the weekend.
- 3.29 In our survey, fewer prisoners on both sites than at comparator establishments said that they went to the library at least once a week. On both sites the fiction, non-fiction and legal materials were adequate, although there was insufficient material relating to employment and further education and training to support prisoners' career progression and employment.

Recommendations

- 3.30 **The library should increase its opening hours on both sites.**
- 3.31 **More careers and employment-related information should be 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.

- 3.32 PE provision was adequate on both sites. Gym opening times were reasonable but usage was low. A satisfactory range of recreational activity was available. Facilities were adequate and well used, and healthy living and personal fitness were promoted well.

- 3.33 Published gym opening times were reasonable on both sites but prisoners complained of a lack of staff and cancelled sessions. In our survey, only 5% of prisoners on the main site, against the 31% comparator, went to the gym three or more times a week; on the West Hill site, numbers were similar to those at other establishments. Fitness facilities were of high quality, clean and well used. The sports hall on the main site was well used for sports and games and as a classroom. On the West Hill site, the small multi-activity surface was underused for ball games because of health and safety concerns and the proximity of windows that could potentially be broken. Only 40% of prisoners participated in recreational PE.
- 3.34 There was good promotion of healthy living and personal fitness. All prisoners attended a detailed induction that explained the safe use of equipment, and emphasised the importance of healthy training, diet and nutrition. During induction, all prisoners completed a health screening questionnaire. Concerns identified were referred to the health care department, but, gym staff were not informed if health services staff deemed a prisoner unfit to use the gym.
- 3.35 A well-planned four-week rotational programme enabled prisoners to participate in a range of sports and activities. Sessions for the over-50s, weight loss and to help those recovering from injury were well promoted and attended.
- 3.36 PE staff were suitably qualified and successfully provided short courses in manual handling, first aid and weight training, and contributed to the health trainer qualifications. This better met the needs of short-stay prisoners but there was little time or scope to provide further training.

Recommendation

- 3.37 **Levels of participation in recreational PE should be improved.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.38 Health services staff should notify the gym of prisoners unfit for physical activity.

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 Governance was weak, as previous arrangements had ended eight months before the inspection. The lack of a comprehensive needs analysis and action plan undermined the value of the new draft strategy. The offender management unit did not have a high enough profile and, although strategic links were adequate, there was insufficient information exchange. There was too little offending behaviour or victim awareness work, or release on temporary license to meet the needs of prisoners. Far too few could achieve their targets at the establishment. While resettlement provision was adequate across most of the pathways, there was little evaluation of effectiveness.
- 4.2 The strategic management group had stopped meeting in January 2012, leaving little formal governance of offender management and resettlement. As a result, there was a lack of focus on identifying and driving forward improvements. A new group was being established, with a wide range of proposed members, and terms of reference had been developed. The first meeting was due to be held in November 2012.
- 4.3 A draft strategy had been written and, although it covered the seven resettlement pathways, it was not based on a comprehensive needs analysis of the complex range of prisoners held at the establishment. While a needs analysis had been carried out for substance use, learning and skills, and resettlement, it had not been used to inform the strategy. There was also no action plan, making it difficult for the prison staff to see the priorities for the coming year or how progress would be monitored.
- 4.4 Little offending behaviour work was provided, as previous accredited programmes and victim awareness work had ended. Other resettlement provision was more developed and was managed through a single unit, providing a coordinated approach. However, there was little evaluation of the effectiveness of the resettlement services. In our survey, only 18% of prisoners on the main site and 46% of those at West Hill, against the 62% and 69% comparators, respectively, said that they could meet their sentence plan targets at the establishment. However, more on the main site (55%, against the 24% comparator) said that there were plans to transfer to another prison to access interventions.
- 4.5 Release on temporary license (ROTL) was not a central part of the resettlement strategy for prisoners held on the West Hill site. A very small number of prisoners there had been granted ROTL and this had only involved working in the prison grounds.
- 4.6 There was a lack of a 'whole prison' approach to offender management, and the profile of the offender management unit (OMU) was not sufficiently high. Strategic links between public protection, offender management and resettlement services were adequate but practice was not always sufficiently well developed, with some gaps in information exchange. Some staff in

the OMU had not received adequate training to fulfil the role, including training in the assessment and management of risk of harm to others.

Recommendation

- 4.7 **A comprehensive reducing reoffending strategy should be in place which is based on a comprehensive needs analysis and supported by a detailed action plan, including the provision of offending behaviour work and release on temporary licence.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.8 An imbalance of workloads, underutilisation of probation officers and cross-deployment of uniformed staff hindered the work of an already underdeveloped offender management unit. Not all eligible prisoners (i.e. those assessed as low- and medium-risk of harm) had a named offender supervisor and too many did not have a current offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and sentence plan. A large backlog of OASys assessments was not actively managed and affected prisoners' ability to progress or obtain release on temporary license. Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was variable, with too little meaningful offence-focused work. Home detention curfew processes were clear but hindered by a lack of wing officer reports. Contributions to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) meetings had improved. Categorisation and reviews were well managed but some prisoners experienced delays in being transferred. Public protection restrictions were appropriate but not formally reviewed. It was proving difficult to transfer some of those in denial of their offence and there was no motivational work available to challenge them.

4.9 There was an imbalance in the workloads of offender supervisors and an underutilisation of probation officer skills. Seconded probation officers managed lifers and prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP) and had an average caseload of around 15, while uniformed offender supervisors managed high/very high risk and prolific or priority offender cases and had average caseloads of more than 30. The probation officers wrote too many pre-sentence reports on behalf of Hampshire Probation Trust, which reduced the time they had available to carry out offender assessment system (OASys) assessments and other important OMU work. Uniformed offender supervisors were regularly cross-deployed to operational duties, making it difficult for them to manage their workload.

4.10 In our survey, only 23% of prisoners on the West Hill site, far worse than the 67% comparator, had an offender supervisor, which reflected the limited offender management model in operation. Most of the prisoners presenting a low and medium risk of serious harm (100 out of 119, including a large proportion of prisoners held on the West Hill site) did not have a current OASys assessment or sentence plan. Many had waited several months for an assessment, and we came across one prisoner who had not had an assessment since being sentenced in June 2011. The backlog was not being proactively managed. In our survey, only 23% of prisoners on the main site and 32% of prisoners on the West Hill site, against the 41% and 73% comparators, respectively, said that they had a sentence plan. The lack of OASys

assessments limited prisoners' opportunities to progress and access ROTL (see main recommendation HP59).

- 4.11 We reviewed 20 cases that were managed by an external probation officer, supported by a prison-based offender supervisor. We assessed the overall quality of assessment and planning to address the likelihood of reoffending as adequate in only seven of the 20 cases. Weaknesses included a lack of attention to offender engagement and diversity issues. Participation in sentence planning boards was limited to the offender manager, offender supervisor and the prisoner. Staff from other departments were rarely involved. The analysis of the risk of serious harm was adequate in most cases, although three of the risk management plans had not been completed and two were unclear. The overall quality of assessment and planning to address the risk of harm was adequate in only 10 of the cases we reviewed.
- 4.12 The amount of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners varied. We found little evidence of one-to-one work being undertaken, with some prisoners having no structured interventions or only very limited contact with their offender supervisor. Sufficient priority had been given to activities specified in the sentence plan in only five of the 20 cases we inspected. Although there was a formal supervision structure for offender supervisors, and managers were accessible and generally supportive, there was no regular, systematic case management oversight. This was particularly noticeable in high and very high risk of harm cases.
- 4.13 The home detention curfew (HDC) suitability criteria and assessment processes were clear and the process was started 10 weeks before the eligibility date. Of the 106 assessed over the previous six months, only a third had been awarded release on HDC. However, the assessment reports we reviewed were adequately detailed and the decisions made were defensible, although the assessment process was hindered by too few wing staff submitting progress reports. The database used to log applicants did not make it easy to track the outcome and timeliness was not routinely monitored.

Recommendations

- 4.14 **All prisoners serving over 12 months should have an offender supervisor who provides them with regular and meaningful contact which is appropriately overseen by a line manager.**
- 4.15 **There should be high-quality assessments and plans for managing the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm for all relevant prisoners, and sentence planning boards should be multidisciplinary.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.16 Home detention curfew processes and their outcomes should be monitored and action taken to address issues.

Public protection

- 4.17 Restrictions on child contact were defensible and proportionate to the protection of victims and potential victims. However, review processes through the IDRMT were not sufficiently robust to ensure that restrictions on contact were removed at the earliest opportunity. In one case, a review had started but had not been completed some three months later despite contact being

approved by children's services. Prisoners were told in person about the restrictions applied and how to appeal. Monitoring of mail and telephone calls was used appropriately and for time-limited periods.

- 4.18 At the time of the inspection, about 220 prisoners had been identified as multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases, with most being managed at level 1 or 2. Over recent months, contributions to MAPPA meetings had improved but minutes were not available on the prisoner's file. Offender supervisors did not use the violent and sexual offenders register (ViSOR) to support risk management and information exchange.
- 4.19 Restrictions on child contact were defensible and proportionate to the protection of victims and potential victims. However, review processes were not sufficiently formal to ensure that prisoners were not unnecessarily restricted.

