

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Leeds

8–18 January 2013

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Glossary of terms

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

Crown copyright 2013

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

Contents

	Introduction	5
	Fact page	7
	Healthy prison summary	9
1	Safety	17
<hr/>		
2	Respect	27
<hr/>		
3	Purposeful activity	41
<hr/>		
4	Resettlement	47
<hr/>		
5	Recommendations, housekeeping points and good practice	55
<hr/>		
	Appendices	
<hr/>		
	I Inspection team	62
	II Prison population profile	63
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	66

Introduction

This was a very positive inspection. In the past, Armley Prison, as HMP Leeds was once known, had a notorious reputation for violence and brutality. At the time of the inspection it faced many of the typical challenges of a large, Victorian, inner-city local prison: it was chronically overcrowded, the physical condition of some parts of the prison was poor, and it held a challenging and needy population. However, the prison had dealt with these challenges very well and, although there was still room for improvement, much of what the prison did appeared to be very successful and we identified much good practice that should be emulated elsewhere.

At the heart of the prison's success were very good staff-prisoner relationships, which were among the best we have seen in a local prison. Most prisoners told us they were treated with respect, and this was reflected both in the individual interactions we observed and well-developed consultation arrangements. However, in this and in some other important areas, prisoners from black and minority ethnic groups and those with disabilities, while still positive, were less so than the rest of the population. Work on equality and diversity issues as a whole was energetic and committed and the support for some minority groups was excellent, although that for older prisoners and those with disabilities needed more attention.

Good relationships were underpinned by decent conditions. Despite the poor physical state of some parts of the prison and overcrowding, communal areas were clean and very well cared for. Health care was good with some innovative practice: 'The Harbour' was a facility that helped prisoners manage low level mental health problems, and the brain injury programme was an excellent development that helped the significant number of prisoners with brain injuries cope with the attendant problems. The most significant exception to this generally positive picture was the quality and quantity of the food, which was poor, served extremely early and had to be eaten in cell.

The generally good relationships and conditions were a crucial factor in the overall safety of the prison. Security was well informed, proportionate and well managed. Prisoners' perceptions of their safety were better than in comparable prisons, and data about assault, self-harm and the use of force supported this. Care for those most at risk of suicide or self-harm was very good. However, prisoners who were vulnerable because of their offence needed more protection from abuse, particularly when they first arrived, some unexplained injuries were not thoroughly investigated and poor behaviour was not always effectively challenged.

Most violent incidents that did occur were believed to be associated with the supply of alcohol and drugs but this needed to be investigated further. However, the prison worked hard to reduce the supply and demand for drugs and alcohol. Testing and prisoner survey responses suggested that the supply of illegal drugs was similar to comparable prisons, and the overall trend was sharply downwards from previous very high levels. There was a very good staged treatment programme for those with substance misuse problems that emphasised reduction and was supported by well-trained staff and prisoner 'recovery champions'. Prison drug and alcohol services were effectively integrated with community services and work with prisoners' families.

A generally safe and respectful environment created the conditions in which prisoners could have a very good amount of time out of cell. In every inspection we count the number of prisoners locked in their cells during the working part of the day. Typically, in a local prison, we

find between a third and half the prisoners locked behind their doors then. At Leeds, the figure was less than 1%.

Overcrowding meant there was a serious shortfall in the amount of activity available. There were 828 full-time activity places– enough for the ‘certified normal accommodation’ of 826 but far short of the 1,121 men actually held. However, the activity available was shared out fairly and most men who wanted an activity could get at least something part time. Partnerships with local employers and external agencies were very good, but the quality of some teaching needed to improve.

With so much activity part-time and so few men locked behind their doors, the wings during the day felt busy and crowded, but safe. Prisoners got on with individual or establishment domestic tasks. Some staffed effective ‘prisoners’ information desks’ (PIDs) that provided practical help with prison issues and signposted resettlement services. Officers actively engaged with the men they were supervising.

The work of the PIDs and the use prisoners could make of their extended association time to sort out practical resettlement issues was part of a genuinely whole-prison approach to reducing reoffending. The prison was to have been a pilot for an early version of a payment-by-results scheme but this had been halted by the time of the inspection, creating some uncertainty. Nevertheless, the work that was still being done appeared impressive. The focus was on those with 12 months or less to serve. The aim for those serving longer sentences was to move them to a training prison where they could receive more appropriate interventions; this was not always successful, but for a local prison it seemed a sensible approach.

The resettlement wing, use of release on temporary licence, ‘through-the-gate’ support and the ‘sixth hub’ (an integrated offender management scheme working with prolific and priority offenders both inside the prison and on release) were all excellent initiatives that were showing some good early results in reducing reoffending. Links to partner organisations to deliver this agenda were very strong. Practical resettlement support was well developed in the most important areas – JobCentre Plus, for instance, had helped 50% of prisoners safeguard their outside jobs while they served their sentence. Wider support for maintaining contact with family and friends was excellent.

HMP Leeds shows what can be done despite poor physical conditions and overcrowding. Good relationships and treatment underpinned security and made the prison safe. Because the prison was generally safe, prisoners could spend a lot of time out of their cell. Prisoners used this opportunity to take part in activities likely to reduce the risk they would reoffend. Because prisoners felt they were making progress, that helped make the prison safer and relationships more relaxed, and so a virtuous circle was created. Improvements were still required and some of the progress the prison had made was fragile.

There appears to be much that the rest of the Prison Service can learn from the experience of HMP Leeds. This experience should be evaluated in more depth than we have been able to do on this inspection, and the lessons applied to the government’s wider plans for rehabilitation.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A category B local prison

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

Public sector

Region/Department

Yorkshire and Humberside

Number held

1121

Certified normal accommodation

826

Operational capacity

1212

Date of last full inspection

3–12 March 2010

Brief history

HMP Leeds was built in 1847 and has undergone several expansion programmes over the years, the last of which was in 1994 when two large accommodation units were added. Other refurbishments since then modernised the residential units, provided improved showering and food servery areas and enhanced primary health care facilities. HMP Leeds served courts in Leeds and West Yorkshire.

Short description of residential units

A wing – a vulnerable prisoner wing with a workshop activity area; the segregation unit was on A1 landing

B wing – accommodation for adult male convicted prisoners and those on remand

C wing – the resettlement wing for prisoners from the West Yorkshire area with less than 12 months before their release

D wing – a recovery wing for prisoners with a self-reported or medically referred addiction; the first night centre was on D1 landing and housed prisoners who were new to custody or to HMP Leeds

E wing – a post recovery wing, holding adult convicted prisoners who had graduated from the recovery wing and kitchen workers

F wing – predominantly housing remanded prisoners.

Name of governor/director

Paul Baker

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

NHS Airedale, Bradford and Leeds (commissioner)

NHS Leeds Community Foundation Trust (provider)

Leeds and York Partnership Foundation Trust (provider)

Learning and skills providers

The Manchester College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Andrew Winfield

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.¹

Safety

HP6 Most prisoners' journeys to the prison were short. The reception area was poor but staff were efficient and welcoming. First night arrangements were generally very good, but vulnerable prisoners reported feeling less safe on their first night than others. Induction arrangements were adequate. Most prisoners in our survey said they felt safe generally, but some minority groups and vulnerable prisoners were less positive. Arrangements and care for those at risk of self-harm was good. Security was proportionate and the positive mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was decreasing. Greater oversight was needed of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. Adjudications were generally well managed. The segregation unit regime needed improving, but relationships were very good and use of force was well managed. Services for prisoners with substance misuse problems were good. On the basis of this inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP7 Most prisoners had a reasonable experience of escorts, which were usually from local courts. Some prisoners spent too long waiting to be collected from court cells. The physical condition of the reception was poor. Holding rooms were stark and communal areas in need of repair. However, prisoners moved swiftly to the first night centre and relationships between staff and prisoners were very good. First night arrangements were generally very good. The first night landing (D1) was welcoming and staff focused on the importance of keeping prisoners safe. Vulnerable prisoners were less positive than others about their overall experience, including feeling safe on their first night. Resettlement service providers saw all prisoners soon after their arrival; prisoners also had good access to prisoner information desks (PIDs) located on all

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*.)

wings. Most aspects of induction were reasonable, but some important elements needed to be better.

- HP8 In our survey, overall perceptions of safety were better than in comparator prisons and most prisoners said they felt safe. Black and minority ethnic and vulnerable prisoners' perceptions were significantly poorer, although most still reported feeling safe. The number of assaults was not high and most incidents involved verbal rather than physical confrontations. Not all incidents were thoroughly investigated or analysed. The violence reduction strategy process was rarely used and there was little formal support for victims.
- HP9 Overall levels of self-harm were low. There had been four self-inflicted deaths in the previous three years, fewer than in similar large local prisons. Action plans based on investigations were implemented. Some investigations following serious self-harm incidents had been completed, but more needed to be done to ensure lessons were learnt. Awareness of the potential risks of cell sharing was good and reflected in cell sharing risk assessment procedures, but very few reviews involved non-discipline staff. We saw evidence of excellent levels of care, including for those requiring constant supervision. The team of Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) provided good peer support.
- HP10 Security arrangements demonstrated a mature and proportionate approach to risk management. Dynamic security was very good and was underpinned by good interaction between staff and prisoners. There was an excellent flow of intelligence, and collaboration between security and other departments was good. The positive MDT rate was declining and was comparable with other local prisons. The number of suspicion tests that failed to be completed was unsatisfactory. It was clear how the IEP scheme operated, but there was insufficient oversight.
- HP11 The number of adjudications was high, but the process was generally well managed. The number of incidents involving the use of force was not high and written accounts demonstrated that it was used as a last resort. Governance arrangements were particularly effective and information was used to help identify trends and patterns. Living conditions in the segregation unit were reasonable, but some cells were grubby and toilets were dirty. Conditions in the biohazard cells were poor. Relationships between staff and prisoners were very good, but case management arrangements and reintegration planning were not well developed. The regime for longer-stay prisoners was inadequate.
- HP12 Substance misuse services were very good, with a clear staged treatment programme. There was an appropriate focus on recovery and prisoners were positive about the support they received. Alcohol services were very well integrated.

Respect

- HP13 Residential units were clean, but many cells were overcrowded. Communal areas were excellent and the PID system worked well, although some elements needed greater oversight. Staff-prisoner relationships were very good and were better than we usually see. Equality and diversity (E&D) was well managed and support provided to protected groups was reasonable; however, in our survey many black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners were less positive than others about a range of issues. Prisoners valued the faith provision. Complaints were reasonably well managed, although some against staff were not. Legal services support was reasonable. Health services were very good. The quality of food was poor. Prisoners could experience unacceptable delays in receiving their first canteen order. On the basis of this

inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

- HP14 Cells and residential units were generally clean; communal areas were exceptional. Many cells were too small for two people and had unscreened and stained toilets, which had no seats or lids. The PID system, which worked well, allowed prisoners to seek advice and make applications during association periods although staff oversight needed to be developed in some areas. Consultation with prisoners was good and they were offered opportunities to influence improvements in conditions.
- HP15 Staff-prisoner relationships were very good, and in our survey most said they were treated with respect and had a member of staff they could turn to for help. We saw some excellent staff interaction with prisoners, which underpinned much of what was good about the prison.
- HP16 Strategic management of E&D was good, and policies covered all the protected characteristics. The E&D team was highly motivated and committed to its work. Investigations into discrimination complaints were carried out promptly and to a good standard, and scrutiny arrangements were excellent. Monitoring of outcomes was taken seriously and there was some good analysis. Asian prisoners did not have the same access to release on temporary licence (ROTL) as other prisoners.
- HP17 In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners' perceptions about many issues were worse than other prisoners'. Despite some good work, more needed to be done to understand their concerns. Most protected groups, including Gypsy, Roma, and Travellers and gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners, received good support. There was reasonable support for foreign nationals, although telephone translation services needed to be used more frequently. Foreign nationals held solely on immigration grounds were signposted to independent immigration advice services.
- HP18 Disabled prisoners were under-identified and in our survey they were more negative than others about some issues. Those who had been identified were seen and any immediate needs were met, but consultation with them as a group was limited. More needed to be done to meet the needs of older prisoners. Faith provision was good, and most prisoners in our survey said that their religious beliefs were respected.
- HP19 Most responses to complaints were legible, polite, fair and prompt. Some prisoners told us they did not have confidence in the process. Some complaints against staff were answered at too low a level and did not assure us that a robust, impartial investigation took place. Legal services officers offered a reasonable range of support.
- HP20 The range of health services was good. Initial and secondary health screening was effective. Prisoners could usually see a nurse every day on the wings and consultations were well conducted. Waiting times to see a GP were reasonable, but better nurse triage could have improved this further. The administration of medications was generally safe. Waiting times for routine dental appointments for sentenced prisoners were acceptable and all prisoners could get urgent treatment. The provision of a dental hygiene service was excellent. Prisoners waited too long to see the optician. Long-term conditions were well managed and the sleep clinic was very good. The use of prisoner health care representatives was excellent and associated health promotion work was good. In patient care was supportive and met prisoners' needs. Mental health services offered prisoners with mental health needs a responsive and supportive service, including family visits if appropriate. A new brain injury service was a very useful adjunct to support the significant proportion of prisoners coping with the consequences of brain injury.

HP21 The food was poor and prisoners were very dissatisfied. Meals were served too early. Prisoners received canteen packs on reception, but some waited a long time before receiving their first canteen order.

Purposeful activity

HP22 Nearly all prisoners had a reasonable amount of good quality time out of cell. Learning and skills management was developing, although some quality improvement measures still needed to be implemented. There were insufficient activity places for the whole population, but most prisoners who wanted to work could. Partnership working was strong. The range of provision was narrow but appropriate to the population, and allocation procedures were good. The quality of provision was mixed and some outcomes needed to be better, particularly the accreditation of achievement. Vocational places were insufficiently used. In education teaching, success and retention rates needed to be better. Library services were reasonable and physical education (PE) was good. On the basis of this inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

HP23 It was commendable that the vast majority of prisoners were unlocked for at least 7.5 hours Monday to Thursday, although this was reduced on Friday and at the weekend. Prisoners could exercise outside and association was rarely cancelled or curtailed.

HP24 Learning and skills management was improving and there were clear links between curriculum development and planning to meet resettlement needs. There was adequate use of data and targets to inform performance management. The delayed completion of some planned improvements, such as assessment of teaching and learning quality through observation, was having a negative impact on delivery. Staff were suitably qualified and experienced, and staffing levels were sufficient to progress the improvement plans. There was particularly strong partnership work to support resettlement. Information, advice and guidance services were satisfactory at the pre-release stage but inconsistent at other times.

HP25 There were not enough places to ensure that the entire population was fully occupied, but most prisoners who wanted to participate in an activity could do so promptly. Vulnerable prisoners received equitable provision compared with mainstream prisoners. The learning and skills offer was narrow but appropriate, and waiting lists were short and effectively managed. Allocation was fair, timely and reflected prisoners' needs. Pay rates had been reviewed, but needed to better reflect performance.

HP26 Workshops provided good working environments with a suitable range of vocational training, although too little was accredited and not all opportunities were used. The quality of training was at least satisfactory, with prisoners often producing good quality work. The recognition and recording of the skills prisoners had developed were insufficient. There were some well-planned classes in education with a good variety of activity. In the less successful lessons, some activities were too long and teachers were not proactive enough to change activities. Individual learning plans were not used effectively.

HP27 There was a good work ethic in workshops. Prisoners developed an appropriate range of employability skills; attendance was good and prisoners progressed well. Most who completed accredited vocational training achieved an award. Retention rates were improving. In education, success and retention rates had been poor, particularly for Skills for Life. However, in the latest academic year, retention was improving. Overall, most prisoners were making at least satisfactory progress. Attendance rates in education were not consistently high enough.

Access to the library was satisfactory and an adequate range of texts was available. However, the library did not fully reflect the needs of the learning and skills provision and staffing levels were inadequate.

- HP28 All prisoners had access to PE at least three times a week, and the indoor facilities were good. There were no outdoor facilities. Specific groups of prisoners were satisfactorily catered for. The prison held a number of health promotion activities each year, but this was not frequent enough. The prison had good external links, which brought groups into the prison, and non-accredited learning programmes were offered.

