

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Huntercombe

7–11 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	63
	II Prison population profile	64
	III Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	67

Introduction

Huntercombe is a category C establishment in Oxfordshire holding up to 430 adult male prisoners. Following several changes of role, in 2012 the establishment was designated a facility for holding convicted foreign national prisoners. At the time of our inspection, only a handful of UK nationals remained in the prison.

Despite experiencing change and transition, some of it rapid, Huntercombe was a good institution. Most prisoners felt safe and other indicators supported that perception. The exception was a small number of sex offenders, some of whom raised concerns that poor respect for their confidentiality had put them at risk. Self-harm had risen slightly, but prisoners were well supported. Segregation was overused and there was insufficient accountability for the use of special accommodation, but use of force generally was low and security procedures proportionate.

Environmental standards across the prison were reasonably good. Staff-prisoner relationships, similarly, were reasonable, although in our survey some prisoners perceived an element of victimisation from staff and also reported some insensitivity to cultural differences. We describe the promotion of diversity at Huntercombe as embryonic but it was improving. The provision of health care was good.

A key strength of the establishment was the quality of purposeful activity. Prisoners benefited from good time out of cell, and there was sufficient activity for the vast majority. Virtually all education, vocational training and work were accredited, and the breadth and quality of what was on offer was very good. The achievement of accreditations and qualifications by learners was outstanding. Three-quarters of prisoners regularly visited both the library and the gym, which was higher than we often see.

The prison had begun to assess the resettlement needs of its new population and a reducing reoffending strategy was developing. Engagement and communication with prisoners about resettlement worked well, and the prison used release on temporary licence in support of resettlement confidently. Most prisoners were subject to assessment and sentence planning. However, contact time with offender supervisors was limited and provision for those with higher risks needed to improve. Work to support resettlement and reintegration was generally good, although, as is often the case with a foreign national population, more could have been done to meet the needs of those due to be deported and it was difficult to assess actual effectiveness. Nevertheless, it is notable that Huntercombe had a more developed approach to reducing risk and resettling foreign nationals – a number of whom would ultimately be released into the UK – than we have seen at other foreign national prisons. This more responsible approach will need to be maintained and further developed.

Huntercombe is an example of a prison that has not been overwhelmed by change. It has embraced the challenge, exploited its strengths and planned effectively where it needed to develop new services. There were gaps, some significant, and some catch-up was required, but overall the prison was doing well in adapting to its new role.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2013

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Huntercombe is a category C foreign national prison.

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

Public

Region/Department

South Central

Number held

408

Certified normal accommodation

370

Operational capacity

430

Date of last full inspection

8–12 May 2006

Brief history

Opened as a prison in 1946, the site was originally built as an internment camp during the Second World War. Extensive redevelopment has taken place over the last 20 years and there is little left of the wartime buildings. In November 2010, the establishment re-rolled as a category C adult prison. It was undergoing another change in function to hold solely category C foreign national prisoners at the time of the inspection. This was almost complete and few British nationals were left.

Short description of residential units

Howard and Fry units each hold 79 prisoners. Each unit has a dormitory holding three prisoners, and 16 doubled cells holding up to 32. Each unit has a laundry, servery and other facilities. Rich unit also holds 79 prisoners but operates as the induction unit; it has the same facilities as Howard and Fry units. Patterson unit currently holds 73 prisoners; its facilities are the same as those of the other three smaller units, but with 12 double cells and two cells for prisoners with a disability. One of the bottom spurs operates as a category D spur. Mountbatten unit is a larger, newer build holding 120 prisoners in single-cell accommodation. Twenty cells were in the process of being fitted with bunk beds.