Recommendation

- 4.20 **Reviews of child contact restrictions should be completed at the earliest opportunity.**

Categorisation

- 4.21 The initial categorisation processes were rigorously applied and there was a clear system for tracking the work. Allocation decisions took into account family ties, required courses and the prisoner's preference. Completed categorisation forms were overseen by a manager and countersigned. Processes to review categorisation were also well developed. Some prisoners who did not have an OASys assessment experienced delays in being transferred to a more appropriate establishment. In the 20 cases we inspected, eight prisoners who needed to be transferred to achieve targets were still waiting for this to happen (see main recommendation HP59). Prisoners were not directly involved in the review of their category but could submit a written progress report. Personal officer reports were weak and provided little information, but reports by the probation staff were of a good quality.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.22 At the time of the inspection, the establishment held 16 IPP and 16 life-sentenced prisoners. There was no consultation forum and there were no dedicated family days for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs).
- 4.23 Prisoners on remand who were facing an indeterminate sentence were not routinely seen by OMU staff. However, newly sentenced prisoners were seen within five days for an assessment and a discussion about the implications of their sentence. A multi-agency meeting was held within eight weeks of sentence and was followed by the sentence planning meeting.
- 4.24 ISPs received frequent contact from offender supervisors but little offence-focused work. Priority was given to transferring ISPs at the earliest opportunity. However, some who were in denial of their offence proved particularly difficult to move (see main recommendation HP60). There was a lack of structured motivational work for this group at the establishment.

Recommendation

- 4.25 Prisoners serving an indeterminate sentence should have access to a discussion forum in order to understand the processes they face, and family days should be available to them.

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.

- 4.26 All prisoners had their individual needs assessed on arrival but some pre-release interviews were held too close to discharge. While custody planning for short-term prisoners was not formalised, they were referred to relevant agencies for help. Housing support was good but little was done to monitor the effectiveness of the service. There was insufficient employment-related training but the number released into employment and training was reasonable. There was no routine health care interview before discharge but there were links with community mental health and drug services. Good support in relation to finance, benefit and debt was available. The children and families pathway was well developed and family support workers were available through Spurgeons. The visitors centre was excellent but too few visits sessions were provided and there were difficulties in booking and getting into the visits hall on time. With the exception of a domestic violence awareness programme on the West Hill site, there were no offending behaviour programmes and there was no motivational work for those in denial of their sexual offending.
- 4.27 Individualised needs assessments were undertaken as part of the induction process, and these covered the range of resettlement pathways. Although short-term and remand prisoners did not receive a formal custody plan, their needs were assessed and there was effective signposting to services. Effective reintegration work was provided by benefits, employment, training and accommodation (BETA) officers and community agencies. Pre-release interviews were undertaken but sometimes too near release.
- 4.28 Although BETA staff were visible on the wings, there were notices to advertise services, and surgeries were held regularly, in our survey fewer prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons said that they knew whom to go to for help with accommodation and finances; on the West Hill site, considerably more than at comparator establishments said that they knew whom to turn to for help. The reason for this variable level of knowledge was unclear.

Housekeeping points

- 4.29 All prisoners should have a custody plan and pre-release interviews should be held well in advance of release.
- 4.30 The reason for those on the main wings not knowing whom to turn to for help should be explored and action taken to improve prisoner perceptions.

Accommodation

- 4.31 Trained housing officers provided support for a range of accommodation needs, such as maintaining or closing down tenancies. Although the key performance target of 84% of prisoners being released to settled accommodation was being achieved, the percentage of prisoners being released homeless in the previous year had still been relatively high, at 15%. The reasons for prisoners being released homeless had recently been monitored to identify issues. The number of prisoners being released from Winchester into settled accommodation who would otherwise have been homeless was not monitored.

Recommendation

- 4.32 **The number of homeless prisoners helped to find accommodation on release should be monitored to demonstrate effectiveness.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.33 Insufficient vocational and employment related-work and training were provided, particularly on the West Hill site. However, the number of prisoners entering employment, education or training (ETE) on release was relatively high. During the previous six months, approximately 40% had been recorded as entering ETE. There were productive relationships between resettlement staff, Jobcentre Plus staff and the National Careers Service. There was no formal pre-release programme but prisoners could access an employment programme in the education department at any time during their sentence. Those on the carpentry programme participated in an employment-related programme which was effectively linked to their skills training and potential employment in this field. Good opportunities had developed with local employers, including hotels, but at the time of inspection these had not been fully utilised.

Recommendations

- 4.34 **A more structured pre-release programme should be provided, particularly on the West Hill site, to improve prisoners' preparation for employment and reintegration into the community.**
- 4.35 **Links with employers in the local community should be further developed, to provide meaningful employment and training opportunities for prisoners on release.**

Health care

- 4.36 Prisoners were not routinely seen by health services staff before release. Men on prescribed medication were either given back medication they had arrived with or prescribed seven days' supply. They were not given any information about registering with a GP.
- 4.37 There were effective links with local community mental health teams, and prisoners with severe and enduring mental health conditions were linked with their local team. Where possible, pre-discharge planning meetings included community practitioners.

Recommendation

- 4.38 **There should be pre-release clinics to enable prisoners' ongoing health needs to be met and to link them to a local GP and community health services on release.**

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.39 Pre-discharge planning for those with substance use issues was good, and there were links with local drug intervention programme teams. The use of prescriptions (FP10s) for prisoners to take to local pharmacists was a successful initiative.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.40 Prisoners could access a good level of advice and support to resolve debts and other financial problems. This included the issuing of an information pack, contacting creditors and maintaining benefits where relevant. Jobcentre Plus staff were available to set up a benefits interview before release. Applications to open bank accounts had been submitted for 130 prisoners over the previous year. Access to money management training was limited to one module, provided via education department.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.41 Remand prisoners could have visits every day. Of the convicted prisoners, only those on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme could have a weekly visit; those on standard and basic levels were entitled to fewer visits. Vulnerable prisoners had the same access to visits as other prisoners. There was only one visits telephone booking line and most of the visitors we spoke to said that it took too long to get through.
- 4.42 The visitors centre was excellent, providing a positive and supportive environment with a wide range of information. Photographs on display there aimed to reassure visitors about prison life. A DVD to inform visitors about the work of the prison had been developed.
- 4.43 Visitors told us that visits sessions sometimes started late; the one we observed started on time but the slow searching procedures delayed the last visitors getting into the hall. The fixed furniture in the visits hall was unwelcoming and the closed visits booths lacked privacy. The crèche was not always open because of a lack of volunteer supervisors. Prisoners had to wear identification bibs during visits. A volunteer prison visitor scheme was in place and coordinated through the chaplaincy.
- 4.44 Family support workers were available through Spurgeons, a charitable organisation which provided high-quality support for families before, during and after visits. They were also active in training volunteers and other agency staff, including workers from children's centres and Home Start. Additional visits with children were facilitated when appropriate, such as the last contact before an adoption.
- 4.45 Prisoners could access a 'You and Your Child' course, and 36 had completed it in the previous year. A creative and well-presented pack for fathers had also been developed. High-quality family days were held but there were too few to meet demand. Storybook Dads was available and 75 prisoners had taken part over the previous year.

Recommendations

4.46 **All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week.**

4.47 **The number of family days should be increased.**

Housekeeping points

4.48 Visits booking facilities should be improved.

4.49 A system should be implemented to ensure that all visitors access the visits hall on time.

4.50 Prisoners should not have to wear identification bibs.

4.51 The fixed furniture in the visits hall should be replaced and closed visits booths should provide adequate privacy.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

4.52 The establishment did not deliver any accredited offender behaviour programmes (see main recommendation HP60). There was no analysis or strategy to manage the needs of the current population, so prisoners, especially those on the West Hill site, found it difficult to progress. According to our survey, only 5% of those on the main wings, against the 21% comparator, said that it was easy to get an offending behaviour programme place. Most prisoners in denial of their sexual offending faced little challenge about their offending behaviour and no structured motivational work, resulting in a lack of progress and difficulties in securing a transfer.

4.53 A domestic violence awareness programme was delivered, but only on the West Hill site, and there was very limited monitoring and evaluation.

Additional resettlement services

Veterans in custody

4.54 Good support was available to veterans, and this was developing further with the introduction of a forum for advice and discussion. The scheme had been launched in 2010 and had worked with about 70 prisoners to date. These prisoners were identified through the induction process and referred to one of two officers. There was good access to a range of support networks, including the British Legion, the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Families Association and Combat Stress. Some such prisoners had received financial support to clear housing arrears or help with other resettlement needs.