Resettlement

HP29 Strategic planning of resettlement was well developed and based on a needs analysis of the population. Work with partner organisations was particularly strong. The resettlement wing was excellent and a good range of ROTL opportunities were offered. Offender management arrangements were reasonable and assessments were up to date, although the quality varied. The 6th Hub was a very good initiative and the resettlement wing presented prisoners with much better opportunities for pre-release resettlement support than we usually see. Public protection arrangements were generally robust. Reintegration work with prisoners approaching release was good. The visits room was too small, but there was some impressive support to help prisoners maintain links with children and families. On the basis of this inspection, we considered that outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

- HP30 The reducing reoffending strategy was based on an up-to-date needs analysis, but did not address the specific needs of all groups of prisoners. The reducing reoffending strategy team met quarterly, and targets to develop appropriate services were updated after each meeting. Enthusiastic senior managers were driving the development of a variety of resettlement services, and the partnership manager had developed links with a wide range of partner agencies.
- HP31 Dedicated and proactive staff on the resettlement (C) wing provided prisoners nearing the end of their sentence with good support. Significantly more prisoners on the wing than in the rest of the prison said that they had done something, or something had happened to them to make them less likely to reoffend in future. The use of ROTL for prisoners attending voluntary and paid employment in the community was excellent.
- HP32 Over a third of prisoners were in scope for offender management (prisoners serving 12 months or more and classified as posing a high risk to the public) and links with community services were generally good. The offender management unit was well established, but its position outside the prison meant that it was not easily accessible to other staff. There was no custody planning for remanded and very short-term sentenced prisoners, but all other prisoners had a named offender supervisor. Prisoners on C wing were more positive than others about the support they were receiving. Offender assessment system documents were up to date but the quality was mixed; quality assurance arrangements needed to be better. Sharing of information with others involved in resettlement needed improvement.
- HP33 Very good work was undertaken with prolific and other priority offenders (PPOs) through the 6th Hub initiative, and some encouraging data was being collected about its impact on reoffending rates. It was impressive that prison staff were seconded to community agencies focused on reducing reoffending. Public protection arrangements were robust, although there were delays

in some processes. Prisoners were categorised promptly, but the prison found it difficult to find places in training prisons for category B vulnerable prisoners, especially sex offenders.

- HP34 All prisoners' resettlement needs were assessed on arrival. A variety of accommodation providers were available and outcomes on release were good. Jobcentre Plus workers provided good support, including retaining employment on arrival and securing work on release. There was a good employment training programme, which focused on preparing prisoners for ROTL and release, although take up needed to improve. Debt advice was a recognised gap, but the prison was working to address this. All prisoners could open a bank account. Support for health and substance misuse problems on release was appropriately developed.
- HP35 The visitors' centre was good, but it was not open for all visits sessions. The visits hall was too small, but the atmosphere was appropriately relaxed. An excellent and imaginative range of activities was available through the visitors' centre to help prisoners maintain and improve contact with their families.
- HP36 No accredited offending behaviour courses were offered.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP37 Concern: While most prisoners felt safe, the complex population mix required constant diligence to ensure that all potential issues were quickly identified and dealt with. The systems in place were not being used effectively to ensure that problem behaviour was rigorously and promptly addressed. Support for victims needed to be more proactive and systematic.

Recommendation: The analysis and investigation of violent incidents should be improved and a strategy developed to address the underlying causes and to support victims.

- HP38 Concern: In our surveys, black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners were more negative than others about their treatment and outcomes. The prison needed to do more proactive work to engage with these groups to ensure their needs were identified and where possible met.

Recommendation: The prison should explore the more negative perceptions of prisoners from black and minority ethnic and disabled groups across many areas of prison life, and have regular consultative forums with them to better understand their concerns and meet their needs.

- HP39 Concern: Too much teaching lacked variety and adequate challenge. Attendance in education needed to improve. Although there had been some improvements, success and retention rates in education were low, particularly in Skills for Life programmes. Given the attainment levels of the population held, this was a particularly concern.

Recommendation: The quality of teaching should improve and the prison should significantly raise attendance, success and retention rates in education.

- HP40 Concern: The focus on concentrating resettlement work for those prisoners in the last 12 months of their sentence on a bespoke wing with a wide range of providers and staff engaged in supporting them was an interesting initiative. This was supported by the 6th hub, which provided end-to-end supervision and support to prolific and other priority offenders. If these

initiatives prove to be successful in reducing reoffending, it may provide a model for other prisons.

Recommendation: The Leeds' resettlement approach should be evaluated and any lessons applied nationally.

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 prisoners reported reasonably short journeys to the prison, but vulnerable prisoners were less positive. Relationships between escort and reception staff were good. All prisoners received a good first night service. Some prisoners had long waits at court. The court video link was used extensively.

1.2 Journey times for prisoners were generally short. Late arrivals were not uncommon, but even those who arrived after 7pm received the full first night service. However, some prisoners waited too long in court before being returned to the prison. Staff were polite and respectful and appropriately focused on prisoner safety. In our survey, most prisoners said that they felt safe during their journey, but vulnerable prisoners were less positive. Relationships between escort and reception staff were generally good. Information was shared systematically and used to inform initial risk assessments. Person escort records were properly completed and legible. Video link facilities were used extensively to reduce the number of prisoners that needed to leave the prison to attend court. During our inspection we saw nearly 40 prisoners use the service every day.

Recommendation

1.3 Systems should be in place to ensure that waiting times in court before prisoners are returned to the prison are not excessive.

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.

1.4 The physical environment of the busy reception was poor, but the attitude and processes adopted by the staff working there mitigated this. First night arrangements were generally good, but vulnerable prisoners were less content. Some elements of the induction were good, but others concerning daily life and rules were poor, and the whole process was not effectively managed.

1.5 Reception was busy, with over 100 prisoner movements a day and it remained open until the last prisoner returned from court. The physical condition of reception was poor: holding rooms were stark and communal areas were in a poor state of repair; corridors were cramped and many areas were grubby. Sight lines were weak and the provision for private interviews was

inadequate. This was mitigated by effective processing systems that allowed prisoners to move swiftly to the first night centre. Reception officers' attitudes were particularly positive; they were clearly aware of the potential risks to new prisoners. They were welcoming and had created a relaxed and friendly atmosphere.

- 1.6 Prisoners were searched sensitively before being taken to the first night centre on D1 landing, usually within an hour of their arrival. The first night centre was welcoming; it dealt with mainstream location and vulnerable prisoners. Cells were clean and well prepared. Initial safety screenings for new prisoners were particularly good. All were seen by a range of health care and prison staff who interviewed them in private shortly after their arrival at the unit. Prisoners' first night needs were effectively identified and met, and staff were aware of levels of anxiety and associated risks. They took time to ensure that prisoners understood how to access prison services if they needed help during their first night. This was supported by good use of prisoner peer workers, including Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) and prisoner information desk workers (see section on residential units).
- 1.7 In our survey, 78% of respondents said that they felt safe during their first night, compared with 74% in comparator prisons. However, only 58% of vulnerable prisoners said that they felt safe during this time. Prisoners were able to make a phone call and have a shower on their first night, but perceptions of this and other support available were again poorer for vulnerable prisoners. While most newly arrived prisoners were not locked up until the end of evening, vulnerable prisoners were usually locked in their cells immediately after interviews with staff.
- 1.8 During their first night interview, most prisoners were provided with information about how to get help. This was reinforced the following morning, when all were seen by key service providers such as workers from the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARAT) for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems, resettlement staff, housing advisors and a chaplain. However, presentations about general prison issues were uninteresting and many prisoners said that they were overloaded with information. Tracking systems to ensure that prisoners received a full induction were not in place. In our survey, only 46% said that they had a full induction programme.

Recommendations

- 1.9 Conditions in reception should be improved.
- 1.10 Tracking systems to ensure that all prisoners receive a full induction should be introduced.
- 1.11 First night arrangements should ensure that all prisoners feel safe and get the support they require.

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.

- 1.12 Most prisoners felt safe and the data about incidents supported this, although some minority groups felt less secure. The analysis and investigation of violent incidents needed improvement as did formal support for victims of violence.
- 1.13 In our survey, overall perceptions of safety were better than in comparator prisons and than during the last inspection. Most prisoners reported feeling safe, but black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners felt less safe than others. The prison monitored violent incidents involving black and minority ethnic groups, and they were within range.
- 1.14 The perceptions of safety among vulnerable prisoners were also significantly poorer than among those from other wings, although the data about incidents did not indicate any troubling trends; it was good that vulnerable prisoners were no longer regularly located alongside the general population. Shared visiting and first night location arrangements and the fact their exercise yard was overlooked by B wing, exposing them to verbal insults, might have contributed to these poorer perceptions.
- 1.15 The number of assaults was not high and was comparable to other similar prisons. Most incidents involved verbal rather than physical confrontations. On average, 28 violent incidents were reported to the safer custody team each month. Minutes from the safer prisons meetings indicated some concerns about under-reporting. There was a good awareness of the potential risks of cell sharing, which was reflected in procedures to gather background information.
- 1.16 Not all incidents, including unexplained injuries, were thoroughly investigated or analysed, and we identified examples of problematic behaviour that had not been effectively challenged. There were delays between incidents being reported and investigations being completed. On average, between two and three incidents each month were recorded as unexplained and had not been investigated. Most violent incidents were said to be associated with the use and trading of illicit drugs and prescribed medication, but a more thorough analysis of the underlying reasons for the violence was needed.
- 1.17 The anti-bullying process was rarely used to challenge violent or anti-social behaviour. Perpetrators usually faced sanctions, including a move to another location or transfer from the prison or they were downgraded through the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. There was little formal support for victims.
- 1.18 Safer custody was led by a senior manager and daily management was overseen by an appropriately staffed safer prisons team, which met regularly and involved prisoners. There were reasonably good links between the security and safer custody departments.

Recommendation

- 1.19 Vulnerable prisoners should be able to exercise without fear of being verbally abused by other prisoners.

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.

- 1.20 Action plans following deaths in custody were monitored, but learning from serious self-harm incidents could have been improved. Levels of self-harm were low and the care provided to those most vulnerable to self-harm was very good. Some self-harm monitoring procedures needed improvement.
- 1.21 There had been four self-inflicted deaths in the previous three years, fewer than in similar large local prisons. Action plans from investigations were largely up to date and implemented. Lessons that could have been learned from Prisons and Probation Ombudsman investigations were discussed at the monthly safer prisons meeting. Comprehensive plans to monitor clinical issues were also reviewed by the primary care trust.
- 1.22 Overall, levels of self-harm were low, with an average of 11 incidents each month involving a small number of prisoners. Some investigations following serious self-harm incidents had been completed, but more needed to be done to ensure that lessons were learned. Two had involved foreign nationals, but this had not led to recommendations about how to reduce risks in similar cases in future. High risk cases were discussed at the monthly safer prisons meetings.
- 1.23 On average 64 self-harm monitoring documents were opened every month. Their quality varied, but some included thorough assessments. Few self-harm monitoring reviews were attended by multidisciplinary teams, as the notice of review dates was not always sufficient. However, work with mental health nurses to support vulnerable prisoners was good. Three senior officers from the safer prisons team ensured some case management consistency, but we found a small number of examples where cases had been inappropriately closed by a senior officer acting alone. Interpreters were not always used to help prisoners with limited English. Daily self-harm monitoring entries were mainly observational, with few revealing any meaningful interaction.
- 1.24 In other cases we saw evidence of excellent levels of care. There was a well used 'at risk hotline'. The Harbour (see section on health services) was a positive resource, supporting individuals finding it difficult to cope. The chaplaincy offered bereavement counselling and the Listeners team provided good peer support. Staff interaction with those requiring constant supervision was excellent. During our night visit not all staff were familiar with the policy that emphasised the preservation of life when entering cells in an emergency.

Recommendations

- 1.25 Investigations into serious self-harm incidents should identify learning points and good practice, which should be reflected in future practices.
- 1.26 Self-harm monitoring procedures should be improved and staff from other disciplines should be more involved.

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

- 1.27 There were no formal safeguarding protocols or policies aimed at protecting adults at risk, although contact had been made with the local safeguarding board to begin to develop these. The needs of prisoners requiring support and protection from themselves or others were being reasonably well met through existing practice.
- 1.28 Contact had been made with the safeguarding and risk manager from the Leeds Safeguarding Adults Partnership Support Unit, who had met with senior managers and the safer prisons team. There were plans to introduce protocols and to develop a local safeguarding policy and work was in progress.
- 1.29 The protection of adults at risk was managed through existing procedures that identified these prisoners at reception, as well as through health care assessments, measures to support older and disabled prisoners and diversity policies. Requirements for staff to raise concerns about the treatment of prisoners were met through professional standards.

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.

- 1.30 Overall, dynamic security arrangements were very good. There was an excellent flow of intelligence into the department. Security committee meetings were well attended and there were strong links to the rest of the prison and local police.
- 1.31 Security procedures were managed properly and security committee meetings were well attended by representatives from across the prison. The standing agenda was comprehensive and included a thorough analysis of security information reports (SIRs), which informed monthly security objectives. Reports from other functional areas were also discussed.
- 1.32 The security department received an average of 500 SIRs each month; these were processed by a security analyst. Intelligence was effectively communicated to other departments particularly the safer prisons team (see section on bullying and violence reduction) and the residential wings, to ensure informed decision making. Links with other departments such as the offender management unit, drug strategy committee and education department were also

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).

good. We reviewed a random selection of SIRs and found that they had been submitted by staff from a wide range of departments. The information reported was appropriate and had been processed without undue delay.

- 1.33 There was evidence that the prison's response to security concerns was proportionate and based on a reasoned approach to risk management. For example, prisoners were only strip-searched in exceptional circumstances according to the risk they presented, and closed visits were not unnecessarily put into place as a result of a single piece of information. During our inspection we saw no evidence to suggest that security procedures or restrictions hindered prisoners' ability to access a full regime.
- 1.34 Excellent links had been established with the local police, particularly where sharing intelligence about local and persistent offenders was concerned. A police information unit known as the 6th Hub was located directly outside the prison gate, which made the exchange of relevant information very efficient (see section on strategic management of resettlement). Overall, relationships between staff and prisoners were very good and interactions between wing-based staff and prisoners were better than we usually see. These positive relationships underpinned the important elements of dynamic security.
- 1.35 The mandatory drug testing (MDT) random positive rate for the six months to December 2012 was 8.3% against a key performance target of 16%. The positive test rate had varied from 20% to 3.8% but the overall trend was downwards and in line with similar prisons. The number of suspicion tests that were requested, but not completed was unsatisfactory. In the six months to December 2012, 67% of requested tests were not completed. This represented a serious gap in the prison's otherwise good work on a strategic approach to drugs. A total of 54 suspicion tests were completed in the same period, with a positive rate of 38.3%. When asked how easy it was to obtain drugs, prisoners' responses were similar to those in comparator prisons. However, significantly fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons said it was easy to obtain alcohol. The MDT suite was not sufficiently clean.

Recommendation

- 1.36 MDT should be appropriately staffed to ensure all testing is carried out appropriately, within identified timescales and without gaps in provision.

Housekeeping point

- 1.37 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to maintain a respectful waiting and testing environment.

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.

1.38 The IEP scheme was generally well understood and was being used robustly to discourage poor behaviour. However, management oversight of the scheme was insufficient and many prisoners in our survey felt it was applied unfairly.

1.39 Prisoners and staff were familiar with the regime on each level of the IEP scheme. However, a number of prisoners felt that some staff were not proactive enough in helping them to gain enhanced status. In our survey, fewer than in comparator prisons said that the scheme was applied fairly. A management assurance process, described in one of the two policy documents in circulation, did not operate on all wings and did not assure us that the IEP scheme was always used fairly. Perceptions of unfairness might have been reinforced by a local notice to prisoners (64/2012), which informed them that remand prisoners were prevented from moving to the enhanced regime unless they were employed. The scheme was being used assertively to support efforts to reduce violence and drug supply, but we did not believe this was disproportionate, because more prisoners were on the enhanced regime and fewer were on the basic level, than is typical in local prisons.

Recommendations

1.40 Management oversight of the IEP scheme should be sufficient to ensure it is applied fairly to all.

1.41 The local notice to prisoners (64/2012) that remand prisoners cannot have enhanced status unless they are employed should be revoked.

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.