Section 5: Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

-
- 5.1 All incidents of bullying should be acted on and reported. A local policy should be introduced and all data relating to violence should be collated and analysed to identify trends, and action taken to improve safety. (HP54)
 - 5.2 Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (HP55)
 - 5.3 Prescribed medication should be available and prisoners should be unlocked at the right time to receive it. (HP56)
 - 5.4 The core day should be reviewed to reduce long periods of lock-up. All prisoners should be able have some evening association. Any changes to the published core day should be kept to a minimum, appropriately authorised and communicated to prisoners. (HP57)
 - 5.5 The total number of activity places should be increased and places should be fully utilised to allow more prisoners to be employed. The amount of employment-related work and vocational training should be increased, particularly at the West Hill site. (HP58)
 - 5.6 All eligible prisoners should have an OASys assessment and a review within the required timescales. (HP59)
 - 5.7 The offending behaviour needs of the population should be analysed and suitable offending behaviour courses introduced. (HP60)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

- 5.8 Prisoners should only be handcuffed during disembarkation when justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.5)
- 5.9 A full criminal record should accompany all new prisoners being received at the prison. (1.6)

Early days in custody

- 5.10 Prisoners should only be subject to a strip-search when justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.17)

- 5.11 Written information for new prisoners should be available in appropriate languages other than English. (1.18)
- 5.12 Thorough first night procedures should be applied to ensure that accommodation is prepared, a shower and a telephone call are available and appropriate support and checks are carried out on new arrivals through the night. (1.19)
- 5.13 Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival. (1.20)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.14 The abusive behaviour directed at vulnerable prisoners in general, but especially during exercise, should be challenged. (1.28)
- 5.15 There should be a specific policy to manage the vulnerable prisoner population. (1.29)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.16 The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) observations, interaction and entries by night staff should be improved. (1.36)
- 5.17 All discipline staff should be issued with and trained in the use of anti-ligature knives. (1.37)
- 5.18 Care suites should be properly furnished and equipped to provide an appropriately supportive environment. (1.38)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.19 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.43)

Security

- 5.20 The unnecessary regime-based locking-up procedures should cease. (1.52)
- 5.21 An up to date supply reduction strategy should be in place, supported by monitoring data and a drug strategy meeting to direct action. (1.53)
- 5.22 Drug testing should be adequately resourced to allow for mandatory and suspicion testing to be appropriately spread and completed on time. (1.54)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.23 The incentives and earned privileges policy should be reviewed, made fit for purpose and uniformly implemented across the prison, with assurances made of staff and prisoner understanding and confidence in the system. (1.61)

Discipline

- 5.24 Adjudication paperwork should be scrutinised by a senior manager and there should be regular standardisation and monitoring meetings. (1.64)
- 5.25 Prisoners segregated for good order or discipline should have completed Rule 45 paperwork and effective behavioural targets. (1.72)
- 5.26 A segregation monitoring and review group (SMARG) should meet regularly to analyse and act on segregation-related data. (1.73)

Substance misuse

- 5.27 There should be sufficient peer workers to provide substance use support across both sites in line with local operational policies and protocols. (1.83)
- 5.28 Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission. (1.84)
- 5.29 There should be a full range of psychosocial interventions. These should not be cancelled as a result of a shortage of discipline officers. (1.85)

Residential units

- 5.30 Cells should have clean, adequately screened toilets, adequate furniture and sufficient natural light. (2.10)
- 5.31 Problems with drainage and damp in showers in older units should be rectified. (2.11)
- 5.32 Prisoners should be provided with sufficient clothing of adequate quality and the facility to launder their own clothes. (2.12)
- 5.33 Prisoners should have daily access to telephones, and all wings should have at least one telephone to every 20 prisoners and they should all have privacy hoods or enclosures. (2.13)
- 5.34 The timeliness and quality of responses to prisoner applications should be monitored and improvements made where required. (2.14)
- 5.35 Prisoners should have reliable access to their stored property. (2.15)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.36 There should be an effective system for ensuring that prisoners know whom to ask for help with problems, for checking on their well-being and for supporting them in achieving progress. (2.21)
- 5.37 Consultation with prisoners should be regular, consistent and accountable. (2.22)

Equality and diversity

- 5.38 Prisoners from minority groups should be identified accurately. (2.28)
- 5.39 The diversity officer should be suitably trained. (2.29)
- 5.40 Dedicated forums and prisoner representatives from minority groups should be introduced. (2.30)
- 5.41 Prisoners with disabilities should have multidisciplinary care plans, which are available on the wings to identify any additional support required. (2.39)
- 5.42 Prisoners who have been allocated responsibility for carrying out diversity work should be suitably trained and supported. (2.40)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.43 Prisoners should be able to attend religious services and activities without registering. (2.47)
- 5.44 Muslim Friday prayers should be conducted in a suitable venue. (2.48)

Complaints

- 5.45 Complaints should be analysed in order to determine relevant patterns and trends. (2.52)

Health services

- 5.46 Health promotion should be developed and literature readily available. (2.66)
- 5.47 Wing treatment rooms should be kept clean and equipped, with adequate storage. (2.67)
- 5.48 A separate secondary health assessment should be completed within 72 hours of arrival. (2.76)
- 5.49 Chronic disease management should be developed, to include regular clinics for prisoners with diabetes, coronary heart disease and epilepsy. (2.77)
- 5.50 Prisoners located on the inpatient unit should be provided with a suitably therapeutic environment and activity. (2.78)
- 5.51 There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities. (2.79)
- 5.52 The in-possession risk assessment should adequately reflect and assess the risk of the individual patient and the specified medicine. (2.91)
- 5.53 There should be adequate supervision of medication queues by prison staff. (2.92)
- 5.54 Pharmacist-led clinics and medicines use reviews should take place. (2.93)

- 5.55 Arrangements for the storage, administration, disposal and recording of controlled drugs should comply with regulations and infection control requirements. (2.94)
- 5.56 Clean and dirty areas should be separated to meet best practice guidelines. (2.104)
- 5.57 Primary mental health services should meet the needs of the prison population. (2.113)
- 5.58 Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training. (2.114)

Catering

- 5.59 Prisoners' should be consulted on their views on food and action taken to improve quality and quantity. (2.120)

Time out of cell

- 5.60 Prisoners should be given the opportunity for one hour of exercise in the open air every day. (3.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.61 Sentence planning should link effectively with the allocation process, and regime interruptions to learning and skills and work activities should be reduced. (3.11)
- 5.62 A prison-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work, which includes all activities and fully informs action planning for improvement, should be developed and implemented. (3.12)
- 5.63 The session observation scheme to improve the quality of teaching and learning and assessment should be developed further. (3.13)
- 5.64 All work and training opportunities should be formally accredited to national standards, and skills not formally accredited should be recognised and recorded to support prisoners' employment needs. (3.18)
- 5.65 Appropriate English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) qualifications should be introduced. (3.22)
- 5.66 The analysis and use of data should be improved, to identify the achievements of different groups of learners and ensure that all their needs are identified and met. (3.23)
- 5.67 Prisoners' learning and skills outcomes should be appropriately tailored towards a short-term population and achievement rates should be improved. (3.26)
- 5.68 The library should increase its opening hours on both sites. (3.30)
- 5.69 More careers and employment-related information should be available. (3.31)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.70 Levels of participation in recreational PE should be improved. (3.37)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.71 A comprehensive reducing reoffending strategy should be in place which is based on a comprehensive needs analysis and supported by a detailed action plan, including the provision of offending behaviour work and release on temporary licence. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.72 All prisoners serving over 12 months should have an offender supervisor who provides them with regular and meaningful contact which is appropriately overseen by a line manager. (4.14)
- 5.73 There should be high-quality assessments and plans for managing the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm for all relevant prisoners, and sentence planning boards should be multidisciplinary. (4.15)
- 5.74 Reviews of child contact restrictions should be completed at the earliest opportunity. (4.20)
- 5.75 Prisoners serving an indeterminate sentence should have access to a discussion forum in order to understand the processes they face, and family days should be available to them. (4.25)

Reintegration planning

- 5.76 The number of homeless prisoners helped to find accommodation on release should be monitored to demonstrate effectiveness. (4.32)
- 5.77 A more structured pre-release programme should be provided, particularly on the West Hill site, to improve prisoners' preparation for employment and reintegration into the community. (4.34)
- 5.78 Links with employers in the local community should be further developed, to provide meaningful employment and training opportunities for prisoners on release. (4.35)
- 5.79 There should be pre-release clinics to enable prisoners' ongoing health needs to be met and to link them to a local GP and community health services on release. (4.38)
- 5.80 All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (4.46)
- 5.81 The number of family days should be increased. (4.47)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.82 The holding rooms used for vulnerable prisoners should be adequately screened. (1.21)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.83 ACCT documents should be maintained and organised to enable key issues to be identified. (1.39)
- 5.84 Action plans from deaths in custody should be reviewed at the safer custody meetings. (1.40)

Security

- 5.85 Attendance at the security committee should reflect those listed in the terms of reference. (1.55)
- 5.86 Monthly security objectives should be action based and appropriately publicised to staff. (1.56)

Discipline

- 5.87 F213 injury to prisoner forms should be fully completed whenever use of force documentation is required. (1.66)
- 5.88 Video recordings of use of force incidents should be continuous and of a high enough quality to evidence proceedings. (1.67)

Residential units

- 5.89 An appropriate offensive displays policy should be enforced. (2.16)

Complaints

- 5.90 Complaint forms should always be readily available. (2.53)

Health services

- 5.91 Prisoners should be able to consult with medical staff in private. (2.80)
- 5.92 The drugs and therapeutics committee should meet quarterly as planned and include representation from the supplying pharmacy. (2.95)
- 5.93 In-possession risk assessments should be available to the pharmacist during dispensing. (2.96)
- 5.94 All staff working in the health care department should be proficient in the operation of SystemOne. (2.97)
- 5.95 All nursing staff should be able to use patient group directions. (2.98)
- 5.96 Use of medicines from the out-of-hours cupboard should reflect Nursing and Midwifery Council guidance on the administration of medicines by nurses. (2.99)
- 5.97 There should be adequate storage space for equipment and consumables. (2.105)

Catering

- 5.98 Food should be served at recognised meal times. (2.121)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.99 Learning and skills staff should attend the sentence planning reviews of prisoners known to them. (3.14)
- 5.100 The quality of paper-based learning materials should be improved. (3.24)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.101 Health services staff should notify the gym of prisoners unfit for physical activity. (3.38)

Offender management and planning

- 5.102 Home detention curfew processes and their outcomes should be monitored and action taken to address issues. (4.16)