1.42 The number of formal adjudications was quite high, but records showed that charges were usually appropriate. Records of hearings showed that charges were usually fully explained and prisoners were given enough time to prepare their case. However, some written accounts were illegible, some conduct reports were not objective and in a few cases, we were not assured that allegations were always fully investigated. Incidents involving the use of force were not excessive and written accounts assured us that it was used as a last resort. Governance arrangements were effective. Living conditions in the segregation unit were reasonable but some cells were grubby and toilets were dirty. Conditions in the biohazard cells were poor. Relationships between staff and prisoners were very good, but case management arrangements and reintegration planning were not well developed. The regime for longer-stay prisoners was inadequate.

Disciplinary procedures

1.43 The number of formal adjudications was quite high at about 190 per month. The most common charges were disobeying lawful orders, possessing unauthorised articles and positive mandatory drug tests.

- 1.44 Most records of hearings we examined showed that proceedings were conducted fairly, but some suggested that prisoners were not given the opportunity to explain their version of events, and a few gave the impression that procedures were rushed. Some records were illegible and we saw evidence that conduct reports from officers who knew the prisoner were not always considered properly as mitigation.
- 1.45 On the whole, disciplinary measures were fair and there were examples where adjudicating governors had dismissed cases due to a lack of evidence or anomalies in the process. The appeals process was explained to all prisoners directly after the formal hearing and again on leaving the adjudication room.
- 1.46 Monthly statistics about the number and nature of adjudications were presented to the senior management team and the safer prisons committee. Where worrying trends were identified, appropriate action followed. Adjudication standardisation meetings took place quarterly and were well attended by adjudicating governors. The minutes reflected good standards of discussion concerning appropriate issues, including prisoner feedback. Discipline tariffs had been published and were being used consistently. There was no evidence of unofficial or collective punishments.

Housekeeping points

- 1.47 Written records of hearings should be legible and should reflect that prisoners have been given the opportunity to explain their version of events at adjudications.
- 1.48 Conduct reports should be considered fully prior to discipline.

The use of force

- 1.49 Incidents involving the use of force were not excessive. Of the 200 incidents in 2012, about 30% did not involve full control and restraint techniques, and the vast majority were spontaneous. Rigorous monitoring arrangements were in place, and incidents were discussed by the security committee meeting, and at other relevant meetings each month. Emerging patterns and trends were identified and presented to the senior management team for action every month.
- 1.50 When it was necessary, use of force was well organised, properly carried out and most documentation was completed correctly. Proper authority was recorded and senior staff supervised most incidents. There was no evidence that force was used unnecessarily or as a first resort when dealing with difficult and violent behaviour.

Segregation

- 1.51 The segregation unit was on the lower ground floor of A wing. There were 23 cells, including two biohazard cells for prisoners on dirty protest and two further special cells. Living conditions were reasonable, but some cells were grubby and some toilets were dirty. Communal areas were clean, but old and worn. Some normalising features such as pot plants, wall mounted pictures and fish tanks had been added to the landing. Conditions in the biohazard cells were poor. Paint was peeling from the walls, there was no furniture and a single hole in the floor served as a toilet.

- 1.52 At the time of our inspection, there were 16 prisoners in segregation. On average about 30 were segregated every month. The average length of segregation was about 15 days. However, a small, but significant, number of prisoners had been segregated for much longer. We found, for example, that periods of segregation of between 20 and 30 days were not unusual.
- 1.53 Governance was good and a strategy document had been published setting out management arrangements and expected working practices, along with a staff selection policy. Relationships between staff and prisoners were very good. Officers treated prisoners respectfully and were comfortable when dealing with them.
- 1.54 The daily regime included showers, exercise and access to telephones. Most prisoners were allowed a television and could exercise with other prisoners, but the regime for longer-stay prisoners was poor and meant that most spent much of the day locked in their cells with nothing meaningful to do.
- 1.55 Segregation reviews were completed on time, but there was little evidence of proactive planning to return prisoners segregated under good order or discipline to a mainstream location. There were no individual care plans for longer-stay prisoners and no behaviour targets.

Recommendations

- 1.56 The daily regime and reintegration planning for prisoners in segregation should be improved.
- 1.57 Conditions in the biohazard cells should be improved.

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.

- 1.58 A comprehensive treatment programme was in place for all prisoners with substance use problems, including alcohol. Selected and trained discipline officers on the recovery and post recovery wings provided prisoners with extra support. Prisoners failing MDT tests were subject to special support reviews. A well constructed drug and alcohol strategy was in place. Most prisoners on the recovery wings could not access compact-based drug testing.
- 1.59 Substance misuse services at Leeds were very good. There was a clear staged treatment programme, which began in reception and took prisoners through detoxification or maintenance on the recovery unit (D wing) to intensive support and group work on the post-recovery unit (E wing). Psychosocial support was available across the prison. There were 218 prisoners on opiate substitution treatment, 80 of whom were on reducing detoxification doses. This emphasis on reduction was impressive and was largely well-received by prisoners.
- 1.60 Clinical reviews were led by a GP specialist in substance use and involved integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) nurses and CARAT workers. Prisoners typically stayed in the recovery unit for six weeks, where they had access to regular one-to-one support, IDTS

psychosocial group work, Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) groups, and a good range of clinics and classes. The unit also provided peer support from prisoner 'recovery champions'. Similar support was available on the post-recovery unit, but with the addition of the SMART recovery programme for addictive behaviours. Alcohol treatment was integrated into the recovery-centred approach, with access to alcohol detoxification, one-to-one sessions with CARAT staff, AA and group work, including a special compulsive binge drinkers group. In our survey, 73% compared with 59% in comparator prisons said they had received help for an alcohol problem.

- 1.61 The supervision and support from discipline officers on D and E wings, who had received extra training, was particularly well balanced. Prisoners who tested positive following MDT were given a special support review. Chaired by the governor or deputy governor and attended by the CARAT manager, security representative, IDTS nurse and a segregation officer, the review aimed to understand the reasons for the prisoners' drug use and to offer additional support, including a possible referral for their families to partnership community agencies.
- 1.62 A comprehensive and well-constructed drug and alcohol strategy was in place. It was delivered through a dynamic action plan and reviewed at the monthly security and drug strategy meeting. Compact-based drug testing was only available for wing cleaners and recovery champions. As a result, the regular verification of drug-free outcomes was not possible for most prisoners on the recovery and post-recovery wings.

Recommendation

- 1.63 Compact-based drug testing should be made available to all prisoners on the recovery and post-recovery wings as a supportive and motivational intervention and to ensure the integrity of the programme.

Good practice

- 1.64 *The deployment of recovery champions, ongoing support from the recovery unit and the post-recovery unit, the quality of D and E wing discipline staff and the extent of integration with community and family services were all examples of good practice.*

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 Many cells were overcrowded, and had unscreened toilets, but most were clean. Communal areas were particularly well presented. The prisoner information desk (PID) system was good, as was access to mail, but telephones lacked privacy. Prisoners' clothing was generally well managed.
- 2.2 Across the prison, two prisoners were being held in cells designed for one. On the older wings (A-D), most shared cells were too small for two people. A large number of them had unscreened toilets; others had screening curtains, which were either purpose-made or improvised, and not all had lockable cupboards. Hardly any toilets had seats or lids, except where prisoners had improvised them out of cardboard or trays. Many toilet pans were heavily stained. Rubbish had accumulated between the windows and the external grills in many cells.
- 2.3 However, despite these failings, most cells were reasonably well furnished and decorated, and there was very little graffiti. In our survey, some prisoners said that it was difficult to obtain cleaning materials, but we saw hardly any dirty cells. The communal areas of the prison were very clean and welcoming and very well presented.
- 2.4 PID workers operated from prominent workstations located on each wing. These provided a wide range of relevant information, which prisoners could readily access, and gave the wings a purposeful focus. The application system was administered by the PID workers, who were available during all association periods. In our survey, prisoners were broadly content with it despite the absence of a robust quality assurance or tracking mechanism. However, a few prisoners expressed concern about PID workers having access to sensitive information and arrangements to oversee the PID process needed to be developed.
- 2.5 We found that some prisoners had long waits to have telephone numbers added to their phone accounts, which affected their ability to keep in touch with family and friends, organise visits, and arrange for property to be handed in (see section on children, families and contact with the outside world.)
- 2.6 Prisoners' mail, including incoming email, was processed promptly. There were enough telephones on each wing, but it was difficult to hold a private conversation because most telephones were close together in busy areas and had no hoods. Although a good number of free-phone advice lines were available, these were not well advertised. During our inspection, the relevant telephone accounts had no credit, so prisoners could not make calls to these lines, even if they knew the number to call.
- 2.7 Prisoners were given a full set of prison kit on arrival, including a track suit. There were good systems to exchange underwear, socks, T-shirts and towels every day and sheets every week, but some men struggled to obtain a second tracksuit. Most prisoners chose to wear their own

clothes some of the time and each wing had a laundry, which prisoners could use at least once a week.

Recommendations

- 2.8 Cells designed for one prisoner should not accommodate two and all cells should have privacy locks and lockable cupboards.
- 2.9 Toilets should be screened and have seats and lids.

Housekeeping point

- 2.10 Prisoners should be able to make an application without having to disclose its contents to a PID worker.

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.

- 2.11 Staff-prisoner relationships were very good and had improved since we last inspected the prison. There were good opportunities for consultation through a range of forums.
- 2.12 Staff-prisoner relationships were very good. In our survey, most said they were treated with respect and 75% said there was a member of staff they could turn to for help. Our survey indicated an improvement in staff-prisoner relationships since our last inspection; however, most minority groups responded more negatively. We saw excellent staff-prisoner interactions throughout the inspection, and this was also reflected in key areas such as reception, the segregation unit and with specialist staff.
- 2.13 Arrangements for consulting prisoners were good. Some wings held meetings, although this was not consistent across all wings. PID workers from each wing met at a prisoner council. Prisoners were represented at part of the senior management team meetings, and consultations with prisoners enabled them to influence aspects of their lives through identified and implemented action points. There was also good prisoner representation at a range of policy forums.
- 2.14 Written guidance on the role of the landing support officer was not always adhered to. We found case note entries from support officers focused mainly on prisoners' institutional behaviour, manners and cleanliness. Most were related to their progress through the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. There was little reference to prisoners' lives outside prison. Entries were infrequent but did occasionally include some positive comments.

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.

2.15 Strategic management of equality and diversity was good and policies covered all the protected characteristics. The equality and diversity (E&D) team was highly motivated and staff were committed to their work. Scrutiny arrangements for diversity complaints were excellent. Support for protected groups, including Gypsy, Roma and Travellers, and gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners, was good. There were gaps in the support provided for disabled prisoners and those who spoke little or no English. Black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners reported less positively than others in our survey about a range of important issues.

Strategic management

- 2.16 Strategic management of E&D was good. The prison had comprehensive policy documents, covering all the protected characteristics, and E&D information was on display on all wings. The governor chaired the well-attended, bi-monthly diversity and equality action team (DEAT) meetings. The E&D team was highly motivated and had helped the prison achieve a prestigious national quality mark for its diversity work. There were individual staff champions for each of the protected groups. Trained prisoner E&D representatives on each wing wore distinctive T-shirts, but black and minority ethnic prisoners were under-represented in this group. The representatives attended the DEAT and bi-monthly E&D representative meetings.
- 2.17 Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were available on all wings, and incidents could also be reported via a free-phone number. There had been 48 complaints in the last six months, similar to the same period last year. Investigations into these complaints had been conducted promptly and to a good standard. Scrutiny arrangements were excellent, with up to eight outside agencies attending the monthly hate crime scrutiny panel, chaired by the governor; the panel scrutinised a sample of DIRFs to check investigations were thorough and responses fair.
- 2.18 Monitoring was taken seriously, and some good analysis took place, including a locally developed system to monitor outcomes for all protected groups. Under-representation in access to release on temporary licence (ROTL) for Asian prisoners had been unresolved for too long.

Recommendation

- 2.19 The disparities in access to ROTL for Asian prisoners should be examined and any remedial action needed taken.

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

Housekeeping point

- 2.20 The ethnicity of the trained prisoner representatives on each wing should be more representative of the prisoner population.

Good practice

- 2.21 *The hate crime scrutiny panel was an excellent initiative for quality assuring responses to E&D complaints.*

Protected characteristics

- 2.22 In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners reported less positively than the general population across a range of indicators. Despite some good work to interact positively with this group of prisoners, more needed to be done to understand their concerns.
- 2.23 A small number of prisoners had identified themselves as being from Gypsy, Roma, or Traveller groups, and forums had been run for them. Speakers had been invited to talk to them about relevant issues, and two cultural events had been celebrated. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners received a copy of the *Travellers in prison news* and *Traveller news* publications. Support had been arranged for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners' families, and Horton Housing, in conjunction with Shelter, arranged accommodation for those who wanted to move to a fixed abode.
- 2.24 One hundred foreign national prisoners were held; they were interviewed by the foreign national liaison officer within 48 hours of their arrival. Each wing had a touch-screen monitor with audio and written information in 10 languages, but not all of them were working. Reception and first night information was available in 13 languages, including on audio CDs. There was a list of staff and prisoner translators. Telephone translation services had been used 80 times in the last six months, but we found several prisoners who understood little English for whom translation services had not been used.
- 2.25 There were good links with embassies and the UK Border Agency. Prisoners held solely on immigration grounds were signposted to independent legal advice. Foreign nationals received a free monthly telephone call, but only if they had not received a domestic visit during the preceding month. At the end of each month, any unused telephone credit was removed from their accounts, and they could not obtain additional credit without a further application. There were links with Asylum Justice and Release, a support group for asylum seekers, and quarterly surgeries with the local Reconnections team, which helped arrange accommodation, advice, and employment for foreign nationals on release.
- 2.26 There were 102 prisoners (9%) who had been identified as having a disability, but in our survey, 23% of prisoners reported a disability, indicating significant under-reporting. The disability liaison officer (DLO) interviewed disabled prisoners within 48 hours of being notified of their arrival. Where appropriate, care plans and personal emergency evacuation plans were in place. There were four fully adapted cells on A and B wings, and all cells in the health care department were wheelchair accessible. Two wings had wheelchair lifts, but the lift on B wing was not working. Prisoners in wheelchairs could not access the multi-faith room, library or education. Activities for prisoners who were unfit for work were limited and there was little to keep them occupied. There was no forum for this group of prisoners. Our survey indicated that prisoners with disabilities were more negative than others about a range of important issues.

- 2.27 There was a very comprehensive gay, bisexual and transgender policy, including well-attended monthly meetings, which included external representation and guest speakers. One-to-one support was available from the staff champion, a representative of MESMAC (a support group for gay and bisexual men) and a transgender volunteer. Gay and bisexual prisoners told us that they felt well supported. The canteen list catered for transgender prisoners' needs.
- 2.28 There were 94 prisoners over the age of 50; the oldest man was 82. Health and social care plans were completed for all prisoners over the age of 60, and this information was shared with Shelter to help inform release plans. There were weekly social meetings for older prisoners and special gym sessions twice a week, but apart from this, there was little to keep them occupied. A monthly magazine the *Mature observer* was produced at the prison and distributed to older prisoners. Prisoners over retirement age had to pay for their in-cell television.

Recommendations

- 2.29 Telephone translation services should be used for prisoners who speak little English, particularly for sensitive or complex discussions.
- 2.30 Foreign national prisoners should receive an overseas monthly telephone call, irrespective of receiving domestic visits, and accrued credit should not be deducted from their telephone account.
- 2.31 Prisoners over retirement age should not have to pay for their television.

Housekeeping point

- 2.32 The prison should explore the reasons for the under-reporting of disabilities.

Good practice

- 2.33 *Links with community organisations to support Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and foreign national prisoners on release were good initiatives.*

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.

- 2.34 Faith support was good, and most prisoners in our survey said their religious beliefs were respected. Pastoral support, including bereavement counselling, was good.
- 2.35 The chaplaincy had a multi-faith ethos and was led by a part-time Free Church chaplain. The duty chaplain saw most new receptions on the evening of their arrival or the next morning. There were prisoner faith representatives and notice boards advertising forthcoming events on all wings. Chaplains were well integrated into the life of the prison and attended appropriate meetings.

- 2.36 Faith provision was good. There were separate Christian faith services for vulnerable prisoners, but other faiths had integrated services. The multi-faith centre was shared by all faith groups and could accommodate all prisoners who wished to attend. There were adequate washing facilities for Muslim prisoners. All major faith events were celebrated, and there were good links with the kitchen to provide special meals.
- 2.37 Pastoral support for prisoners was good, especially following bereavements; three members of the chaplaincy offered bereavement counselling and support. In our survey, most prisoners felt their religious beliefs were respected and black and minority ethnic, foreign national and Muslim prisoners were the most positive. There were good links with community group representatives, who attended faith meetings and arranged faith support and housing for prisoners after release.

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.

2.38 Most complaints were managed well, but some complaints about staff were not investigated adequately.

2.39 The number of complaints was similar to comparable prisons, but in our survey, fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons said it was easy to make a complaint, and more than in comparator prisons said they had been prevented from submitting a complaint. In contrast, more than normal reported that their complaint had been dealt with fairly. It was not always easy to obtain complaint forms, partly because of stock levels and partly because the complaints process was closely associated with the PID workers on some wings. However, the system for collecting the forms from wings was appropriately confidential.

2.40 Most replies were legible, timely, and polite and answered the issues raised, but some complaints against staff were answered at too low a level and did not assure us that an impartial investigation would take place. The prison had investigated the fact that black and minority ethnic prisoners made fewer complaints than the general population. They had concluded that there was no disadvantage. The monthly analysis provided to senior managers could have been improved and a regular quality assurance process introduced.

Recommendation

2.41 All complaints against staff should be robustly investigated and answered by a governor grade.

Housekeeping points

2.42 Complaint forms should be easily available to prisoners on the wings; they should not be associated with the PID system.

- 2.43 Management information on complaints should be sufficiently detailed to identify areas of concern.

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.

- 2.44 Trained legal services officers provided reasonable support, but were too frequently diverted to other tasks.

- 2.45 A team of officers had been trained to provide prisoners with legal services, but the work did not happen as often as planned because the staff were regularly diverted to other tasks. There was a clear demand for the service, particularly from newly arrived prisoners, but applications were not always answered quickly, which was a concern for those seeking bail.

- 2.46 Legal visitors found it easy to book visits, but visiting booths did not allow for sufficient privacy. A noisy ventilation system, leaky roof and lack of disabled access further reduced the suitability of the area, but the legal visitors we spoke to were not dissatisfied.

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.

- 2.47 The range of health services was good. Prisoners were usually able to see a nurse every day on the wings and consultations were well conducted. Waiting times to see a GP were reasonable. The administration of medications was safe, but there were delays in prisoners receiving prescribed medication. Dental waiting times were acceptable. Prisoners waited too long to see the optician. Long-term conditions were well managed. The use of prisoner health care representatives was excellent. In-patient care was good. Mental health services offered a responsive and supportive service. The new brain injury service provided helpful support.

Governance arrangements

- 2.48 A joint prison partnership board, with appropriate representation, met quarterly. A comprehensive health needs assessment had been completed in June 2012 alongside a delivery plan. There was clear, effective oversight, operational management and governance of health care. The excellent prisoner health care representative scheme gave prisoners an opportunity to be involved. Representatives were enthusiastic, well trained and supported and played a significant part in the rolling health promotion programme.

- 2.49 The smoking cessation programme, run by a trained discipline officer, had a significant waiting list. Prisoners could obtain sexual health advice and condoms were available on request. Immunisation against blood borne viruses was effective. Care of older prisoners included a regular designated group.
- 2.50 Approximately 260 incidents were reported in the first six months of the year, of which over 80% were medication-related; we were confident that this was largely due to a positive reporting culture and there was evidence that actions were appropriate. The number of complaints was low. Responses were mostly reasonable, but a small number did not deal with the issue raised.
- 2.51 Policies and protocols were relevant and up to date. There was a programme of regular audits with an associated action plan. An infection control audit had identified cleaning and refurbishment actions and the potential for cross-contamination from inadequate hand-washing facilities. There was good take up of mandatory and clinical training. A clear induction and annual appraisal were routine and most staff received clinical supervision. Resuscitation equipment was located in three designated treatment rooms with a system of daily and weekly checks.

Recommendation

- 2.52 All treatment rooms should comply with infection control standards.

Good practice

- 2.53 *Prisoner representatives provided an excellent bridge between prisoners and health care professionals and ensured prisoners' views on quality and planning in health services were heard.*

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.54 Health care services were provided from the central health care suite and on the wings. The suite comprised a mix of consulting and treatment rooms and staff offices. The holding rooms accommodating both mainstream and vulnerable prisoners were stark, but had televisions showing health promotion films. Prisoners sometimes waited too long before returning to the wings.
- 2.55 Reception screening was well organised with good attention to first night safety, including potential self-harm and alcohol withdrawal. Secondary assessments were carried out the following day and included effective follow-through to mental health and substance misuse services; prisoners were also immunised against Hepatitis B.
- 2.56 Prisoners complained about waiting times to see a GP. The usual wait was a week although at the time of the inspection this was somewhat longer because of the Christmas break. Most prisoners attended a nurse triage appointment before seeing a GP; there was scope to improve this system and reduce GP waiting times. Prisoners had daily access to nurse triage clinics on the wings, although prisoners told us this sometimes varied. A helpful range of treatment pathways informed nurse-led care. SystmOne, the electronic clinical information system, was used universally.

- 2.57 Prisoners waited up to seven weeks to see the optician, which was too long. The management of long-term conditions mirrored the community model and prisoners had access to information and follow-up care aligned with national frameworks. Few external hospital appointments were cancelled; when they were, this was supported by a clinical indicator process overseen by a GP.
- 2.58 The in-patient unit had 19 cells and was reasonably clean. It had a large communal room that was well used by prisoners for education and association. There was also a small fitness room and prisoners could use an outside exercise area. There were reasonable adaptations for disabled prisoners. During our visit, 10 prisoners were on the unit. One prisoner was there solely because he was on a constant watch; however we were told that admissions for non-clinical reasons were infrequent. There was an agreed discharge protocol between the health care department and the prison. Care plans for in-patients reflected clinical need and most had been reviewed regularly. Prisoners we spoke to described good care from both nursing and discipline staff.
- 2.59 There was appropriate emergency access to health care out of hours, with a 24-hour nursing presence, medical cover from the Local Care Direct service and an emergency ambulance protocol. Nurses told us that they had direct, prompt access to the wings at night for emergencies. A small proportion of prison staff had completed emergency first aid at work, basic life support and defibrillator use training.

Recommendation

- 2.60 Access to nurse triage clinics should be equitable across the wings.

Pharmacy

- 2.61 Pharmacy services were provided in-house through pharmacists and technicians to enable dispensing and pharmacy-led medicines administration. Supplies came directly from pharmaceutical wholesalers. The pharmacy was located within the main health care unit.
- 2.62 Prescribing was electronic with some records generated through SystmOne and others being generated through conventional paper charts. Staff did not always accurately record on paper records whether a prisoner had received in-possession medication or whether it had been given under supervision.
- 2.63 Prescribing was electronic with some records generated through SystmOne and conventional paper charts. Prescribing practice was evidence based. There was scope to educate prisoners on medicines' use to enhance compliance. There were limited pharmacy technician clinics for minor conditions and no pharmacist-led clinics or medicine use reviews.
- 2.64 Medicines administration was appropriate, confidentiality was good and patient information leaflets were provided. Discipline staff supervision was variable. Approximately 50% of prisoners had their medicines in possession, which was good. The wing treatment rooms had safe appropriate medicines storage, except for the A wing treatment room, where there was one unlocked medicines cupboard and a second inadequately secured cupboard.
- 2.65 The administration of methadone was appropriate. There was a comprehensive suite of standard operating procedures and patient group directions (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) for immunisations and substance use detoxification. The medicine in-possession policy was robust and medicines open to diversion or abuse were

not supplied in possession. A policy on medicines for the treatment of minor ailments enabled prisoners to obtain over-the-counter medicines from a general sales list (GSL) of medicines. Prisoners also told us that they could order and buy specific non-prescribed GSL items. The monthly clinical governance steering group covered medicines management and was informed by reports generated from the pharmacy computer system.

Housekeeping points

- 2.66 All medication administration should be recorded accurately to reflect whether it is in possession or supervised.
- 2.67 Medicines storage cupboards should be robust and meet national standards.

Dentistry

- 2.68 Dental services were provided by an independent contractor commissioned directly by the primary care trust. A dentist and dental nurse provided four sessions per week over two days and a dental hygienist visited once a week.
- 2.69 For sentenced prisoners, the wait for an initial routine dental appointment was two weeks. Remanded and short-sentenced prisoners could usually only receive urgent and emergency treatment. Prisoners with urgent needs could often be seen on the same day or usually within 48 hours. Sentenced prisoners could have the full range of dental treatments, including more complex invasive procedures, reducing the need for external appointments. The dentist recorded information on SystmOne and charted dentition on paper dental records, which were secured in locked cabinets in the surgery.
- 2.70 Infection control arrangements in the surgery were suitable and complied with national guidance. Equipment had been maintained and serviced appropriately, but it was not clear who was responsible for this work. The dentist was the only health service without contractual or management oversight by the head of health care, which had an impact on the management of prisoners' dental health needs and the safe maintenance of clinical equipment.

Recommendation

- 2.71 **The dental service contract should be within the operational oversight of the head of health care to ensure prisoners' dental needs are met and equipment is safely maintained and serviced.**

Good practice

- 2.72 *Use of a dental hygienist helped educate and support good oral health.*

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.73 Primary mental health services had been reviewed in August 2012. The team leader worked with a small team of registered mental health nurses. We noted good integration between primary and in-reach services, wider health care and the prison, notably safer custody. A stepped primary mental health model incorporating improving access to psychological

therapies was in place. Prisoners could self-refer by visiting the Harbour facility, a discrete unit offering a range of focused group work, including sleep clinics and anger management. Prisoners we spoke to praised the support they had received.

- 2.74 Prisoners were usually assessed within 24 hours and there was a risk assessment and follow-up system for those who failed to attend appointments. A multidisciplinary referral meeting determined what service was required and prisoners were seen within two to four weeks.
- 2.75 Prisoners with severe and enduring mental health conditions were supported by an integrated criminal justice in-reach team. The team leader was supported by a team of community psychiatric nurses (CPNs) and an adult general psychiatrist. The service was provided Monday to Friday with additional access to an on-call forensic psychiatrist. Local attention deficit hyperactivity assessment services and support for men with personality disorders were available.
- 2.76 Working relationships were excellent and CPNs attended safer custody reviews regularly. The team also provided specialist mental health support to the segregation unit. Records we reviewed were up to date and accurate, including risk assessments. Prisoners we spoke to praised the sensitive and thoughtful support they had received, which included in-reach team contact with and visits to their families.
- 2.77 The new brain injury programme was an exciting response to the unmet needs of the significant proportion of prisoners with a history of brain injury and attendant problems.

Good practice

- 2.78 *The Harbour provided prisoners with an excellent resource, enabling them to better manage their own mental health problems.*
- 2.79 *The sleep clinic was a helpful initiative to support prisoners with sleeping difficulties without resorting to medication.*
- 2.80 *The brain injury service gave prisoners with a previously undiagnosed brain injury effective support to cope and better comply with their sentence plan.*
- 2.81 *The links and visits to prisoners' families supported the effective rehabilitation of prisoners.*

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.

- 2.82 The food was poor and prisoners were very dissatisfied. Meals were served too early and there were no hot meals in the evenings at weekends. There was good information about nutrition on all wings.
- 2.83 Tiles were lifting from the kitchen floor, and the prisoner changing area and toilets were dirty and in need of repair and some were covered in graffiti. There was a published four-week

menu cycle from which prisoners ordered their meals in advance. Appropriate choices were provided for different dietary needs and preferences. Breakfast packs were offered the evening before, and lunch and evening meals were served at 11.45am and 4.15pm, which was too early. Hot meals were not served in the evenings at weekends. There were no facilities for prisoners to eat communally, so meals were eaten in cells, many of which had unscreened toilets.

- 2.84 In our survey, only 15% of prisoners said the food was good; black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners' responses were particularly negative. The kitchen manager attended prisoner consultation meetings, but food comment books were not readily available, and there were few comments, or responses. Daily servery checks were not always completed, and some prisoners and staff serving food were not appropriately dressed. Some of the hot food we sampled had gone cold. There was good information on wings about nutrition, covering a wide range of dietary needs. Up to 61 prisoners worked in the kitchen; they could study for a national vocational qualification level 2 in food hygiene and food and hospitality.

Recommendations

- 2.85 Meals should be served after 12 noon and not before 5pm, and hot meals should be provided in the evenings at weekends.
- 2.86 The quality of the food provided should be sufficient to meet the everyday needs of prisoners.

Housekeeping points

- 2.87 Floor tiles in the kitchen should be repaired, graffiti in prisoner areas removed, and the toilets repaired.
- 2.88 Food comments books should be readily available to prisoners, who should be encouraged to comment about the food.
- 2.89 Management checks of serveries should ensure prisoners and staff are dressed appropriately, and that daily records are maintained.

Good practice

- 2.90 *Information about nutrition was available to prisoners on wings.*

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.91 Some prisoners had to wait too long for their first canteen order. Black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were more negative about the range of products available in the prison shop.

- 2.92 Prisoners received a canteen pack on arrival. Those who arrived with some funds could purchase extra packs. Some prisoners had to wait up to 16 days before receiving their first canteen order, although emergency packs could be purchased. In our survey, 47% of prisoners said the prison shop sold a wide enough range to meet their needs, which was similar to comparator prisons. However, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were less positive. The canteen list was available in six languages, and was reviewed quarterly. Prisoners were notified of any price changes two weeks before they were implemented. Prisoners could order from five catalogues and paid a 50p delivery charge per order. Newspapers could be ordered through the library.

Recommendation

- 2.93 Prisoners should have their first canteen order within a few days of arriving at the prison.

Housekeeping point

- 2.94 Prisoners should not have to pay an administration fee for catalogue order deliveries.

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 Nearly all prisoners had about 7.5 hours out of cell Monday to Thursday, but less during weekends. Access to outside exercise was reasonable for most, but some yards were stark.
- 3.2 During two spot checks, we found less than 1% of prisoners (those on the basic regime) locked up during activity periods. It was commendable and very unusual in a local prison to find nearly all prisoners unlocked during the working day, which equated to approximately 7.5 hours every week day. Most prisoners were unlocked four evenings a week until 6.30pm, but standard level prisoners on B and F wings had fewer evenings out of cell because of low staffing levels. Time out of cell was about five hours at weekends, when prisoners were locked up continuously for over 15 hours at night time.
- 3.3 Daily opportunities for exercise were often early in the morning or in the evening. On some wings, those in full-time employment could not spend one hour outside on week days. There were three exercise yards: one was very stark, a second had some grass and benches, a third had some modern exercise equipment.

Good practice

- 3.4 *The policy of unlocking prisoners for as long as possible each day, even if they had no paid activity to attend, was excellent.*

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.5 The management of learning and skills was effective but needed further improvement. Quality improvement and self-assessment processes were used well to identify and address shortfalls in the provision's quality. However, the implementation of some key quality improvement measures had been delayed. Partnership working was very strong. There were insufficient activity places for the whole population, but most prisoners who wanted to work could. The

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.

range of provision was narrow, but appropriate to the population and allocation procedures were good. The quality of provision was mixed, with teaching, learning and assessment in need of improvement. Prisoners' work standards were generally good, but outcomes needed to be better, particularly for accredited qualifications. Library services were reasonable.

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

Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities:

Requires improvement

Quality of learning and skills and work activities (including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment):

Requires improvement

Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:

Requires improvement

Management of learning and skills and work

3.7 The prison had established a good management focus on improving the quality of the provision to support resettlement. The learning and skills provision was narrow in scope but appropriate for the prison population. Managers had made good use of curriculum reviews and market intelligence as part of a needs analysis to inform the planning of provision.

3.8 Partnership working with employers and external agencies, including voluntary organisations, was strong and well coordinated. The partnership manager had overall responsibility for coordination and over the last year had ensured less duplication in contact with prisoners and introduced better resettlement planning. Frequent and regular meetings took place at strategic level; they were focused on the resettlement pathways and identified ways of improving support for prisoners, for example, by promoting links with employers and work placements.

3.9 Managers' collection and use of data and targets to inform performance management were satisfactory, but the prison recognised the need to exploit fully their potential to assist in monitoring outcomes. The quality improvement group and self-assessment process was well used to identify and address shortfalls in the provision's quality but the prison had delayed the implementation of some key improvement actions, such as the assessment of the quality of learning sessions across the provision through direct observation. Arrangements to support all prisoners with an identified need were underdeveloped. Staffing levels were appropriate to progress plans for improvement. All teachers were suitably qualified and experienced.