Reintegration planning

- 5.103 All prisoners should have a custody plan and pre-release interviews should be held well in advance of release. (4.29)
- 5.104 The reason for those on the main wings not knowing whom to turn to for help should be explored and action taken to improve prisoner perceptions. (4.30)
- 5.105 Visits booking facilities should be improved. (4.48)
- 5.106 A system should be implemented to ensure that all visitors access the visits hall on time. (4.49)
- 5.107 Prisoners should not have to wear identification bibs. (4.50)
- 5.108 The fixed furniture in the visits hall should be replaced and closed visits booths should provide adequate privacy. (4.51)

Examples of good practice

Health services

- 5.109 A daily multidisciplinary meeting, which included wide representation from the prison and health care professionals, was held to discuss and plan the care of inpatient prisoners. (2.81)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Ian MacFadyen	Inspector
Laura Nettleingham	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher
Olayinka Macauley	Researcher
Caroline Elwood	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Helen Carter	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Eilean Robson	Pharmacist
Tim Inkson	CQC
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Eileen O'Sullivan	Offender management inspector
Ian Simpkins	HMI Probation
Martyn Griffiths	HMI Probation
Janet Crowe	Prison Reform Trust

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	0	408	61.9
Recall	0	41	6.2
Convicted unsentenced	0	72	10.9
Remand	0	134	20.3
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	4	0.7
Total	0	659	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	215	32.6
Less than 6 months	0	78	11.8
6 months to less than 12 months	0	42	6.4
12 months to less than 2 years	0	76	11.5
2 years to less than 4 years	0	114	17.4
4 years to less than 10 years	0	66	10.0
10 years and over (not life)	0	35	5.3
ISPP	0	19	5.0
Life	0	14	
Total	0	659	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age 21		
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	257	39.0
30 years to 39 years	197	29.9
40 years to 49 years	123	18.7
50 years to 59 years	56	8.5
60 years to 69 years	17	2.6
70 plus years	9	1.3
Please state maximum age 84		
Total	659	100

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	0	578	87.7
Foreign nationals	0	59	9.0
Not stated	0	22	3.3
Total	0	659	100

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	274	41.6
Uncategorised sentenced	0	1	0.15
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	50	7.58
Category C	0	324	49.16
Category D	0	10	1.51

Other	0	0	0.0
Total	0	659	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White	0		
British	0	525	79.7
Irish	0	5	0.76
Other white	0	33	5
	0		
Mixed	0		
White and black Caribbean	0	3	0.5
White and black African	0	2	0.3
White and Asian	0	2	0.3
Other mixed	0	1	0.2
	0		
Asian or Asian British	0		
Indian	0	9	1.4
Pakistani	0	4	0.6
Bangladeshi	0	4	0.6
Other Asian	0	3	0.5
	0		
Black or black British	0		
Caribbean	0	26	3.9
African	0	14	2.1
Other black	0	8	1.2
	0		
Chinese or other ethnic group	0		
Chinese	0	1	0.2
Arab	0	0	0.0
Other ethnic group	0	4	0.6
	0		
Not stated	0	15	2.3
Total	0	659	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	0	0
Church of England	0	164	24.9
Roman Catholic	0	103	15.6
Other Christian denominations	0	76	11.5
Muslim	0	48	7.3
Sikh	0	7	1.1
Hindu	0	2	0.3
Buddhist	0	11	1.7
Jewish	0	4	0.6
Other	0	6	0.9
No religion	0	215	32.6
Not stated	0	23	3.5
Total	0	659	100

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	0	33	5
Total	0		

Other demographics	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	0		
Total	0		

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	116	17.6
1 month to 3 months	0	0	126	19.1
3 months to 6 months	0	0	93	14.1
6 months to 1 year	0	0	69	10.5
1 year to 2 years	0	0	34	5.2
2 years to 4 years	0	0	6	0.9
4 years or more	0	0	0	0.0
Total	0	0	444	67.4

Sentenced prisoners only

	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	4	0.6
Public protection cases	0	220	33.39
Total	0	224	33.99

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	67	31.2
1 month to 3 months	0	0	75	34.9
3 months to 6 months	0	0	46	21.4
6 months to 1 year	0	0	20	9.3
1 year to 2 years	0	0	4	1.9
2 years to 4 years	0	0	3	1.4
4 years or more	0	0	0	0.0
Total	0	0	215	32.6

Main offence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person			
Sexual offences			
Burglary			
Robbery			
Theft and handling			
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences			
Other offences			
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
Total			

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 18 September 2012, the prisoner population at HMP Winchester was 544. The sample size was 193. Overall, this represented 35% of the prisoner population.

HMP West Hill, a category C training facility at HMP Winchester, was sampled separately. In total there were 123 prisoners; all were offered a survey.

Selecting the sample

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

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Ten respondents (four on the main site and six at HMP West Hill) refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, three respondents on the main site were interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

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

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

Response rates

On the main site, 173 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 32% of the prison population. The response rate was 90%. In addition to the four respondents on the main site who refused to complete a questionnaire, 12 questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

At HMP West Hill, 115 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 93% of the population of this unit and, as all prisoners received a survey, this was also the response rate. In addition to the six respondents who refused to complete the questionnaire, two questionnaires were not returned.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses 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.
- 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 prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background and those who do not consider themselves to be from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between D wing and all other wings (on the local site) of the establishment.
- The current survey responses for HMP West Hill in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in category C prisons. This comparator is based on all the responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 38 category C trainer prisons since April 2007.
- A comparison within the HMP West Hill 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

- A comparison within the HMP West Hill 2012 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

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

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

Summary

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question. 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 (main site)

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	2	(1%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	69	(40%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	52	(30%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	29	(17%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	10	(6%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	7	(4%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	4	(2%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	83	(48%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	16	(9%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	37	(21%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	37	(21%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	74	(44%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	30	(18%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	6	(4%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	8	(5%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	17	(10%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	16	(10%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	11	(7%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>Life</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	<i>Yes</i>	11	(6%)
	<i>No</i>	162	(94%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	169	(99%)
	<i>No</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	168	(98%)
	<i>No</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)</i>	134 (79%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	9 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Arab</i> 0 (0%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> ..	1 (1%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	2 (1%)		

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

Yes	16 (10%)
No	148 (90%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	58 (35%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	54 (33%)	<i>Jewish</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Catholic</i>	24 (15%)	<i>Muslim</i>	13 (8%)
<i>Protestant</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	9 (5%)	<i>Other</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	159 (94%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	6 (4%)

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	52 (31%)
No	117 (69%)

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

Yes	11 (7%)
No	157 (93%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	47 (28%)
No	123 (72%)

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

Yes	95 (56%)
No	75 (44%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	136 (79%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	26 (15%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (6%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	136 (80%)
Yes	12 (7%)
No	19 (11%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	136 (80%)
Yes	4 (2%)

No 26 (15%)
 Don't remember 4 (2%)

Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?
 Yes 115 (68%)
 No 42 (25%)
 Don't remember 13 (8%)

Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?
 Yes 123 (72%)
 No 44 (26%)
 Don't remember 4 (2%)

Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?
 Very well 39 (23%)
 Well 79 (46%)
 Neither 37 (21%)
 Badly 12 (7%)
 Very badly 3 (2%)
 Don't remember 3 (2%)

**Q2.7 Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here?
 (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
 Yes, someone told me 121 (71%)
 Yes, I received written information 3 (2%)
 No, I was not told anything 39 (23%)
 Don't remember 9 (5%)

Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?
 Yes 146 (84%)
 No 20 (12%)
 Don't remember 7 (4%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?
 Less than 2 hours 58 (34%)
 2 hours or longer 103 (61%)
 Don't remember 9 (5%)

Q3.2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?
 Yes 137 (81%)
 No 26 (15%)
 Don't remember 6 (4%)

Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?
 Very well 24 (14%)
 Well 70 (41%)
 Neither 41 (24%)
 Badly 23 (14%)
 Very badly 7 (4%)
 Don't remember 5 (3%)

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>	22 (13%)	<i>Physical health</i>
	<i>Housing problems</i>	36 (22%)	<i>Mental health</i>
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>
	<i>Contacting family</i>	56 (34%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>
	<i>Childcare</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other</i>
	<i>Money worries</i>	39 (23%)	Did not have any problems
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	51 (31%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	<i>Yes</i>	46 (28%)	
	<i>No</i>	90 (55%)	
	Did not have any problems	29 (18%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>	134 (78%)	
	<i>A shower</i>	22 (13%)	
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	47 (27%)	
	<i>Something to eat</i>	123 (72%)	
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>	89 (52%)	
	<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>	103 (60%)	
	Did not receive anything	7 (4%)	
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>	69 (41%)	
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	110 (65%)	
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	63 (38%)	
	<i>Prison shop/canteen</i>	25 (15%)	
	Did not have access to any of these	34 (20%)	
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	70 (43%)	
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	70 (43%)	
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	56 (34%)	
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	57 (35%)	
	<i>Health services</i>	73 (45%)	
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>	55 (34%)	
	Not offered any information	46 (28%)	
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	<i>Yes</i>	119 (70%)	
	<i>No</i>	46 (27%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (4%)	
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?		
	Have not been on an induction course	20 (12%)	
	<i>Within the first week</i>	120 (71%)	
	<i>More than a week</i>	26 (15%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)	

Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	20 (12%)
	Yes	72 (43%)
	No	64 (38%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (7%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	46 (27%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	31 (18%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	84 (49%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (5%)

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>	12 (7%)	34 (20%)	27 (16%)	45 (27%)	32 (19%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	18 (12%)	51 (33%)	31 (20%)	17 (11%)	14 (9%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	2 (1%)	22 (15%)	31 (21%)	35 (23%)	17 (11%)
						42 (28%)
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>					26 (15%)
	Yes					65 (38%)
	No					80 (47%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	Yes					48 (28%)
	No					23 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					100 (58%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	62 (36%)	106 (62%)	3 (2%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	44 (26%)	124 (73%)	1 (1%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	119 (71%)	44 (26%)	4 (2%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	110 (65%)	53 (32%)	5 (3%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	26 (16%)	130 (78%)	10 (6%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	77 (47%)	87 (53%)	1 (1%)		

If you need to, can you normally get your stored property? 22 (13%) 106 (63%) 40 (24%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good 0 (0%)
 Good 22 (13%)
 Neither 29 (17%)
 Bad 48 (28%)
 Very bad 74 (43%)

Q4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?