Recommendation

3.10 The prison should fully implement all identified improvement actions.

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

Provision of activities

- 3.11 There were 828 full-time equivalent purposeful activity places, which were not sufficient to keep the whole prison population fully occupied, but most prisoners who wanted an activity could get one promptly. Allocation was fair, timely and reflected prisoners' needs. Activity records were accurate and effectively monitored. Activities were available on a part- or full-time basis, with a minority only available as full time. Vulnerable prisoners received equitable access to provision compared with mainstream prisoners. The learning and skills provision was narrow but appropriate, and waiting lists were short and effectively managed. Pay rates had been reviewed, but the policy lacked clarity and needed to be revised further to ensure a clear link between prisoners' performance and reward. However, no evidence was found that the new arrangements deterred participation in activities.
- 3.12 Prisoners received an appropriate assessment of needs at induction. On entry to the prison, 70% of prisoners were assessed as having English and mathematics skills below level 1 and of these, 30% had skills below entry level 3. The curriculum range had generally decreased since the last inspection, with a greater focus on the low skill levels of current prisoners. Information, advice and guidance were satisfactory at the pre-release stage, but not consistently effective at other times particularly on arrival in custody.
- 3.13 There were 76 full-time equivalent places in vocational workshops accounting for around 9% of the prison population. The range of accredited qualifications was narrow but appropriate. However, too many qualifications were not available. On some programmes, recruitment was low.
- 3.14 The Manchester College provided 262 full-time equivalent places every week day, which were used by around 46% of the prison population at some time during the week. The range of accredited courses was satisfactory and included functional skills in mathematics, English and information and communication technology (ICT), English for speakers of other languages and business administration. English, maths and ICT were provided in the segregation and health care units to around 68 prisoners who could not attend education classes. There were plans to offer similar provision to prisoners housed in the recovery wing. Two prisoners were following distance-learning courses. The prison had a virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) that was primarily used as a resource to support resettlement.
- 3.15 The prison had 490 full-time equivalent work places that could be undertaken alongside most education and vocational training opportunities. The range and variety of work was appropriate to the needs of the prison population and provided prisoners with good opportunities to develop useful employability skills.
- 3.16 The prison managed the Toe by Toe reading scheme supported by 21 Shannon Trust-trained peer mentors. Six prisoners were participating in the scheme. The prison was using its good external partnership links to provide opportunities for 20 prisoners, who received release on temporary licence (ROTL) to gain work experience prior to release.

Recommendations

- 3.17 The pay policy should have clear links between prisoners' performance and reward.

- 3.18 The availability of information, advice and guidance, especially for new arrivals, should be improved.

Quality of provision

- 3.19 The quality of teaching, learning and assessment required improvement. The better sessions were effectively planned and teachers adapted the lessons well to respond to prisoners' needs and encourage them to take responsibility for their learning. For example, in a maths session, all prisoners reviewed test questions in preparation for an exam. Good discussions took place regarding the calculations needed to arrive at the correct answer and prisoners quizzed each other and identified the best method to use. Non-accredited training in the workshops was well organised and prisoners had a sound appreciation of expected work standards. The quality of individual coaching in work and workshop areas was usually good. In weaker lessons, prisoners spent too much time listening to their teachers and insufficient time undertaking relevant activities that reinforced their learning. A minority of teachers failed to challenge stereotypical views expressed by prisoners or promote effectively an understanding of inclusion and diversity. Assessment was satisfactory, but needed to be improved. Teachers gave prisoners good feedback to help them develop, although too few provided enough information on how to improve written course work.
- 3.20 All teaching and training took place in appropriately resourced rooms. However, arrangements to provide a quiet environment for the diagnostic assessment of new prisoners during education classes were not routinely effective.
- 3.21 The prison had introduced a prison-wide individual learning plan that was used well to set targets for performance and standards linked to work, education and other activities. Overall, individual learning plans linked to each course required improvement. Better plans set out clearly what prisoners needed to do to progress and achieve and included an evaluation of their employability skills. However, too often they focused only on qualification or unit achievement. Short-term target setting was not consistently effective in raising aspirations and standards.

Recommendation

- 3.22 Better use should be made of individual learning plans and targets to improve outcomes for prisoners.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.23 Most prisoners who completed their vocational training achieved their award. Overall in 2011/12 retention rates were low, with prisoners being allowed to transfer to another work activity or training before completing their course. This practice had stopped and in 2012/13, retention rates were improving.
- 3.24 Prisoners in vocational training made appropriate progress. They demonstrated a good work ethic and produced good standards of work, as illustrated by the quality of finished items in the print shop and textiles workshops. However, the prison did not sufficiently recognise and record prisoners' skills development or use this to support employment and resettlement. Attendance at work and vocational training was good, but not consistently high enough in education.

- 3.25 In education, success and retention rates were generally low, particularly for Skills for Life programmes. However, retention in the latest academic year was improving. Success rates for information technology courses at entry level and level 1 were satisfactory, but rates at level 2 were low. Most prisoners were making at least satisfactory progress, and in the better lessons, the rate of skill development was very good. Overall, prisoners' work was of a good standard. It was well presented and prisoners took pride in their achievements. They developed good social skills and were respectful to each other and their teachers who effectively challenged occasional poor behaviour.

Recommendation

- 3.26 Arrangements should be introduced to recognise and record all prisoners' skills development to support employment and resettlement.

Library

- 3.27 Leeds City Council managed two libraries that were welcoming and well maintained. A new library for E and F wings was to open shortly. In addition, a small collection of texts was available to prisoners in other areas such as the segregation wing and in-patient unit. All accommodation wings had satisfactory access to a library, with approximately 42% of the prison population registered as library members, although usage was not being effectively monitored. Prisoners could obtain an adequate variety and number of texts. The library stock included a sufficient range of fiction and non-fiction, 'easy reads' and foreign language books. An appropriate variety of other material, including daily newspapers was available. However, the library offer did not fully reflect the needs of the learning and skills provision, and there was little available computer-based learning material. The library provided a Storybook Dads service and a reading club. However, staffing levels were significantly below planned levels, limiting literacy promotion activities. An annual survey of users' needs had been undertaken in June 2012, but this had not been analysed or used to inform planning.

Recommendation

- 3.28 There should be sufficient staff to provide a full library service, which should be informed by the views of users and support learning and skills provision.

Housekeeping point

- 3.29 Diagnostic assessment should take place in a quiet location.

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.

- 3.30 Physical education (PE) provision was good with prisoners having appropriate access to a good range of indoor facilities, although outdoor facilities were limited. All prisoners received a

suitable induction. The prison catered satisfactorily for specific groups of prisoners. Prisoners involved in recreational PE were not always encouraged to set and use personal objectives to support improvement. Health promotion activities were offered, but they were not held frequently enough. Staff were well qualified, experienced and used their links well to bring external groups into the prison. Non-accredited learning programmes were offered.

- 3.31** All prisoners could attend PE at least three times a week, with 23% using the facilities this often. They could obtain clean kit and use appropriate shower facilities. Prisoners made effective use of a good range of indoor facilities, but had no access to outdoor sports areas. However, additional exercise stations had been built in one of the exercise areas to enhance prisoners' fitness options. Prisoners participated in appropriate and timely PE inductions. The prison satisfactorily catered for specific groups of prisoners, including older users. Prisoners taking part in recreational PE did not always benefit from appropriate advice to guide their choice of exercise, provide encouragement and facilitate regular progress review.
- 3.32** The prison held a number of health promotion activities each year, but this was not frequent enough to have any impact on the regularly changing prisoner population. In some areas of the prison, promotional material was used well and prisoners could obtain a good variety of information, for example on diet and healthy eating and colon cancer, although this was not uniformly the case.
- 3.33** Staff were well qualified and experienced. They used their links well to bring into the prison representatives from external groups, including the Prince's Trust, Leeds Football Club and the Yorkshire Cricket Club. Prisoners could participate in non-accredited learning programmes covering a range of PE topics, which were offered on a rolling one-course-per-month basis.

Housekeeping point

- 3.34** Health promotion materials and activities should be used more consistently.

Section 4: Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1 The reducing reoffending strategy did not describe the management and needs of all groups of prisoners. Nevertheless, strategic planning of resettlement made sense, and there were well developed links with partner organisations, resulting in some innovative services. Excellent use was made of release on temporary licence (ROTL), and good resettlement opportunities were provided for prisoners on the resettlement wing.
- 4.2 The prison's declared core function was to reduce reoffending rates of prisoners with less than 12 months to serve and to move on to training prisons those who needed more intense support such as offending behaviour programmes. Given finite resources and the primary role of Leeds as a local prison this was a sensible compromise. The reducing reoffending strategy was based on a needs analysis and incorporated reintegration pathways. Outcomes were monitored monthly against performance measures. The strategy did not describe how it would meet the needs of prisoners across all protected characteristics or specific groups such as remanded, vulnerable or longer-term prisoners. The reducing reoffending strategy team met quarterly and the action plan to develop services was monitored and updated regularly. Enthusiastic senior managers were driving the development of a variety of strong resettlement services, and all managers and staff understood the objectives.
- 4.3 To maximise resettlement opportunities for short-term prisoners, those from West Yorkshire with a sentence of two years or less and in the last 12 months of their sentence were accommodated on the resettlement unit (C wing), supported by a dedicated team of officers. Staff from partnership agencies supported prisoners across all wings (see section on reintegration), but prioritised those on the resettlement unit. The partnership manager organised quarterly pathway-focused meetings for internal and external providers, and met current and potential ROTL partner agencies.
- 4.4 Job and resettlement fairs had been held in the unit and there were regular unit consultation meetings, exit questionnaires, ROTL feedback meetings and resettlement family forums. Prisoners on all wings could apply for ROTL, but had to move to the resettlement unit if they were successful.
- 4.5 Prisoners started with a 'tester' period of supervised ROTL and progressed on to unsupervised work placements, of which there were 30 across 20 organisations. Twenty-three prisoners were involved in ROTL placements during the inspection; two were in paid work and were paying 40% of their wages to victim services. No prisoners had absconded since the scheme had begun.

- 4.6 In our survey 58% of prisoners on C wing compared with 42% in the rest of the prison said that they had done something, or something had happened to them at the prison, to make them less likely to offend.
- 4.7 The 6th Hub, an integrated offender management scheme, monitored and worked with prolific or priority offenders (PPOs) (a total of 122) while in custody and on release, in partnership with West Yorkshire Probation Trust and West Yorkshire Police. Those not subject to licence conditions, were supported 'through the gate', by a joint venture with the probation-led Positive Futures initiative. Encouraging data was collected about the impact of these projects on reoffending rates. Prisoners returning to West Yorkshire were also supported in custody and on release through the West Yorkshire community chaplaincy project. Three prison officers were seconded full time to various relevant community agencies.

Recommendation

- 4.8 **The reducing reoffending strategy should describe how the prison meets the needs of all groups of prisoners.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.9 The offender management unit (OMU) was well established, but not easily accessible to all staff. All sentenced prisoners were allocated to an offender supervisor and most prisoners had a sentence plan. The quality of assessments was mixed. The exchange of information between other departments and the OMU needed improvement. Public protection work was generally robust. There were delays in moving some prisoners to other establishments.
- 4.10 The OMU was well established, but it was based outside the prison and was not easily accessible to other staff. Links with community services were good, but there was no published offender management strategy to describe the work of the unit, work with prisoners or links to other departments.
- 4.11 The OMU was led by a senior prison manager assisted by a senior probation officer (SPO) and a senior prison officer. The unit was well resourced with prison officers and probation staff. The prison officers in the unit were to be replaced in April 2013 by senior officer grade staff as a result of a national staffing review. Staff were anxious about the future, but all were clear about their purpose to promote the reduction of reoffending.
- 4.12 Links with most offender managers were good. All sentenced prisoners were allocated to an offender supervisor and seen promptly. All supervisors managed cases across the risk spectrum, but in the last six months prisoners on indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPPs), PPOs, lifers and high risk prisoners were being allocated primarily to the six probation offender supervisors in order to mitigate the problem of imminent staff changes.
- 4.13 In our survey, 33% of sentenced prisoners said they had a sentence plan, which was significantly less than in comparator prisons, but for prisoners on the resettlement wing, the

figure was 58%. Of all prisoners, 45% said they had been involved in the development of their sentence plan, significantly less than in comparator prisons, but 61% of prisoners on the resettlement wing said this was the case. Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners varied, but was better on the resettlement wing.

- 4.14 Only probation staff received formal supervision from the SPO and apart from the 10% quality assurance sampling of offender assessment system (OASys) documents by managers, there was no formal oversight of the work of uniformed offender supervisors. Not all prisoner contact was recorded, and in some cases a lack of effective information exchange between the OMU and some departments hampered the work with prisoners.
- 4.15 Prison-based offender supervisors completed assessments and sentence plans for short sentence and low risk prisoners; community offender managers completed this work for higher risk prisoners. Inspectors analysed 20 of these cases and found that most in-scope prisoners (prisoners serving 12 months or more and classified as posing a high risk to the public) had an up-to-date OASys document and sentence plan, but the quality of sentence plans was inconsistent and objectives were poorly defined. Critically the risk of harm classification was assessed as accurate in all cases seen, and OASys risk of serious harm screenings were completed for all and accurate in most. Prisoners posing a high risk of harm to others were clearly identified in OASys, but not all had a sufficient risk of serious harm analysis completed.
- 4.16 Attendance at sentence planning boards was not generally multidisciplinary and some cases had excluded the offender supervisor. No minutes were kept of discussions and decisions made, but there was some good practice in identifying and supporting prisoners with individual needs.
- 4.17 From June to December 2012, 152 prisoners (52% of applicants) were granted home detention curfew. Of these, 31 were released between eight and 37 days after their eligibility date. More than half of the delayed decisions were due to late return of paperwork from external probation.

Recommendations

- 4.18 All offender supervisors should receive formal professional case management and supervision.
- 4.19 The quality and consistency of all elements of OASys documents should be improved.
- 4.20 There should be improved communication and recording of all contact and work undertaken with prisoners across all departments.

Housekeeping point

- 4.21 Sentence planning boards should be multidisciplinary, include offender supervisors and personal officers and be minuted.

Public protection

- 4.22 Public protection work was generally robust and integrated into the work of the OMU. The public protection clerk was notified of all new receptions with convictions indicating public protection issues, and maintained up-to-date electronic records of all prisoners subject to

public protection, which were available to staff on the intranet. Prisoners subject to restrictions were seen individually by an offender supervisor to have their situation explained; 118 prisoners were identified as a risk to children and 82 subject to harassment monitoring.

- 4.23 Until January 2013, all prisoners charged with, convicted of or with previous convictions for offences against children, were unnecessarily automatically prevented from contact with any children, including their own, until a full assessment had been carried out. It was not uncommon for prisoners who had applied for contact to be transferred or released before assessments had been completed. Two prisoners had been waiting over 12 months. From January 2013, the SPO alone determined if restrictions needed to be instigated and if so at what level.
- 4.24 Weekly public protection meetings discussed the management of those subject to monitoring, and monthly inter-departmental risk management meetings were to be introduced to discuss matters concerning multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA). MAPPA were used effectively to manage risk of harm in two of the three cases examined, but offender supervisors were unsure of MAPPA protocols.
- 4.25 The list of prisoners subject to child protection arrangements in the visits room was out of date, which meant that supervising staff did not have accurate information on which prisoners were subject to restrictions.

Recommendations

- 4.26 A weekly screening of all new arrivals by a multidisciplinary team should determine whether child protection restrictions are necessary and the required level of monitoring.
- 4.27 Visits staff should have access to up-to-date information about prisoners subject to child protection arrangements, and the restrictions that apply to them.

Housekeeping point

- 4.28 Offender supervisors should have a clear understanding of the correct protocols for MAPPA arrangements.

Categorisation

- 4.29 Prisoners were initially categorised within 48 hours of arrival and were informed in writing. Reviews were conducted annually for those serving sentences of four years and over, and six-monthly for others. Many prisoners could make progressive moves, and approximately 50 prisoners were transferred every week to training prisons. However, it was more difficult to transfer some prisoners, particularly those on methadone maintenance, those who were category B (especially sex offenders) and those requiring open conditions. Some prisoners were not considered for transfer as a result of medical decisions to retain them for treatment, which were not always shared with offender supervisors (see paragraph 4.14).