Have not bought anything yet/don't know 11 (6%)
 Yes 80 (47%)
 No 81 (47%)

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

Yes 104 (61%)
 No 22 (13%)
 Don't know 45 (26%)

Q4.8 Are your religious beliefs respected?

Yes 72 (42%)
 No 27 (16%)
 Don't know/N/A 71 (42%)

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

Yes 77 (45%)
 No 18 (11%)
 Don't know/N/A 75 (44%)

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

I don't want to attend 35 (20%)
 Very easy 16 (9%)
 Easy 50 (29%)
 Neither 13 (8%)
 Difficult 12 (7%)
 Very difficult 12 (7%)
 Don't know 33 (19%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes 126 (75%)
 No 36 (21%)
 Don't know 6 (4%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications:

(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are applications dealt with fairly?	19 (12%)	65 (41%)	76 (48%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	19 (13%)	35 (24%)	91 (63%)

Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes	84	(50%)	
	No	36	(21%)	
	Don't know	48	(29%)	
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?	68 (42%)	29 (18%)	64 (40%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	68 (43%)	24 (15%)	65 (41%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes	33	(22%)	
	No	119	(78%)	
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>	62	(39%)	
	Very easy	11	(7%)	
	Easy	22	(14%)	
	Neither	30	(19%)	
	Difficult	22	(14%)	
	Very difficult	13	(8%)	

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	21	(13%)	
	Yes	49	(30%)	
	No	61	(37%)	
	Don't know	34	(21%)	
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>	21	(13%)	
	Yes	55	(34%)	
	No	70	(43%)	
	Don't know	18	(11%)	
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes	12	(7%)	
	No	151	(93%)	
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?			
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	136	(84%)	
	Very well	3	(2%)	
	Well	7	(4%)	
	Neither	8	(5%)	
	Badly	4	(2%)	
	Very badly	4	(2%)	

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	106 (64%)
	No	59 (36%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	117 (70%)
	No	50 (30%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	30 (18%)
	No	139 (82%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	4 (2%)
	Never	62 (37%)
	Rarely	51 (30%)
	Some of the time	29 (17%)
	Most of the time	14 (8%)
	All of the time	9 (5%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	111 (66%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	39 (23%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (7%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/ her</i>	111 (69%)
	Very helpful	10 (6%)
	Helpful	11 (7%)
	Neither	11 (7%)
	Not very helpful	8 (5%)
	Not at all helpful	11 (7%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	91 (53%)
	No	82 (47%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	25 (16%)
	No	136 (84%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	82 (49%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	32 (19%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>At mealtimes</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>At health services</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	9 (5%)

<i>In an exercise yard</i>	36 (21%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	21 (13%)
<i>At work</i>	6 (4%)	<i>In your cell</i>	18 (11%)
<i>During movement</i>	21 (13%)	<i>At religious services</i>	9 (5%)
<i>At education</i>	3 (2%)		

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

Yes	60 (35%)
No	110 (65%)

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>	25 (15%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	15 (9%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	32 (19%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	15 (9%)
<i>Medication</i>	13 (8%)
<i>Debt</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Drugs</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Your age</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	9 (5%)
<i>You were new here</i>	16 (9%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	15 (9%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	7 (4%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	74 (45%)
No	92 (55%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	35 (21%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	37 (22%)
<i>Medication</i>	20 (12%)
<i>Debt</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Drugs</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	7 (4%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (4%)
<i>You were new here</i>	14 (8%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	3 (2%)

Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	72 (47%)
	Yes	21 (14%)
	No	60 (39%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	25 (15%)	4 (2%)	22 (13%)	14 (8%)	60 (36%)	43 (26%)
	The nurse	28 (17%)	19 (12%)	56 (34%)	10 (6%)	31 (19%)	20 (12%)
	The dentist	44 (27%)	2 (1%)	9 (5%)	6 (4%)	39 (24%)	64 (39%)

Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	25 (15%)	13 (8%)	38 (23%)	25 (15%)	41 (25%)	24 (14%)
	The nurse	26 (16%)	24 (14%)	42 (25%)	29 (17%)	24 (14%)	21 (13%)
	The dentist	60 (38%)	15 (9%)	16 (10%)	17 (11%)	25 (16%)	26 (16%)

Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>Not been</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Very good</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Good</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Neither</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>Bad</i>	49 (30%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	32 (20%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	102 (61%)
	No	65 (39%)

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	65 (39%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	30 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	40 (24%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	72 (43%)
	No	95 (57%)

Q9.7	Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	95 (57%)
	Yes	20 (12%)
	No	51 (31%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	64 (38%)
	No	105 (62%)

Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	39 (23%)
	No	130 (77%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	27 (16%)
	Easy	32 (19%)
	Neither	21 (13%)
	Difficult	8 (5%)
	Very difficult	8 (5%)
	Don't know	72 (43%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	9 (5%)
	Easy	14 (8%)
	Neither	21 (13%)
	Difficult	12 (7%)
	Very difficult	24 (14%)
	Don't know	87 (52%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	15 (9%)
	No	154 (91%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	15 (9%)
	No	148 (91%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	97 (60%)
	Yes	41 (25%)
	No	23 (14%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	130 (77%)
	Yes	14 (8%)
	No	24 (14%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	119 (74%)
	Yes	32 (20%)
	No	9 (6%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	
						<i>Very difficult</i>	
	Prison job	26 (16%)	6 (4%)	13 (8%)	11 (7%)	62 (37%)	48 (29%)

Vocational or skills training	37 (23%)	4 (3%)	16 (10%)	24 (15%)	43 (27%)	35 (22%)
Education (including basic skills)	26 (16%)	10 (6%)	28 (18%)	22 (14%)	46 (29%)	27 (17%)
Offending behaviour programmes	55 (35%)	1 (1%)	7 (4%)	14 (9%)	35 (22%)	46 (29%)

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

Not involved in any of these	74 (46%)
Prison job	52 (32%)
Vocational or skills training	11 (7%)
Education (including basic skills).....	38 (24%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	5 (3%)

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	68 (49%)	21 (15%)	35 (25%)	15 (11%)
Vocational or skills training	77 (63%)	13 (11%)	19 (16%)	13 (11%)
Education (including basic skills)	63 (46%)	36 (26%)	23 (17%)	15 (11%)
Offending behaviour programmes	77 (62%)	15 (12%)	19 (15%)	13 (10%)

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

Don't want to go	20 (12%)
<i>Never</i>	53 (32%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	57 (35%)
<i>About once a week</i>	30 (18%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	5 (3%)

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

Don't use it	50 (31%)
Yes	44 (28%)
No	65 (41%)

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

Don't want to go	31 (20%)
<i>0</i>	35 (22%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	83 (53%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	8 (5%)
<i>More than 5</i>	0 (0%)

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

Don't want to go	25 (16%)
<i>0</i>	19 (12%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	23 (15%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	53 (34%)
<i>More than 5</i>	38 (24%)

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

Don't want to go	3 (2%)
<i>0</i>	4 (3%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	68 (43%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	70 (44%)
<i>More than 5</i>	14 (9%)

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>	81 (50%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	26 (16%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	29 (18%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (2%)

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?	
	<i>Yes</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>No</i>	127 (80%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	88 (54%)
	<i>No</i>	75 (46%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	98 (61%)
	<i>No</i>	63 (39%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Easy</i>	34 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (6%)

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>	74 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i>	49 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	41 (25%)
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>	115 (68%)
	<i>No contact</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Letter</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Phone</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Visit</i>	18 (11%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	43 (27%)
	<i>No</i>	119 (73%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	74	(44%)	
	Yes	22	(13%)	
	No	72	(43%)	
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	146	(87%)	
	<i>Very involved</i>	0	(0%)	
	<i>Involved</i>	4	(2%)	
	<i>Neither</i>	3	(2%)	
	<i>Not very involved</i>	8	(5%)	
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	7	(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>	146	(86%)	
	<i>Nobody</i>	12	(7%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	5	(3%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i>	6	(4%)	
	<i>Named/personal officer</i>	3	(2%)	
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	4	(2%)	
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	146	(86%)	
	Yes	4	(2%)	
	No	14	(8%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	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>	146	(87%)	
	Yes	12	(7%)	
	No	5	(3%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	5	(3%)	
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	146	(87%)	
	Yes	7	(4%)	
	No	6	(4%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	8	(5%)	
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes	10	(6%)	
	No	73	(46%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	76	(48%)	
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes	15	(9%)	
	No	145	(91%)	
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	30 (19%)	33 (21%)	93 (60%)

Accommodation	25 (16%)	50 (33%)	78 (51%)
Benefits	21 (14%)	63 (41%)	71 (46%)
Finances	24 (16%)	26 (18%)	96 (66%)
Education	30 (21%)	36 (25%)	79 (54%)
Drugs and alcohol	36 (23%)	58 (37%)	61 (39%)

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	74 (45%)
Yes	31 (19%)
No	60 (36%)

Survey summary (HMP West Hill)