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.30 There were 22 lifers and 28 IPPs, all allocated to an offender supervisor. Potential lifers were identified on remand and an offender supervisor gave them verbal and written information

about the sentence. Progressive moves were planned for men on indeterminate sentences after a multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel report had been completed. However, some were unable to move on as they were held for medical treatment or parole reviews, and a few were difficult to move because of mental health issues or behavioural problems.

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.

4.31 There was no custody planning for unconvicted prisoners or sentence planning for those serving less than 16 weeks. All prisoners, including these groups, had their accommodation, benefits and employment needs assessed on arrival. Debt advice was a recognised gap that managers were addressing. Support for prisoners seeking work or training on release or requiring ongoing health care was good. Joint working with drug and alcohol community support agencies improved prisoners' resettlement outcomes. The visits room was too small, but the amount of provision was good. There were excellent services to help prisoners maintain and improve family relationships. There were no accredited offending behaviour programmes.

4.32 There was no custody planning for unconvicted men. Prisoners serving sentences of less than 12 months (but not those serving less than 16 weeks), were allocated to an offender supervisor who completed an OASys basic custody screening to identify needs across the reintegration pathways and any risk factors. The offender supervisor made referrals to relevant agencies as necessary. There was no formal assessment follow up. All prisoners were interviewed on arrival so that accommodation or benefits problems could be identified and assistance provided. They were also seen by a prisoner from the resettlement unit to explain what the unit had to offer.

4.33 Information about the various resettlement services was freely available on prisoner information desks (PIDs). Prisoners on the resettlement unit were prioritised for services. However, prisoners from all wings could apply or be referred for help and all prisoners attended discharge planning boards pre-release to identify and address unmet needs.

Accommodation

4.34 Support was provided by a full-time Shelter worker, part-time workers from Leeds City Council housing department and Foundation, a voluntary sector housing provider. Accommodation services were good and included maintaining and surrendering tenancies and dealing with housing benefit and applications for accommodation before release. Monthly statistics recorded outcomes for prisoners: in 2012, 85% of prisoners had been released with accommodation, but on the resettlement wing this was 97%.

Education, training and employment

4.35 All prisoners were offered an employability programme prior to release with a particular emphasis on writing CVs, developing problem solving at work and working in a team.

However, participation was voluntary and too few prisoners participated. There was a good range of supportive community work placements, which had benefited approximately 80 prisoners in the last year. Arrangements for prisoners to continue their learning programmes in other establishments were effective. Some prisoners had gone on to further education and training opportunities in the community through the probation service.

Recommendation

- 4.36 All prisoners should attend a pre-release employability programme that is tailored to individual needs.

Health care

- 4.37 Prisoners were usually seen by a nurse before transfer or discharge. They were advised about registering with a GP and given an information leaflet on accessing NHS services. A basic discharge letter was faxed to their GP, if they were known. Nurses identified a local GP practice for those without a GP and informed the prisoner of this. Prisoners with long-term conditions were advised of follow-up appointments in the community and the GP was notified. Health promotion information and condoms were provided. There were effective links with local Macmillan nurses and hospices. End of life staff training had started and a policy was being formulated.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.38 The prison had very strong links with substance misuse support agencies in Leeds and West Yorkshire, including a new peer-led recovery-centred service called the Space, which involved regular input from the prison's recovery champions on ROTL. These active community links were reinforced through two-day job swaps between counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service (CARAT) workers and local drug intervention programme (DIP) workers. DIP workers visited the prison regularly to see prisoners who were nearing release; they had good access to all areas of the prison.

Good practice

- 4.39 *The two-day job swap opportunities and the extent to which prison access was given to DIP workers were both highly effective in building partnership working, which in turn improved resettlement outcomes for prisoners.*

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.40 A full range of benefit and employment advice was available from Jobcentre Plus staff based in the prison. Staff visited every wing daily and responded to applications. Prisoners in employment pre-custody were prioritised, and staff had safeguarded 50% of prisoners' employment during 2012. Bank accounts could be opened with Leeds Credit Union. Although, in theory prisoners could access the national debt telephone line (see section on residential units) there was no debt adviser. However, managers were actively working to address this.

Recommendation

- 4.41 Prisoners should have access to a specialist debt management service.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.42 There were many excellent opportunities for prisoners to maintain and improve relationships with their children and families, run by an effective partnership with the Jigsaw visitors' centre. These included a variety of relationship courses, several types of family visit and detailed family support casework. In addition, there were impressive consultation processes with both visitors and prisoners about visits. This meant that the prison was aware of the problems visitors encountered when they used the telephone booking line and was working to solve them.
- 4.43 In our survey, vulnerable prisoners were more likely than others to have experienced difficulties in contacting their family when they first arrived due to public protection processes, which delayed the approval of telephone numbers (see section on residential units).
- 4.44 The domestic visits room was too small for the population. To meet demand, two one-hour visiting sessions were run each morning and afternoon. Standard regime remand prisoners could only have three visits a week, which did not meet our expectations. There was no system to ensure that convicted prisoners could receive a visit within one week of their admission.
- 4.45 The visitors' centre was good, but it was not open before the early morning and evening visits sessions. Entry procedures were respectful, but we were concerned that, contrary to local policy, children as young as 11 months old were subject to a rubdown search. The atmosphere during visits was calm and relaxed. Prisoners could hug their children and embrace their visitors at the beginning and end of their visit. Vulnerable prisoners used the main visits hall and some told us that they did not feel safe there. The closed visits facilities were inadequate because they were insufficiently separate from ordinary visits, but they were not over-used, and restrictions on prisoners and visitors were regularly reviewed.

Recommendation

- 4.46 Babies and toddlers should only be searched when there is specific intelligence to indicate a risk.

Housekeeping point

- 4.47 All newly convicted prisoners should be able to receive a visit within one week of admission.

Good practice

- 4.48 *Wider support to help prisoners maintain contact with their families and friends was very good, with a variety of excellent opportunities offered.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.49 No accredited programmes were run at the prison and prisoners who needed them were expected to transfer elsewhere. This was the case for most prisoners but some were unable to do so (see section on offender management).
- 4.50 Jigsaw staff had delivered a three-day National Open College Network level 1 Relationships Without Violence course consisting of four sessions for prisoners wishing to change their patterns of behaviour in their personal relationships. A victim awareness course consisting of nine sessions delivered over three weeks had been developed but not yet delivered. The prison planned to run 12 groups, each involving 10 prisoners, annually.
- 4.51 A restorative justice scheme focusing solely on acquisitive offences had been developed, enabling prisoners to have a face-to-face meeting with victims mediated by a facilitator. One conference had been held so far, and the prison had supported a further two conferences and two cases of indirect mediation.

Additional resettlement services

- 4.52 There were no specific services to identify and support those who had been the victim of abuse, rape or domestic violence. However, some of the casework in the visitors' centre had the potential to meet these needs, for example the Relationships Without Violence course (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).

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 The analysis and investigation of violent incidents should be improved and a strategy developed to address the underlying causes and to support victims. (HP37)
 - 5.2 The prison should explore the more negative perceptions of prisoners from black and minority ethnic and disabled groups across many areas of prison life, and have regular consultative forums with them to better understand their concerns and meet their needs. (HP38)
 - 5.3 The quality of teaching should improve and the prison should significantly raise attendance, success and retention rates in education. (HP39)
 - 5.4 The Leeds' resettlement approach should be evaluated and any lessons applied nationally. (HP40)

Recommendation

To NOMS

-
- 5.5 Systems should be in place to ensure that waiting times in court before prisoners are returned to the prison are not excessive. (1.3)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

-
- 5.6 Conditions in reception should be improved. (1.9)
 - 5.7 Tracking systems to ensure that all prisoners receive a full induction should be introduced. (1.10)
 - 5.8 First night arrangements should ensure that all prisoners feel safe and get the support they require. (1.11)

Bullying and violence reduction

-
- 5.9 Vulnerable prisoners should be able to exercise without fear of being verbally abused by other prisoners. (1.19)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.10 Investigations into serious self-harm incidents should identify learning points and good practice, which should be reflected in future practices. (1.25)
- 5.11 Self-harm monitoring procedures should be improved and staff from other disciplines should be more involved. (1.26)

Security

- 5.12 MDT should be appropriately staffed to ensure all testing is carried out appropriately, within identified timescales and without gaps in provision. (1.36)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.13 Management oversight of the IEP scheme should be sufficient to ensure it is applied fairly to all. (1.40)
- 5.14 The local notice to prisoners (64/2012) that remand prisoners cannot have enhanced status unless they are employed should be revoked. (1.41)

Discipline

- 5.15 The daily regime and reintegration planning for prisoners in segregation should be improved. (1.56)
- 5.16 Conditions in the biohazard cells should be improved. (1.57)

Substance misuse

- 5.17 Compact-based drug testing should be made available to all prisoners on the recovery and post-recovery wings as a supportive and motivational intervention and to ensure the integrity of the programme. (1.63)

Residential units

- 5.18 Cells designed for one prisoner should not accommodate two and all cells should have privacy locks and lockable cupboards. (2.8)
- 5.19 Toilets should be screened and have seats and lids. (2.9)

Equality and diversity

- 5.20 The disparities in access to ROTL for Asian prisoners should be examined and any remedial action needed taken. (2.19)
- 5.21 Telephone translation services should be used for prisoners who speak little English, particularly for sensitive or complex discussions. (2.29)

- 5.22 Foreign national prisoners should receive an overseas monthly telephone call, irrespective of receiving domestic visits, and accrued credit should not be deducted from their telephone account. (2.30)
- 5.23 Prisoners over retirement age should not have to pay for their television. (2.31)

Complaints

- 5.24 All complaints against staff should be robustly investigated and answered by a governor grade. (2.41)

Health services

- 5.25 All treatment rooms should comply with infection control standards. (2.52)
- 5.26 Access to nurse triage clinics should be equitable across the wings. (2.60)
- 5.27 The dental service contract should be within the operational oversight of the head of health care to ensure prisoners' dental needs are met and equipment is safely maintained and serviced. (2.71)

Catering

- 5.28 Meals should be served after 12 noon and not before 5pm, and hot meals should be provided in the evenings at weekends. (2.85)
- 5.29 The quality of the food provided should be sufficient to meet the everyday needs of prisoners. (2.86)

Purchases

- 5.30 Prisoners should have their first canteen order within a few days of arriving at the prison. (2.93)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.31 The prison should fully implement all identified improvement actions. (3.10)
- 5.32 The pay policy should have clear links between prisoners' performance and reward. (3.17)
- 5.33 The availability of information, advice and guidance, especially for new arrivals, should be improved. (3.18)
- 5.34 Better use should be made of individual learning plans and targets to improve outcomes for prisoners. (3.22)
- 5.35 Arrangements should be introduced to recognise and record all prisoners' skills development to support employment and resettlement. (3.26)
- 5.36 There should be sufficient staff to provide a full library service, which should be informed by the views of users and support learning and skills provision. (3.28)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.37 The reducing reoffending strategy should describe how the prison meets the needs of all groups of prisoners. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.38 All offender supervisors should receive formal professional case management and supervision. (4.18)
- 5.39 The quality and consistency of all elements of OASys documents should be improved. (4.19)
- 5.40 There should be improved communication and recording of all contact and work undertaken with prisoners across all departments. (4.20)
- 5.41 A weekly screening of all new arrivals by a multidisciplinary team should determine whether child protection restrictions are necessary and the required level of monitoring. (4.26)
- 5.42 Visits staff should have access to up-to-date information about prisoners subject to child protection arrangements, and the restrictions that apply to them. (4.27)

Reintegration planning

- 5.43 All prisoners should attend a pre-release employability programme that is tailored to individual needs. (4.36)
- 5.44 Prisoners should have access to a specialist debt management service. (4.41)
- 5.45 Babies and toddlers should only be searched when there is specific intelligence to indicate a risk. (4.46)

Housekeeping points

Security

- 5.46 The MDT suite should be kept clean and tidy to maintain a respectful waiting and testing environment. (1.37)

Discipline

- 5.47 Written records of hearings should be legible and should reflect that prisoners have been given the opportunity to explain their version of events at adjudications. (1.47)
- 5.48 Conduct reports should be considered fully prior to discipline. (1.48)

Residential units

- 5.49 Prisoners should be able to make an application without having to disclose its contents to a PID worker. (2.10)

Equality and diversity

- 5.50 The ethnicity of the trained prisoner representatives on each wing should be more representative of the prisoner population. (2.20)
- 5.51 The prison should explore the reasons for the under-reporting of disabilities. (2.32)

Complaints

- 5.52 Complaint forms should be easily available to prisoners on the wings; they should not be associated with the PID system. (2.42)
- 5.53 Management information on complaints should be sufficiently detailed to identify areas of concern. (2.43)

Health services

- 5.54 All medication administration should be recorded accurately to reflect whether it is in possession or supervised. (2.66)
- 5.55 Medicines storage cupboards should be robust and meet national standards. (2.67)

Catering

- 5.56 Floor tiles in the kitchen should be repaired, graffiti in prisoner areas removed, and the toilets repaired. (2.87)
- 5.57 Food comments books should be readily available to prisoners, who should be encouraged to comment about the food. (2.88)
- 5.58 Management checks of servery should ensure prisoners and staff are dressed appropriately, and that daily records are maintained. (2.89)

Purchases

- 5.59 Prisoners should not have to pay an administration fee for catalogue order deliveries. (2.94)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.60 Diagnostic assessment should take place in a quiet location. (3.29)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.61 Health promotion materials and activities should be used more consistently. (3.34)

Offender management and planning

- 5.62 Sentence planning boards should be multidisciplinary, include offender supervisors and personal officers and be minuted. (4.21)
- 5.63 Offender supervisors should have a clear understanding of the correct protocols for MAPPA arrangements. (4.28)

Reintegration planning

- 5.64 All newly convicted prisoners should be able to receive a visit within one week of admission. (4.47)

Examples of good practice

- 5.65 The deployment of recovery champions, ongoing support from the recovery unit and the post-recovery unit, the quality of D and E wing discipline staff and the extent of integration with community and family services were all examples of good practice. (1.64)
- 5.66 The hate crime scrutiny panel was an excellent initiative for quality assuring responses to E&D complaints. (2.21)
- 5.67 Links with community organisations to support Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and foreign national prisoners on release were good initiatives. (2.33)
- 5.68 Prisoner representatives provided an excellent bridge between prisoners and health care professionals and ensured prisoners' views on quality and planning in health services were heard. (2.53)
- 5.69 Use of a dental hygienist helped educate and support good oral health. (2.72)
- 5.70 The Harbour provided prisoners with an excellent resource, enabling them to better manage their own mental health problems. (2.78)
- 5.71 The sleep clinic was a helpful initiative to support prisoners with sleeping difficulties without resorting to medication. (2.79)
- 5.72 The brain injury service gave prisoners with a previously undiagnosed brain injury effective support to cope and better comply with their sentence plan. (2.80)
- 5.73 The links and visits to prisoners' families supported the effective rehabilitation of prisoners. (2.81)
- 5.74 Information about nutrition was available to prisoners on wings. (2.90)