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		47 (41%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		31 (27%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		23 (20%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		10 (9%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		2 (2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		2 (2%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		110 (96%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		5 (4%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced		0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		15 (13%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		19 (17%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		26 (23%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		37 (32%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		15 (13%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		2 (2%)
	<i>Life</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		7 (6%)
	<i>No</i>		108 (94%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		114 (99%)
	<i>No</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		113 (98%)
	<i>No</i>		2 (2%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish).....</i>	88 (79%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> .. 1 (1%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	11 (10%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 0 (0%)

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

- Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?**
 Yes 8 (7%)
 No 102 (93%)
- Q1.10 What is your religion?**
None 50 (44%) *Hindu*..... 0 (0%)
Church of England 31 (27%) *Jewish*..... 0 (0%)
Catholic..... 17 (15%) *Muslim* 5 (4%)
Protestant..... 2 (2%) *Sikh* 2 (2%)
Other Christian denomination 3 (3%) *Other*..... 2 (2%)
Buddhist 2 (2%)
- Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?**
Heterosexual/straight 114(100%)
Homosexual/gay 0 (0%)
Bisexual..... 0 (0%)
- Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?**
 Yes 13 (11%)
 No 102 (89%)
- Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?**
 Yes 10 (9%)
 No 104 (91%)
- Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?**
 Yes 37 (32%)
 No 77 (68%)
- Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?**
 Yes 66 (58%)
 No 48 (42%)

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 96 (83%)
2 hours or longer..... 16 (14%)
Don't remember 3 (3%)
- Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?**
My journey was less than two hours..... 96 (83%)
 Yes 9 (8%)
 No 9 (8%)
 Don't remember 1 (1%)
- Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?**
My journey was less than two hours..... 96 (83%)

Yes	2 (2%)
No	16 (14%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?

Yes	65 (57%)
No	41 (36%)
Don't remember	9 (8%)

Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?

Yes	87 (76%)
No	26 (23%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

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

Very well	23 (20%)
Well	62 (54%)
Neither	27 (23%)
Badly	2 (2%)
Very badly	0 (0%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

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

Yes, someone told me	90 (78%)
Yes, I received written information	2 (2%)
No, I was not told anything	21 (18%)
Don't remember	2 (2%)

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

Yes	99 (86%)
No	9 (8%)
Don't remember	7 (6%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?

Less than 2 hours	42 (37%)
2 hours or longer	70 (61%)
Don't remember	2 (2%)

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

Yes	83 (74%)
No	24 (21%)
Don't remember	5 (4%)

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

Very well	10 (9%)
Well	61 (54%)
Neither	27 (24%)
Badly	12 (11%)
Very badly	3 (3%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	13 (11%)	<i>Physical health</i>
	<i>Housing problems</i>	25 (22%)	<i>Mental health</i>
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	4 (4%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>
	<i>Contacting family</i>	27 (24%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>
	<i>Childcare</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Other</i>
	<i>Money worries</i>	28 (25%)	Did not have any problems
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	13 (11%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	Yes	32 (29%)	
	No	46 (42%)	
	Did not have any problems	32 (29%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>	88 (77%)	
	<i>A shower</i>	20 (17%)	
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	42 (37%)	
	<i>Something to eat</i>	76 (66%)	
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>	63 (55%)	
	<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>	57 (50%)	
	Did not receive anything	6 (5%)	
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>	44 (39%)	
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	75 (67%)	
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	44 (39%)	
	<i>Prison shop/canteen</i>	15 (13%)	
	Did not have access to any of these	20 (18%)	
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	60 (55%)	
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	49 (45%)	
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	44 (40%)	
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	40 (37%)	
	<i>Health services</i>	54 (50%)	
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>	43 (39%)	
	Not offered any information	24 (22%)	
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	Yes	89 (77%)	
	No	23 (20%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (3%)	
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?		
	Have not been on an induction course	5 (4%)	
	<i>Within the first week</i>	92 (81%)	
	<i>More than a week</i>	15 (13%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (2%)	

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 5 (4%)
 Yes 58 (51%)
 No 43 (38%)
 Don't remember 7 (6%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?
Did not receive an assessment..... 18 (16%)
 Within the first week 28 (25%)
 More than a week 61 (54%)
 Don't remember 7 (6%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	9 (8%)	32 (29%)	18 (17%)	24 (22%)	12 (11%)	14 (13%)
<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	11 (11%)	40 (39%)	13 (13%)	10 (10%)	7 (7%)	22 (21%)
<i>Get bail information?</i>	4 (4%)	13 (13%)	17 (17%)	18 (18%)	8 (8%)	38 (39%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?
Not had any letters 6 (5%)
 Yes 47 (41%)
 No 61 (54%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?
 Yes 29 (25%)
 No 23 (20%)
 Don't know 62 (54%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	70 (61%)	40 (35%)	4 (4%)
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	111 (97%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	85 (76%)	26 (23%)	1 (1%)
<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	93 (82%)	14 (12%)	6 (5%)
<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	27 (24%)	63 (56%)	23 (20%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	83 (74%)	26 (23%)	3 (3%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	18 (16%)	68 (61%)	26 (23%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	Very good	0	(0%)
	Good	6	(5%)
	Neither	20	(18%)
	Bad	29	(26%)
	Very bad	58	(51%)
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>	2	(2%)
	Yes	36	(31%)
	No	77	(67%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?		
	Yes	52	(45%)
	No	13	(11%)
	Don't know	50	(43%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	Yes	39	(34%)
	No	15	(13%)
	Don't know/N/A	61	(53%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	Yes	44	(38%)
	No	10	(9%)
	Don't know/N/A	61	(53%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	31	(27%)
	Very easy	19	(17%)
	Easy	20	(17%)
	Neither	9	(8%)
	Difficult	7	(6%)
	Very difficult	6	(5%)
	Don't know	23	(20%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes	100	(88%)	
	No	13	(11%)	
	Don't know	1	(1%)	
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?	4 (4%)	50 (46%)	55 (50%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	4 (4%)	39 (39%)	58 (57%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes			56 (52%)

No	13 (12%)
Don't know	39 (36%)

Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints:

(If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	67 (60%)	15 (13%)	30 (27%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	67 (61%)	18 (17%)	24 (22%)

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

Yes	11 (11%)
No	92 (89%)

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>	44 (39%)
Very easy	4 (4%)
Easy	16 (14%)
Neither	30 (27%)
Difficult	12 (11%)
Very difficult	6 (5%)

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>	10 (9%)
Yes	69 (61%)
No	24 (21%)
Don't know	11 (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>	10 (9%)
Yes	57 (51%)
No	33 (30%)
Don't know	11 (10%)

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

Yes	2 (2%)
No	110 (98%)

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>	101 (95%)
Very well	1 (1%)
Well	0 (0%)
Neither	2 (2%)
Badly	1 (1%)
Very badly	1 (1%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	88 (78%)
	No	25 (22%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	80 (71%)
	No	33 (29%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	17 (15%)
	No	96 (85%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	2 (2%)
	Never	32 (28%)
	Rarely	35 (31%)
	Some of the time	34 (30%)
	Most of the time	5 (4%)
	All of the time	5 (4%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	42 (37%)
	In the first week	16 (14%)
	More than a week	49 (43%)
	Don't remember	7 (6%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	42 (37%)
	Very helpful	21 (19%)
	Helpful	27 (24%)
	Neither	8 (7%)
	Not very helpful	11 (10%)
	Not at all helpful	4 (4%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	29 (26%)
	No	84 (74%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	6 (5%)
	No	105 (95%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	84 (80%)
	Everywhere	1 (1%)
	Segregation unit	0 (0%)
	Association areas	4 (4%)
	Reception area	2 (2%)
	At the gym	1 (1%)
	At mealtimes	2 (2%)
	At health services	3 (3%)
	Visits area	0 (0%)
	In wing showers	3 (3%)
	In gym showers	0 (0%)
	In corridors/stairwells	3 (3%)

<i>In an exercise yard</i>	5 (5%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	10 (10%)
<i>At work</i>	1 (1%)	<i>In your cell</i>	10 (10%)
<i>During movement</i>	3 (3%)	<i>At religious services</i>	2 (2%)
<i>At education</i>	0 (0%)		

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

Yes	18 (16%)
No	93 (84%)

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

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	27 (24%)
No	85 (76%)

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

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

Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	77 (74%)
	Yes	6 (6%)
	No	21 (20%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	12 (11%)	1 (1%)	21 (19%)	11 (10%)	48 (44%)	16 (15%)
	The nurse	9 (8%)	15 (14%)	51 (47%)	14 (13%)	13 (12%)	6 (6%)
	The dentist	12 (11%)	1 (1%)	13 (12%)	10 (9%)	28 (26%)	44 (41%)

Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	19 (17%)	5 (5%)	29 (26%)	21 (19%)	23 (21%)	14 (13%)
	The nurse	13 (12%)	8 (7%)	38 (34%)	20 (18%)	17 (15%)	15 (14%)
	The dentist	30 (28%)	18 (17%)	19 (18%)	10 (9%)	13 (12%)	17 (16%)

Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>Not been</i>	11 (10%)
	<i>Very good</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Good</i>	27 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i>	26 (24%)
	<i>Bad</i>	25 (23%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	17 (16%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	51 (46%)
	No	60 (54%)

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/all of it in your own cell?	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	60 (55%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	27 (25%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	18 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (5%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	28 (25%)
	No	83 (75%)

Q9.7	Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	83 (76%)
	Yes	9 (8%)
	No	17 (16%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	34 (30%)
	No	78 (70%)

Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	29 (26%)
	No	83 (74%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	16 (14%)
	Easy	17 (15%)
	Neither	9 (8%)
	Difficult	5 (5%)
	Very difficult	10 (9%)
	Don't know	54 (49%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	12 (11%)
	Easy	9 (8%)
	Neither	13 (12%)
	Difficult	5 (4%)
	Very difficult	11 (10%)
	Don't know	62 (55%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	2 (2%)
	No	110 (98%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	3 (3%)
	No	109 (97%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	78 (70%)
	Yes	24 (22%)
	No	9 (8%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	83 (74%)
	Yes	16 (14%)
	No	13 (12%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	78 (71%)
	Yes	27 (25%)
	No	5 (5%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>
						<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	16 (14%)	5 (4%)	34 (30%)	19 (17%)	27 (24%)
						11 (10%)

Vocational or skills training	21 (19%)	9 (8%)	24 (22%)	20 (19%)	20 (19%)	14 (13%)
Education (including basic skills)	13 (13%)	14 (14%)	43 (42%)	14 (14%)	12 (12%)	7 (7%)
Offending behaviour programmes	25 (24%)	9 (9%)	16 (15%)	15 (14%)	16 (15%)	23 (22%)

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

Not involved in any of these	19 (18%)
Prison job	62 (57%)
Vocational or skills training	10 (9%)
Education (including basic skills).....	36 (33%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	12 (11%)

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	30 (31%)	25 (26%)	30 (31%)	11 (11%)
Vocational or skills training	34 (49%)	17 (25%)	13 (19%)	5 (7%)
Education (including basic skills)	22 (27%)	41 (49%)	13 (16%)	7 (8%)
Offending behaviour programmes	28 (35%)	34 (43%)	8 (10%)	9 (11%)

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

Don't want to go	17 (15%)
<i>Never</i>	22 (20%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	34 (31%)
<i>About once a week</i>	27 (24%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	11 (10%)

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

Don't use it	20 (18%)
Yes	29 (26%)
No	61 (55%)

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

Don't want to go	23 (21%)
<i>0</i>	12 (11%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	32 (29%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	42 (39%)
<i>More than 5</i>	0 (0%)

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

Don't want to go	1 (1%)
<i>0</i>	6 (5%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	24 (22%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	50 (45%)
<i>More than 5</i>	29 (26%)

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

Don't want to go	1 (1%)
<i>0</i>	1 (1%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	61 (56%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	44 (41%)
<i>More than 5</i>	1 (1%)

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>	11 (10%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	13 (12%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	26 (24%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	13 (12%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	29 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (10%)

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?	
	<i>Yes</i>	34 (32%)
	<i>No</i>	71 (68%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	55 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	55 (50%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	92 (84%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	15 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	13 (12%)
	<i>Easy</i>	42 (38%)
	<i>Neither</i>	15 (14%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	15 (14%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	10 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

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>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	62 (58%)
	<i>No</i>	44 (42%)
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>	44 (41%)
	<i>No contact</i>	25 (23%)
	<i>Letter</i>	22 (21%)
	<i>Phone</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Visit</i>	18 (17%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	24 (23%)
	<i>No</i>	82 (77%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0	(0%)	
	Yes	34	(32%)	
	No	73	(68%)	
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	73	(68%)	
	<i>Very involved</i>	8	(7%)	
	<i>Involved</i>	10	(9%)	
	<i>Neither</i>	6	(6%)	
	<i>Not very involved</i>	5	(5%)	
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	5	(5%)	
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>	73	(69%)	
	<i>Nobody</i>	14	(13%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	9	(8%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i>	7	(7%)	
	<i>Named/personal officer</i>	11	(10%)	
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	6	(6%)	
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	73	(68%)	
	Yes	16	(15%)	
	No	12	(11%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	7	(6%)	
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>	73	(68%)	
	Yes	5	(5%)	
	No	20	(19%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	10	(9%)	
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	73	(68%)	
	Yes	11	(10%)	
	No	12	(11%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	12	(11%)	
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes	6	(6%)	
	No	60	(56%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	41	(38%)	
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes	18	(17%)	
	No	91	(83%)	
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	19 (20%)	34 (36%)	42 (44%)

Accommodation	21 (21%)	45 (45%)	35 (35%)
Benefits	16 (16%)	52 (52%)	32 (32%)
Finances	21 (23%)	30 (33%)	39 (43%)
Education	24 (26%)	39 (43%)	28 (31%)
Drugs and alcohol	24 (26%)	42 (45%)	28 (30%)

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

Not sentenced	0 (0%)
Yes	55 (53%)
No	49 (47%)

Main comparator



Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester (Local) 2012

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		173	5481
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	6%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	57%	68%
1.3	Are you on recall?	9%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	21%	20%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	12%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	16%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	6%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	31%	20%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	28%	29%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	56%	54%
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%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	35%	44%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	12%	8%
2.4	Was the van clean?	68%	68%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	72%	78%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	71%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	7%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	84%	81%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	34%	49%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	74%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	58%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	83%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	22%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	34%	33%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	7%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	23%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	31%	21%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	25%	16%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	25%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	13%	9%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	31%	30%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	34%	42%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	78%	87%
3.6	A shower?	13%	33%
3.6	A free telephone call?	28%	57%
3.6	Something to eat?	72%	79%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	52%	54%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	60%	58%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	41%	50%
3.7	Someone from health services?	65%	76%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	38%	39%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	15%	14%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	43%	48%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	43%	48%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	34%	40%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	35%	45%
3.8	Health services?	45%	52%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	34%	48%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	70%	73%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	78%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	49%	58%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	73%	75%
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?	28%	41%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	45%	58%
4.1	Get bail information?	16%	23%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	38%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	28%	39%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	36%	53%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	26%	80%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	71%	82%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	66%	63%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	16%	38%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	47%	63%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	13%	27%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	13%	24%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	46%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	42%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	45%	55%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	39%	46%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	82%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	46%	57%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	28%	47%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	60%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	31%	31%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	27%	35%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	22%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	21%	22%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	30%	49%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	34%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	7%
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?	39%	40%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64%	71%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	70%	73%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	18%	35%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	18%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	34%	47%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	41%	64%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	53%	41%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	17%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	35%	21%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	7%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	19%	14%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	9%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	4%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	45%	25%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	12%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	26%	34%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	16%	27%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	46%	52%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	7%	10%
	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?	36%	44%
9.2	The nurse?	47%	57%
9.2	The dentist?	31%	32%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	23%	39%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	61%	50%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	60%	70%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	43%	34%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	28%	44%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	38%	36%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	23%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	28%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%	15%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	9%	8%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	9%	8%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	64%	65%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	37%	59%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	78%	78%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	12%	32%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	13%	28%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	24%	43%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	5%	21%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	32%	44%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	7%	10%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	24%	27%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	3%	8%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	51%	69%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	30%	42%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	37%	53%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	29%	50%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	54%	65%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	49%	58%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	38%	51%
	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?	32%	48%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	21%	36%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	28%	38%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	5%	31%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	58%	38%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	9%	49%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	8%	10%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	20%	35%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	54%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	61%	34%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	30%	30%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester	Local Prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	54%	62%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	32%	42%
13.2	Contact by letter?	27%	29%
13.2	Contact by phone?	17%	16%
13.2	Contact by visit?	34%	34%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	27%	29%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	23%	41%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	19%	56%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	52%	45%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	22%	30%
13.6	Offender manager?	26%	30%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	13%	17%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	18%	22%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	18%	62%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	55%	24%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	33%	32%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	9%	15%
	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?	26%	31%
13.12	Accommodation?	39%	45%
13.12	Benefits?	47%	46%
13.12	Finances?	21%	28%
13.12	Education?	31%	34%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	49%	50%
	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?	34%	46%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Winchester 2012

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		27	143
1.3	Are you sentenced?	45%	59%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	19%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	93%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	11%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	57%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	34%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	25%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	55%	74%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	65%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	50%	56%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	84%	83%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from healthcare when you first arrived here?	65%	66%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	54%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	77%	91%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	23%	29%

Key to tables

Diversity Analysis

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	33%	38%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	26%	27%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19%	16%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	4%	14%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	29%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	55%	62%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	41%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	38%	45%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	67%	76%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	49%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	23%	31%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	24%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	60%	64%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	54%	73%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (Most/all of the time)	7%	15%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	41%	34%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	55%	52%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	25%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	33%	36%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	11%	21%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	7%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	7%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	4%	6%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	59%	43%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	29%	21%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	7%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	15%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	46%	46%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	27%	67%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	20%	47%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	35%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	29%	33%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	15%	5%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	29%	22%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	3%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	35%	19%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	9%	5%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	70%	56%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	21%	7%
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%	8%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	62%	53%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	57%	61%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Winchester 2012