- 5.75 The policy of unlocking prisoners for as long as possible each day, even if they had no paid activity to attend, was excellent. (3.4)
- 5.76 The two-day job swap opportunities and the extent to which prison access was given to DIP workers were both highly effective in building partnership working, which in turn improved resettlement outcomes for prisoners. (4.39)
- 5.77 Wider support to help prisoners maintain contact with their families and friends was very good, with a variety of excellent opportunities offered. (4.48)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Rosemarie Bugdale	Inspector
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Joe Simmonds	Senior researcher
Olayinka Macauley	Researcher
Caroline Elwood	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Stan Brandwood	Pharmacist
Martin Jolly	Offender management inspector
Ian Simkins	Offender management inspector
Chris Simpson	Offender management inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Simon Cutting	Ofsted inspector
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	0	748	63.2
Recall	0	103	8.7
Convicted unsentenced	0	118	10
Remand	0	207	17.5
Civil prisoners	0	2	0.2
Detainees	0	6	0.5
Total	0	1,184	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	336	28.4
Less than 6 months	0	111	9.4
6 months to less than 12 months	0	61	5.2
12 months to less than 2 years	0	170	14.4
2 years to less than 4 years	0	206	17.4
4 years to less than 10 years	0	196	16.6
10 years and over (not life)	0	55	4.6
ISPP	0	26	2.2
Life	0	23	1.9
Total	0	1,184	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age	-	-
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	498	42.1
30 years to 39 years	396	33.4
40 years to 49 years	192	16.2
50 years to 59 years	54	4.6
60 years to 69 years	38	3.2
70 plus years	6	0.5
Please state maximum age	-	82
Total	1,184	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	0	1,082	91.4
Foreign nationals	0	102	8.6
Total	0	1,184	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	377	31.8
Uncategorised sentenced	0	10	0.8
Cat A	0	0	0
Cat B	0	78	6.6
Cat C	0	668	56.4
Cat D	0	48	4.1
Other	0	3	0.3
Total	0	1,184	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	0	717	69.8
Irish	0	6	0.8
Other white	0	47	4.7
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	18	1.7
White and black African	0	2	0.2
White and Asian	0	4	0.3
Other mixed	0	7	0.6
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	28	2.7
Pakistani	0	89	9.1
Bangladeshi	0	3	0.3
Other Asian	0	32	2.9
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	25	2.7
African	0	12	1.2
Other black	0	9	0.9
Chinese or other ethnic group			
Chinese	0	3	0.3
Other ethnic group	0	7	0.6
Not stated	0	131	1.2
Total	0	1,140	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	0	0.
Church of England	0	244	20.6
Roman Catholic	0	225	19
Other Christian denominations	0	75	6.3
Muslim	0	188	15.9
Sikh	0	8	0.7
Hindu	0	1	0.1
Buddhist	0	14	1.2
Jewish	0	2	0.2
Other	0	6	0.5
No religion	0	421	35.5
Total	0	1,140	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	224	26.4
1 month to 3 months	0	0	274	32.3
3 months to 6 months	0	0	173	20.4
6 months to 1 year	0	0	108	12.7
1 year to 2 years	0	0	53	6.3
2 years to 4 years	0	0	14	1.6
4 years or more	0	0	2	0.2
Total	0	0	848	100

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	121	36
1 month to 3 months	0	0	115	34
3 months to 6 months	0	0	68	20
6 months to 1 year	0	0	21	6.4
1 year to 2 years	0	0	11	3.3
2 years to 4 years	0	0	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	336	100

Main offence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	0	NOT AVAILABLE	
Sexual offences	0		
Burglary	0		
Robbery	0		
Theft and handling	0		
Fraud and forgery	0		
Drugs offences	0		
Other offences	0		
Civil offences	0		
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	0		
Total	0		

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 8 January 2013 the prisoner population at HMP Leeds was 1121. The sample size was 212. Overall, this represented 19% of the prisoner population.

Selecting the sample

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

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, one respondent was 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:

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

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

Response rates

In total, 190 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 17% of the prison population. The response rate was 90%. In addition to the seven respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 11 questionnaires were not returned and four were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation about 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 2013 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 35 local prisons since April 2007.
- The current survey responses in 2013 against the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Leeds in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2013 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 2013 survey between the VP wings (A) and the rest of the establishment.

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

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

Summary

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

No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages for 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 results

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	78	(41%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	64	(34%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	35	(19%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	6	(3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	124	(65%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	17	(9%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	29	(15%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	18	(9%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	2	(1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	49	(27%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	22	(12%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	16	(9%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	27	(15%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	31	(17%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	24	(13%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	9	(5%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	2	(1%)
	<i>Life</i>	1	(1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	<i>Yes</i>	19	(10%)
	<i>No</i>	169	(90%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	187	(98%)
	<i>No</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	186	(98%)
	<i>No</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish)....</i>	125 (66%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese.</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>White - other</i>	11 (6%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 2 (1%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Arab</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	26 (14%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)		

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

Yes.....	9 (5%)
No.....	173 (95%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	52 (28%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	45 (24%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	37 (20%)	<i>Muslim</i>	36 (19%)
<i>Protestant</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Other</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	4 (2%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	182 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	1 (1%)

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

Yes.....	43 (23%)
No.....	144 (77%)

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

Yes.....	10 (5%)
No.....	178 (95%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	65 (35%)
No.....	122 (65%)

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

Yes.....	104 (55%)
No.....	84 (45%)

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>	160 (85%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	23 (12%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (3%)

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>	160 (84%)
Yes.....	10 (5%)
No.....	18 (9%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	160 (85%)
---	-----------

Yes.....	3 (2%)
No.....	24 (13%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

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

Yes.....	124 (65%)
No.....	52 (27%)
Don't remember	14 (7%)

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

Yes.....	149 (79%)
No.....	36 (19%)
Don't remember	3 (2%)

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

Very well.....	43 (23%)
Well.....	81 (43%)
Neither.....	48 (25%)
Badly.....	7 (4%)
Very badly	4 (2%)
Don't remember	7 (4%)

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	125 (67%)
Yes, I received written information.....	6 (3%)
No, I was not told anything.....	37 (20%)
Don't remember	19 (10%)

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

Yes.....	151 (80%)
No.....	32 (17%)
Don't remember	5 (3%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?

Less than 2 hours.....	110 (59%)
2 hours or longer.....	64 (34%)
Don't remember	14 (7%)

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

Yes.....	154 (82%)
No	25 (13%)
Don't remember	8 (4%)

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

Very well.....	46 (24%)
Well.....	85 (45%)
Neither.....	38 (20%)
Badly.....	13 (7%)
Very badly	4 (2%)
Don't remember	2 (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>	27 (15%)	<i>Physical health</i> 31 (17%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	30 (16%)	<i>Mental health</i> 33 (18%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	13 (7%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 13 (7%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	49 (26%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 51 (28%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Other</i> 8 (4%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	38 (21%)	Did not have any problems 61 (33%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	40 (22%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	Yes	56 (31%)	
	No.....	66 (36%)	
	Did not have any problems	61 (33%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>	158 (84%)	
	<i>A shower</i>	127 (67%)	
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	92 (49%)	
	<i>Something to eat</i>	151 (80%)	
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>	144 (76%)	
	<i>Toiletries/basic items</i>	149 (79%)	
	Did not receive anything	3 (2%)	
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>	98 (53%)	
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	132 (72%)	
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	76 (41%)	
	<i>Prison shop/canteen</i>	53 (29%)	
	Did not have access to any of these	28 (15%)	
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>	96 (52%)	
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	76 (41%)	
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	83 (45%)	
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	76 (41%)	
	<i>Health services</i>	88 (48%)	
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>	83 (45%)	
	Not offered any information	43 (23%)	
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	Yes	146 (78%)	
	No.....	34 (18%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)	
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?		
	Have not been on an induction course	52 (28%)	
	<i>Within the first week</i>	79 (43%)	
	<i>More than a week</i>	43 (23%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	10 (5%)	

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 52 (29%)
 Yes 76 (42%)
 No..... 40 (22%)
 Don't remember 12 (7%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?
Did not receive an assessment..... 39 (21%)
 Within the first week 41 (22%)
 More than a week 82 (45%)
 Don't remember 21 (11%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1 How easy is it to:

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	18 (10%)	55 (30%)	34 (19%)	34 (19%)	25 (14%)	15 (8%)
Attend legal visits?	27 (17%)	67 (41%)	29 (18%)	12 (7%)	7 (4%)	21 (13%)
Get bail information?	9 (6%)	29 (18%)	33 (21%)	28 (18%)	17 (11%)	44 (28%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?
Not had any letters 32 (17%)
 Yes 67 (36%)
 No..... 85 (46%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?
 Yes 60 (33%)
 No..... 17 (9%)
 Don't know 107 (58%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	115 (64%)	62 (34%)	4 (2%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	176 (96%)	7 (4%)	0 (0%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	157 (89%)	18 (10%)	2 (1%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	91 (50%)	83 (46%)	7 (4%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42 (23%)	114 (63%)	26 (14%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	113 (63%)	63 (35%)	3 (2%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	42 (23%)	66 (36%)	73 (40%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	Very good.....	1	(1%)
	Good.....	27	(15%)
	Neither.....	28	(15%)
	Bad.....	50	(27%)
	Very bad.....	80	(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	16	(9%)
	Yes.....	87	(47%)
	No.....	83	(45%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?		
	Yes.....	124	(67%)
	No.....	12	(6%)
	Don't know.....	49	(26%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	Yes.....	108	(59%)
	No.....	8	(4%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	68	(37%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	Yes.....	97	(52%)
	No.....	10	(5%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	80	(43%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	I don't want to attend	49	(26%)
	Very easy.....	43	(23%)
	Easy.....	43	(23%)
	Neither.....	15	(8%)
	Difficult.....	5	(3%)
	Very difficult.....	1	(1%)
	Don't know.....	30	(16%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	153	(84%)	
	No.....	16	(9%)	
	Don't know.....	14	(8%)	
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:			
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>			
		Not made one	Yes	No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	21 (13%)	103 (63%)	40 (24%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	21 (13%)	66 (42%)	71 (45%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....			84 (47%)

No 31 (18%)
 Don't know 62 (35%)

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	94 (52%)	32 (18%)	54 (30%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	94 (55%)	29 (17%)	49 (28%)

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

Yes 34 (20%)
 No 140 (80%)

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

Don't know who they are 100 (55%)
 Very easy 14 (8%)
 Easy 18 (10%)
 Neither 24 (13%)
 Difficult 15 (8%)
 Very difficult 11 (6%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

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

Don't know what the IEP scheme is 25 (14%)
 Yes 72 (40%)
 No 48 (26%)
 Don't know 37 (20%)

Q6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)

Don't know what the IEP scheme is 25 (14%)
 Yes 94 (53%)
 No 42 (24%)
 Don't know 17 (10%)

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

Yes 11 (6%)
 No 165 (94%)

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

I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months 140 (80%)
 Very well 5 (3%)
 Well 7 (4%)
 Neither 13 (7%)
 Badly 6 (3%)
 Very badly 4 (2%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	131 (73%)
	No.....	48 (27%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	135 (75%)
	No.....	44 (25%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	53 (29%)
	No.....	128 (71%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	6 (3%)
	Never.....	41 (23%)
	Rarely	53 (29%)
	Some of the time.....	47 (26%)
	Most of the time.....	19 (10%)
	All of the time.....	15 (8%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	102 (57%)
	In the first week.....	33 (18%)
	More than a week.....	25 (14%)
	Don't remember	19 (11%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	102 (57%)
	Very helpful.....	28 (16%)
	Helpful.....	25 (14%)
	Neither.....	11 (6%)
	Not very helpful.....	8 (4%)
	Not at all helpful	6 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	57 (32%)
	No.....	123 (68%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	18 (10%)
	No.....	159 (90%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	123 (70%)
	Everywhere.....	10 (6%)
	Segregation unit.....	6 (3%)
	Association areas	17 (10%)
	Reception area.....	14 (8%)
	At the gym.....	1 (1%)
	At mealtimes.....	1 (1%)
	At health services	7 (4%)
	Visits area	12 (7%)
	In wing showers.....	14 (8%)
	In gym showers.....	3 (2%)
	In corridors/stairwells	9 (5%)

<i>In an exercise yard</i>	11 (6%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	7 (4%)
<i>At work</i>	5 (3%)	<i>In your cell</i>	4 (2%)
<i>During movement</i>	17 (10%)	<i>At religious services</i>	5 (3%)
<i>At education</i>	3 (2%)		

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

Yes	38 (21%)
No.....	141 (79%)

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>	19 (11%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	10 (6%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	21 (12%)
<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Medication</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Debt</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Drugs</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You were new here</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	11 (6%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	10 (6%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	47 (27%)
No.....	129 (73%)

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>	17 (10%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	17 (10%)
<i>Medication</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Debt</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	6 (3%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (3%)
<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>	5 (3%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (3%)
<i>You were new here</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Your offence/crime</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)

Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	116 (68%)
	Yes	16 (9%)
	No	38 (22%)

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	30 (17%)	12 (7%)	30 (17%)	15 (8%)	67 (37%)	26 (14%)
	The nurse	31 (18%)	25 (14%)	64 (37%)	18 (10%)	23 (13%)	14 (8%)
	The dentist	39 (22%)	6 (3%)	10 (6%)	14 (8%)	48 (27%)	59 (34%)

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	40 (22%)	20 (11%)	44 (25%)	28 (16%)	26 (15%)	21 (12%)
	The nurse	30 (17%)	33 (19%)	58 (33%)	23 (13%)	15 (9%)	15 (9%)
	The dentist	70 (41%)	13 (8%)	19 (11%)	19 (11%)	17 (10%)	33 (19%)

Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>Not been</i>	28 (16%)
	<i>Very good</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Good</i>	42 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>Bad</i>	38 (22%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	20 (11%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	88 (49%)
	No	93 (51%)

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>	93 (52%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	26 (14%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (17%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	53 (29%)
	No	128 (71%)

Q9.7	Are you being helped/supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	128 (72%)
	Yes	21 (12%)
	No	30 (17%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	48 (27%)
	No	131 (73%)

Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	31 (18%)
	No.....	144 (82%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	24 (14%)
	Easy.....	24 (14%)
	Neither.....	12 (7%)
	Difficult.....	7 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	8 (5%)
	Don't know.....	100 (57%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	5 (3%)
	Easy.....	8 (5%)
	Neither.....	14 (8%)
	Difficult.....	13 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	22 (12%)
	Don't know.....	115 (65%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	12 (7%)
	No.....	165 (93%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	10 (6%)
	No.....	165 (94%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not/do not have a drug problem.....	120 (70%)
	Yes.....	35 (20%)
	No.....	17 (10%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not/do not have an alcohol problem.....	144 (81%)
	Yes.....	24 (14%)
	No.....	9 (5%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	Did not have a problem/did not receive help.....	121 (71%)
	Yes.....	41 (24%)
	No.....	8 (5%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		Don't know	Very Easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult
						Very difficult
	Prison job	35 (20%)	20 (11%)	55 (31%)	17 (10%)	31 (18%)
						18 (10%)

Vocational or skills training	38 (22%)	19 (11%)	48 (28%)	29 (17%)	24 (14%)	13 (8%)
Education (including basic skills)	29 (17%)	24 (14%)	61 (36%)	27 (16%)	18 (11%)	9 (5%)
Offending behaviour programmes	73 (43%)	7 (4%)	21 (12%)	16 (9%)	24 (14%)	30 (18%)

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

Not involved in any of these	53 (32%)
Prison job	82 (49%)
Vocational or skills training.....	18 (11%)
Education (including basic skills).....	36 (22%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	6 (4%)

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	52 (33%)	35 (22%)	56 (35%)	15 (9%)
Vocational or skills training	68 (48%)	39 (28%)	23 (16%)	11 (8%)
Education (including basic skills)	62 (42%)	45 (31%)	30 (20%)	10 (7%)
Offending behaviour programmes	87 (64%)	17 (13%)	20 (15%)	12 (9%)

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

Don't want to go	33 (19%)
Never	46 (26%)
Less than once a week.....	35 (20%)
About once a week.....	54 (31%)
More than once a week.....	8 (5%)

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

Don't use it	64 (37%)
Yes.....	55 (32%)
No.....	52 (30%)

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

Don't want to go	55 (31%)
0.....	31 (18%)
1 to 2.....	48 (27%)
3 to 5.....	38 (22%)
More than 5.....	3 (2%)

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

Don't want to go	34 (19%)
0.....	22 (13%)
1 to 2.....	69 (39%)
3 to 5.....	34 (19%)
More than 5.....	17 (10%)

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

Don't want to go	6 (3%)
0.....	3 (2%)
1 to 2.....	18 (10%)
3 to 5.....	32 (18%)
More than 5.....	118 (67%)

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>	21 (12%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	49 (28%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	36 (21%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (6%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	51 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	120 (70%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	67 (39%)
	<i>No</i>	107 (61%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	39 (22%)
	<i>No</i>	137 (78%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Easy</i>	52 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i>	28 (16%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	22 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (4%)

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>	49 (28%)
	<i>Yes</i>	79 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	45 (26%)
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>	94 (54%)
	<i>No contact</i>	37 (21%)
	<i>Letter</i>	25 (14%)
	<i>Phone</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Visit</i>	25 (14%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	73 (43%)
	<i>No</i>	97 (57%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	49	(28%)	
	Yes	41	(23%)	
	No	85	(49%)	
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i>	134	(76%)	
	<i>Very involved</i>	5	(3%)	
	<i>Involved</i>	14	(8%)	
	<i>Neither</i>	6	(3%)	
	<i>Not very involved</i>	9	(5%)	
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	8	(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>	134	(77%)	
	<i>Nobody</i>	20	(11%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	14	(8%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i>	9	(5%)	
	<i>Named/personal officer</i>	1	(1%)	
	<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>	134	(78%)	
	Yes	14	(8%)	
	No	9	(5%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	15	(9%)	
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>	134	(77%)	
	Yes	13	(7%)	
	No	13	(7%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	15	(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>	134	(77%)	
	Yes	15	(9%)	
	No	11	(6%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	15	(9%)	
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes	5	(3%)	
	No	74	(45%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	87	(52%)	
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes	19	(11%)	
	No	149	(89%)	
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	49 (30%)	38 (23%)	76 (47%)

Accommodation	49 (31%)	53 (33%)	57 (36%)
Benefits	42 (25%)	59 (36%)	64 (39%)
Finances	47 (31%)	26 (17%)	79 (52%)
Education	47 (31%)	31 (20%)	75 (49%)
Drugs and alcohol	56 (36%)	48 (31%)	50 (32%)

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	49 (28%)
Yes	57 (33%)
No.....	68 (39%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Leeds 2013

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

Key to tables

		HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		190	5726	190	211
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	7%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	74%	68%	74%	67%
1.3	Are you on recall?	9%	10%	9%	14%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	21%	20%	21%	13%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	1%	3%	1%	4%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	13%	10%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	98%	98%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	97%	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)?	26%	25%	26%	21%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	5%	5%	8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	19%	12%	19%	13%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	23%	21%	23%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	6%	5%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	30%	35%	21%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	55%	53%	55%	55%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	12%	19%	12%	15%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	33%	39%	33%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	9%	11%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	65%	64%	65%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	79%	77%	79%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	65%	67%	65%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	67%	67%	67%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	3%	5%	3%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	80%	81%	80%	82%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	59%	47%	59%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	75%	82%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	60%	70%	58%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	67%	74%	67%	78%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	15%	14%	15%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	16%	24%	16%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	7%	6%	7%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	27%	32%	27%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	6%	3%	6%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	21%	22%	21%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	22%	21%	22%	23%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	17%	17%	17%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	18%	19%	18%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	7%	8%	7%	10%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	30%	28%	28%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	46%	39%	46%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	84%	86%	84%	90%
3.6	A shower?	67%	32%	67%	68%
3.6	A free telephone call?	49%	58%	49%	57%
3.6	Something to eat?	80%	78%	80%	88%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	76%	55%	76%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	79%	58%	79%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	53%	50%	53%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	72%	74%	72%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	41%	40%	41%	
3.7	Prison shop/canteen?	29%	16%	29%	10%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	52%	48%	52%	50%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	41%	48%	41%	50%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	45%	40%	45%	41%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	41%	45%	41%	42%
3.8	Health services?	48%	52%	48%	54%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	45%	47%	45%	57%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	74%	78%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	72%	79%	72%	60%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	59%	58%	59%	61%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	79%	73%	79%	
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?	40%	41%	40%	43%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	58%	57%	58%	64%
4.1	Get bail information?	24%	22%	24%	25%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	36%	39%	36%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	33%	38%	33%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	64%	53%	64%	57%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	80%	96%	81%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	89%	80%	89%	83%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	50%	62%	50%	55%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	23%	37%	23%	24%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	63%	64%	63%	58%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	23%	27%	23%	29%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	25%	15%	15%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	47%	47%	46%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	67%	58%	67%	69%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	53%	59%	62%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	55%	52%	63%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	46%	47%	46%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	81%	84%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	72%	58%	72%	51%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	48%	48%	48%	35%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	55%	48%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	37%	33%	37%	33%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	37%	36%	37%	25%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	16%	20%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	22%	18%	26%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	40%	48%	40%	50%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	44%	53%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	7%	6%	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?	34%	38%	34%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	73%	73%	73%	64%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	75%	73%	75%	70%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	33%	29%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	19%	18%	19%	15%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	43%	44%	43%	47%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	68%	65%	68%	60%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	32%	40%	32%	45%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	17%	10%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	21%	22%	21%	19%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	10%	11%	8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	7%	6%	10%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	14%	12%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	5%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	5%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	4%	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%	1%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	5%	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	5%	6%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	4%	6%	3%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	27%	26%	27%	28%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	11%	10%	15%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%	5%	6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	12%	10%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	5%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	4%	3%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	6%	5%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	30%	33%	30%	32%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	23%	26%	23%	27%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	51%	51%	51%	64%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	9%	11%	9%	8%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	46%	43%	46%	47%
9.2	The nurse?	63%	56%	63%	69%
9.2	The dentist?	32%	31%	32%	26%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	41%	39%	41%	42%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	51%	49%	59%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	64%	64%	64%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	29%	34%	29%	36%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	41%	40%	41%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	27%	36%	27%	36%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	18%	27%	18%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	29%	27%	29%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	7%	13%	7%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	8%	7%	12%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%	6%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	67%	65%	67%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	59%	73%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	84%	79%	84%	71%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	43%	33%	43%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	39%	29%	39%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	51%	44%	51%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	16%	20%	16%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	49%	43%	49%	41%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	11%	9%	11%	10%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	22%	27%	22%	31%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	4%	8%	4%	2%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	67%	69%	67%	72%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	33%	42%	33%	41%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	52%	54%	52%	59%
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?	53%	50%	53%	46%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	58%	66%	58%	69%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	53%	58%	53%	52%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	36%	52%	36%	55%
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?	35%	49%	35%	32%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	35%	35%	35%	39%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	32%	35%	32%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	23%	32%	23%	16%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	29%	37%	29%	45%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	67%	46%	67%	57%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	10%	10%	10%	5%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	30%	35%	30%	35%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	39%	45%	39%	49%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	33%	22%	33%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	44%	35%	44%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Leeds 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Leeds 2013	HMP Leeds 2010	
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	64%	60%	64%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	46%	41%	46%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	31%	28%	31%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	5%	18%	5%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	31%	35%	31%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	43%	30%	43%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	33%	40%	33%	37%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	45%	57%	45%	48%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	50%	42%	50%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	35%	31%	35%	
13.6	Offender manager?	23%	30%	23%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	3%	16%	3%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	10%	22%	10%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	37%	62%	37%	51%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	32%	26%	32%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	37%	31%	37%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	3%	7%	3%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	11%	15%	11%	13%
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?	33%	31%	33%	
13.12	Accommodation?	48%	43%	48%	
13.12	Benefits?	48%	46%	48%	
13.12	Finances?	25%	27%	25%	
13.12	Education?	29%	33%	29%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	49%	48%	49%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	46%	46%	46%	38%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Leeds 2013

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

Key to tables

						Foreign national prisoners		British prisoners		Muslim prisoners		Non-Muslim prisoners	
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better													
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse													
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details													
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference													
Number of completed questionnaires returned													
1.3	Are you sentenced?	69%	76%	74%	75%	70%	75%						
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	19%	7%			17%	8%						
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	94%	100%	84%	100%	100%	98%						
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	99%	89%	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)?			50%	23%	97%	9%						
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	2%	6%	6%	5%	3%	5%						
1.1	Are you Muslim?	71%	1%	33%	18%								
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	25%	22%	11%	25%	20%	23%						
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	7%	6%	5%	0%	7%						
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	41%	33%	65%	32%	44%	32%						
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	47%	73%	47%	67%	53%	69%						
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	48%	74%	30%	71%	42%	74%						
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	71%	87%	70%	83%	67%	87%						
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	71%	70%	70%	70%	70%						
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	65%	72%	67%	65%	67%						
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	71%	73%	72%	73%	80%	70%						
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	84%	88%	78%	58%	83%						
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	77%	70%	59%	73%	78%	70%						
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	37%	41%	30%	41%	38%	41%						

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	64%	63%	59%	64%	63%	63%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	97%	100%	96%	91%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	13%	27%	19%	24%	15%	26%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	9%	17%	24%	14%	9%	17%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	50%	39%	48%	34%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	52%	72%	41%	71%	50%	71%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	79%	52%	81%	57%	86%	53%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	42%	55%	56%	52%	43%	54%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	84%	82%	84%	80%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	40%	50%	50%	48%	32%	50%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	32%	42%	44%	40%	29%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	54%	50%	54%	54%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	12%	4%	20%	5%	13%	4%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67%	75%	70%	74%	65%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	72%	77%	82%	75%	74%	76%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	17%	19%	6%	20%	17%	19%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	28%	48%	37%	44%	24%	48%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	48%	26%	41%	30%	50%	26%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	8%	6%	11%	18%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	28%	19%	37%	19%	29%	18%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	13%	11%	6%	12%	15%	11%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	0%	1%	3%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	0%	0%	1%	3%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	0%	3%	0%	3%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	23%	18%	27%	40%	23%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	11%	9%	6%	10%	15%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11%	0%	0%	3%	9%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	1%	0%	3%	9%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	7%	1%	0%	3%	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	5%	0%	4%	0%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	17%	26%	11%	25%	18%	24%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	40%	55%	53%	51%	41%	53%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	36%	53%	39%	50%	35%	51%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	26%	31%	17%	31%	21%	31%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	13%	32%	19%	29%	18%	29%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	36%	54%	50%	49%	28%	54%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	11%	32%	9%	10%	11%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	30%	19%	56%	17%	38%	17%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	2%	4%	13%	3%	0%	5%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	36%	35%	41%	35%	32%	36%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	25%	23%	27%	23%	21%	24%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	36%	27%	53%	27%	36%	28%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	58%	70%	68%	67%	49%	71%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	14%	9%	14%	10%	13%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	40%	38%	20%	41%	40%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	23%	13%	23%	21%	22%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Leeds 2013

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		43	144
1.3	Are you sentenced?	77%	74%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	95%	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)?	28%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	20%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	12%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	37%	34%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	61%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	57%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67%	71%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	90%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	77%	71%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	58%	85%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	51%	78%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	31%	43%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	57%	65%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	97%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	30%	21%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	19%	14%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	48%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	64%	67%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	62%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	47%	54%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	83%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	45%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	30%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	54%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	74%	76%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	23%	18%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	49%	41%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	45%	28%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	34%	17%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	9%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	2%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	12%	0%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	43%	21%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	5%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	2%
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)	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	2%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	14%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	58%	49%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	88%	36%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	71%	16%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	29%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	46%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	10%	11%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	15%	23%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	10%	2%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	40%	33%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	17%	25%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	15%	33%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	61%	69%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	7%	11%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	41%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	22%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Leeds - VP Analysis 2013

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B, C, D, E, F wing
	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		26	159
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	84%	72%
1.3	Are you on recall?	16%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	16%	23%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	24%	27%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	8%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	21%	19%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	8%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	50%	20%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	72%	29%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	52%	56%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	4%	14%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	65%	81%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	69%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	54%	68%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	79%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	46%	61%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	70%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B, C, D, E, F wing
	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		
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	96%	62%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	16%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	27%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	8%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	42%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	23%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	20%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	31%	15%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	23%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	39%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	42%	25%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	50%	89%
3.6	A shower?	35%	72%
3.6	A free telephone call?	23%	53%
3.6	Something to eat?	61%	83%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	31%	84%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	65%	82%
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?	46%	53%
3.7	Someone from health services?	61%	73%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	50%	39%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	12%	32%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	50%	52%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	41%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	27%	46%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	27%	43%
3.8	Health services?	31%	50%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	31%	46%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	58%	81%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B, C, D, E, F wing
	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		
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	46%	77%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	81%	78%
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?	42%	40%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	62%	55%
4.1	Get bail information?	19%	25%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	35%	36%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	31%	33%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	88%	60%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	92%	88%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	48%	50%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	22%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	60%	64%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	27%	23%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	20%	14%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54%	46%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	84%	63%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	57%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	42%	53%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	50%	45%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	96%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	61%	45%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	16%	20%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	24%	16%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	46%	39%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	67%	50%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	7%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B, C, D, E, F wing
	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		
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	92%	70%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	92%	73%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	32%	27%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	20%	19%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	54%	42%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	60%	27%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	11%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	36%	20%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	32%	7%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	16%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	24%	10%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	8%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	28%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8%	5%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	25%	27%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	10%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B, C, D, E, F wing
	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		
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	3%
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?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	13%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	3%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	36%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	72%	46%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	13%	9%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	76%	45%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	44%	28%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	8%	30%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	8%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	4%	30%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	0%	9%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	8%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	6%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	35%	43%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A wing	B, C, D, E, F wing
	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		
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	36%	39%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	45%	51%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	20%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	40%	52%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	24%	8%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	28%	21%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	40%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	48%	29%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	28%	21%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	8%	31%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	65%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	4%	12%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	36%	29%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	40%	37%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	4%	24%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	36%	46%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	60%	40%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	4%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	16%	11%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Leeds 2013

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

Key to tables

		Remand prisoners	Sentenced 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		47	141
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?		
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	12%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	29%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	10%
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)?	31%	24%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	5%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	20%	18%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	5%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	24%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	28%	37%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	54%	55%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	13%	12%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	85%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	66%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	68%	84%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	52%	61%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	70%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Remand prisoners	Sentenced 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		
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	74%	65%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	17%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	20%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	9%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	31%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	24%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	24%	21%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	20%	16%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	24%	16%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	27%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	85%	83%
3.6	A shower?	80%	63%
3.6	A free telephone call?	50%	48%
3.6	Something to eat?	85%	78%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	74%	77%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	78%	79%
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?	59%	52%
3.7	Someone from health services?	75%	70%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	36%	43%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	36%	27%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	47%	53%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	34%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	36%	48%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	36%	43%
3.8	Health services?	42%	50%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	31%	50%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	78%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Remand prisoners	Sentenced 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		
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	73%	71%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	80%	78%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	40%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	64%	57%
4.1	Get bail information?	28%	23%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	25%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	26%	35%
	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?	100%	95%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	89%	89%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	51%	50%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	21%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	73%	59%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	20%	25%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	20%	14%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	49%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	63%	68%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	56%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	50%	53%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	48%	46%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	78%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	50%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	26%	18%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	12%	20%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	32%	41%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	40%	56%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	5%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Remand prisoners	Sentenced 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		
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	72%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	69%	77%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	24%	31%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	18%	19%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	30%	47%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	32%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	8%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	32%	18%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	11%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	14%	3%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	26%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	10%

Key to tables

		Remand prisoners	Sentenced prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	2%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	29%	22%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	56%	50%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	5%	11%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	49%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	44%	25%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	20%	29%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	25%	29%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	5%	8%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	10%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	6%
SECTION 11: Activities			
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:			
11.1	A prison job?	31%	47%

Key to tables

		Remand prisoners	Sentenced 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		
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	41%	39%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	49%	52%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	26%	13%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	38%	53%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	8%	12%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	23%	21%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	8%	2%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	36%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	21%	36%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	30%	22%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	30%	28%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	65%	68%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	9%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	25%	31%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	32%	41%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	47%	43%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	19%	52%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	2%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	14%	10%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Leeds 2013 C Wing Comparator

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

		C wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		33	152
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	97%	69%
1.3	Are you on recall?	9%	9%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	28%	20%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	12%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	15%	29%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	16%	20%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	9%	27%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	34%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	49%	57%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	49%	40%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	56%	34%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	61%	47%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	22%	16%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	66%	46%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	6%	12%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	31%	20%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	0%	5%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	88%	63%
	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%	32%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	75%	47%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	27%	60%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	81%	52%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	48%	56%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	39%	36%
	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?	0%	39%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	38%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	29%	33%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	25%	22%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	22%	29%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	66%	68%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	10%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	29%	30%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	38%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38%	17%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	53%	42%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	77%	59%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	57%	43%
13.2	Contact by letter?	26%	33%
13.2	Contact by phone?	9%	4%
13.2	Contact by visit?	22%	33%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	74%	36%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	58%	23%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	61%	33%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	59%	40%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	24%	45%
13.6	Offender manager?	18%	25%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	6%	0%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	12%	10%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	41%	28%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	28%	35%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	44%	35%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	4%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	13%	12%
	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?	43%	30%
13.12	Accommodation?	50%	47%
13.12	Benefits?	52%	47%
13.12	Finances?	21%	24%
13.12	Education?	36%	27%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	31%	54%
	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?	58%	42%