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability	
				Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		52	117		
				21	152
1.3	Are you sentenced?	69%	51%	71%	55%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	4%	0%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	100%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	94%	100%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	6%	20%	5%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	12%	9%	10%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	11%	0%	9%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			47%	28%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	6%	24%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	39%	23%	62%	23%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	69%	68%	80%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	76%	70%	60%	72%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	77%	85%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	53%	85%	52%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	84%	82%	72%	84%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	70%	64%	72%	65%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	70%	53%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	90%	78%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	31%	27%	42%	26%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	46%	32%	91%	29%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	33%	22%	37%	25%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	11%	15%	16%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	17%	10%	24%	11%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48%	45%	58%	45%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	72%	57%	70%	60%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	38%	56%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	49%	43%	50%	45%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	74%	79%	74%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	46%	44%	51%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	31%	29%	41%	28%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	32%	35%	37%	33%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	8%	5%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71%	60%	79%	62%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	72%	69%	75%	69%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	16%	13%	21%	13%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	43%	31%	48%	33%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	56%	51%	62%	51%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	14%	16%	15%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	43%	33%	38%	35%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	26%	16%	24%	18%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	4%	1%	9%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	14%	2%	9%	5%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	45%	46%	44%	45%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	20%	24%	21%	23%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	4%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	4%	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	2%	3%	10%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	10%	1%	15%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	16%	16%	0%	18%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	56%	42%	50%	45%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	82%	53%	96%	56%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	66%	33%	29%	45%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	44%	31%	33%	35%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	33%	31%	33%	32%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	6%	0%	8%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	31%	20%	20%	24%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	3%	0%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	23%	21%	15%	22%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	4%	6%	0%	6%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50%	61%	53%	58%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	11%	8%	0%	10%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	6%	8%	14%	6%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	48%	57%	30%	57%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	52%	65%	22%	66%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (Gypsy/Romany/Travellers) HMP Winchester 2012

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	Do not consider themselves to be a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	148
1.3	Are you sentenced?	56%	58%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	6%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?		
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	8%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	38%	29%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	6%	30%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	73%	72%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66%	53%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	78%	84%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	50%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	70%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	23%	29%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	Do not consider themselves to be a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	44%	35%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	12%	26%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	18%	14%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	6%	12%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	56%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	60%	63%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	34%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	45%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	60%	77%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	51%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	57%	27%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	21%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	7%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	54%	65%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	70%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	0%	14%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	21%	35%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	52%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24%	15%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	56%	34%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	31%	18%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised you are from a different part of the country than others? (By prisoners)	0%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you are from a Traveller community? (By prisoners)	31%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	6%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	Do not consider themselves to be a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller
	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?	68%	43%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	23%	23%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised you are from a different part of the country than others? (By staff)	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you are from a Traveller community? (By staff)	46%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%	15%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	43%	47%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	71%	60%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	81%	39%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	36%	35%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	36%	32%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	8%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	7%	25%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	30%	20%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	0%	6%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	78%	56%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	7%	9%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	0%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	61%	55%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	78%	61%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester (local) wing analysis 2012

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
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	44	129
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%
1.3 Are you sentenced?	75%	51%
1.3 Are you on recall?	12%	9%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	12%	25%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	2%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	14%	4%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	98%	99%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	98%	99%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	18%	15%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	10%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	10%	7%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	14%	3%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	44%	26%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	16%	3%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	67%	14%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	47%	59%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	20%	13%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	68%	73%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	78%	65%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	64%	73%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	83%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
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?	36% 33%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86% 79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70% 50%
	When you first arrived:	
3.4	Did you have any problems?	91% 79%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	18% 12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9% 26%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0% 3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	43% 30%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0% 2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	28% 22%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	52% 23%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	38% 20%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	34% 21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	34% 5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	34% 30%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:	
3.6	Tobacco?	50% 88%
3.6	A shower?	9% 14%
3.6	A free telephone call?	12% 33%
3.6	Something to eat?	66% 74%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	38% 57%
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	70% 57%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
	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?	26%	46%
3.7	Someone from health services?	70%	64%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	39%	37%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	23%	12%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	28%	48%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	33%	46%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	33%	35%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	33%	36%
3.8	Health services?	47%	44%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	23%	37%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	54%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	84%	90%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	73%	73%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	30%	27%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	30%	51%
4.1	Get bail information?	10%	18%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	41%	37%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	28%	28%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	52%	31%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	44%	20%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	70%	72%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	82%	60%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25%	12%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	35%	51%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	12%	14%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	13%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	48%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	62%	61%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	41%	47%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	20%	45%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	72%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	50%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	24%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	27%	18%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	26%	31%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	29%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	9%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	68%	63%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	70%	70%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	10%	21%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	7%	16%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	49%	29%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
	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?	78%	44%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	11%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	57%	28%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	28%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	8%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	34%	13%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	14%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	7%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	9%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	14%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	28%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	5%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
	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?	38%	47%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	24%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	4%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	28%	21%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	14%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	12%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	12%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
	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?	20%	14%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	52%	43%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	14%	4%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	70%	58%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	44%	43%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	14%	46%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	30%	37%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%	14%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	10%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	12%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D wing (VP)	(All other wings (A, B, C & HC))
	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?	14%	11%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	14%	12%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	28%	23%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	2%	6%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	30%	33%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	12%	5%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	33%	20%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	2%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	30%	18%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	31%	27%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	0%	7%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	63%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	21%	4%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	10%	7%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	22%	19%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	52%	55%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	51%	64%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	23%	32%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	34%	24%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	7%	10%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester (West Hill) 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 Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		115	5932
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	4%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	29%	5%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	10%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	9%	24%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	9%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	35%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	58%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	14%	45%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	48%	71%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	10%	9%
2.4	Was the van clean?	57%	68%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	76%	81%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	78%	61%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	19%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	86%	89%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	37%	52%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	71%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	72%	61%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	17%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	22%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	24%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	25%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	12%	13%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	10%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	7%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	21%	20%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	41%	39%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	76%	80%
3.6	A shower?	17%	32%
3.6	A free telephone call?	37%	43%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	69%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	55%	53%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	50%	44%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:			
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	39%	52%
3.7	Someone from health services?	67%	72%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	39%	36%
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	13%	17%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:			
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	55%	53%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	45%	46%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	40%	44%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	37%	45%
3.8	Health services?	50%	57%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	39%	50%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	83%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	96%	93%
For those who have been on an induction course:			
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	53%	66%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	84%	85%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:			
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	48%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	50%	53%
4.1	Get bail information?	17%	15%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	41%	42%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	25%	47%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:			
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	62%	64%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	91%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	76%	81%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	83%	74%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	24%	40%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	74%	71%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	16%	29%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	5%	29%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	32%	46%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	46%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	34%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	38%	58%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	34%	53%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	88%	86%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	48%	63%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	40%	52%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	63%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	33%	34%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	42%	40%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	11%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	31%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	61%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	51%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	5%
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?	20%	44%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	71%	76%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	15%	31%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	9%	20%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	63%	75%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	67%	64%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	26%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	13%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	16%	20%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	12%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	3%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	24%	25%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	21%	38%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	36%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	61%	58%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	13%	13%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
9.2	The doctor?	37%	49%
9.2	The nurse?	47%	62%
9.2	The dentist?	48%	42%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	31%	45%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	46%	46%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	91%	87%
9.6	Do you have any emotional wellbeing or mental health problems?	25%	25%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	36%	50%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	30%	23%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	26%	17%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	30%	30%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	19%	18%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	2%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	7%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	72%	64%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	55%	63%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	85%	80%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	35%	45%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	30%	37%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	55%	50%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	24%	20%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	57%	62%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	10%	18%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	34%	29%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	15%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	69%	85%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	38%	44%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	51%	76%
	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?	49%	62%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	73%	81%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	67%	64%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	65%	74%
	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?	67%	56%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	35%	49%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	26%	52%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	39%	37%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	72%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	1%	78%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	27%	15%
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%	36%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	50%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	16%	25%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	50%	24%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (Westhill)	Cat C Trainer prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 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?	58%	83%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:			
13.2	No contact?	40%	33%
13.2	Contact by letter?	35%	38%
13.2	Contact by phone?	6%	25%
13.2	Contact by visit?	28%	34%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	23%	67%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	32%	73%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	53%	56%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
13.6	Nobody?	43%	45%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	28%	35%
13.6	Offender manager?	20%	27%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	33%	15%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	17%	18%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	46%	69%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	14%	21%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	32%	27%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	16%	18%
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?	44%	36%
13.12	Accommodation?	57%	41%
13.12	Benefits?	62%	42%
13.12	Finances?	43%	31%
13.12	Education?	58%	39%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	60%	48%
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?	53%	56%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability	
				Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		13	102	14	101
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	6%	0%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	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)?	7%	10%	7%	10%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	7%	7%	0%	9%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	7%	4%	0%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			20%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	15%	8%	33%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	23%	33%	40%	31%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	74%	87%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	79%	78%	50%	82%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	50%	77%	93%	72%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	50%	64%	86%	59%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	79%	71%	93%	69%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	69%	67%	67%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	46%	82%	67%	80%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	96%	93%	96%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	25%	39%	54%	35%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	79%	59%	73%	60%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	97%	100%	97%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	22%	33%	23%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14%	4%	21%	3%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54%	28%	60%	28%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	46%	45%	80%	41%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	36%	33%	40%	32%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	36%	39%	40%	38%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	79%	89%	100%	86%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	53%	71%	50%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	64%	60%	80%	58%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	36%	53%	58%	51%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	78%	93%	76%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	86%	69%	87%	69%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	7%	9%	7%	9%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	54%	64%	60%	64%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	58%	22%	33%	25%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	0%	6%	7%	5%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	31%	14%	20%	15%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	15%	9%	0%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	0%	1%
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 of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	8%	0%	0%	1%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	23%	24%	13%	26%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	0%	7%	0%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	23%	19%	20%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	69%	60%	46%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	85%	42%	67%	43%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	58%	21%	27%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31%	29%	27%	30%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	60%	57%	73%	55%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	10%	13%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	18%	35%	33%	33%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	12%	0%	13%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	25%	35%	33%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	25%	40%	13%	42%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	64%	73%	67%	73%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	0%	1%	7%	0%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	25%	27%	20%	28%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	46%	51%	27%	53%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	25%	15%	7%	18%