Name of governor

Nigel Atkinson

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service commissioner and providers

Commissioner: Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust

Providers: Oxfordshire Health

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

Independent Monitoring Board chair
Shaun Stewart

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

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

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

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

Safety prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

Respect prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HP5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:

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

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

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

Safety

HP6 Prisoners were generally positive about escort staff. The reception area was clean and staff were welcoming, but there was very little use of professional interpreting. Induction was informative. Violence reduction work was good and most prisoners described a safe prison. Self-harm risk was generally well managed, but some prisoners reported limited access to Listeners and there was no care suite. Security was proportionate. Adjudications were conducted fairly. Use of force was low but the special cell was used excessively. The segregation unit was overused. There was little evidence of an illicit drug problem and prisoners received good support from drug support services. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

HP7 Prisoners were generally positive about their treatment by escort staff, but some had undergone long journeys with no toilet stops. In our survey, about half of prisoners described a lack of information about the establishment before arrival, and some were worried about the implications for their deportation status.¹ Escort and prison staff communicated effectively. Some prisoners arrived without their property and cash.

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*.)

- HP8 The reception area was clean and spacious. Prisoners were positive about their treatment by reception staff and good use was made of orderlies and Listeners (prisoners trained to support those at risk of self-harm). The reception process was reasonably thorough and interviews were held privately. However, other prisoners were inappropriately used to interpret during reception processes, including cell sharing risk assessments. There was insufficient translated reception and induction information. Induction was informative and kept prisoners occupied throughout. The induction unit provided a relaxed and open atmosphere for newly arrived prisoners.
- HP9 Most prisoners felt safe, although almost a third of respondents to our survey reported victimisation by staff. The management of safer custody work was good. Monthly safer prison meetings were well attended, considered key issues and discussed trends. There had been few fights and assaults, and they were properly investigated.
- HP10 There was a high proportion of sex offenders and they appeared to be reasonably well integrated into the population. However, some felt under threat because their offences had become known to others, and in some cases personal data had not been protected.
- HP11 The number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents opened and self-harm incidents had increased in 2012. Most prisoners on open ACCT documents remained on their units, but a few had gone to the segregation unit because of their self-harm risk. There was no care suite to provide an alternative location for vulnerable prisoners. The quality of ACCT documents was mostly good and there was robust internal quality assurance and sharing of best practice. The Listener scheme provided useful support but prisoners did not feel able to use cell call bells to summon a Listener at night. At-risk prisoners were identified in reception. There was a safeguarding policy but there were no links with the local safeguarding board.
- HP12 Security arrangements were proportionate and reasonably well managed. Free-flow arrangements were effective. Intelligence was processed efficiently but suspicion drug testing was often not completed within the set timescales. Strip-searching was generally proportionate but 10% of prisoners were searched unnecessarily after visits. There were few closed visits but not all prisoners had this restriction removed at the earliest opportunity. Few prisoners reported easy availability of illegal drugs and alcohol, and mandatory drug testing positive rates were relatively low.
- HP13 There were few differentials between the different levels of the incentives and privilege schemes. Few prisoners were on the basic regime; those who were, were offered a good regime but remained on this level for 28 days, with perfunctory targets and little incentive to improve behaviour.
- HP14 The number of adjudications was low and the charges laid were appropriate. Records of hearings were generally good, reflecting sufficient exploration of cases, and punishments were broadly fair. Adjudication standardisation meetings were effective, although detailed analysis had started only recently.
- HP15 There was little use of force. However, the special cell was used excessively, and we were concerned to find that one man had been held there for 13 hours. Record keeping and quality assurance were underdeveloped. Planned interventions were video-recorded but not reviewed. Those we looked at were of variable quality. Batons had been drawn on one occasion but this had not been properly investigated.

- HP16 The segregation unit was overused and some prisoners spent too long there. The physical environment and access to the regime were generally good, but not all prisoners had care or reintegration plans. Relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were good and this was reflected in history sheets.
- HP17 The psychosocial team provided good-quality, recovery-focused individual support for substance users, and prisoners we spoke to were positive about the service provided.

Respect

- HP18 The environment was clean and well maintained. Mountbatten unit was noisy. Staff-prisoner relationships were generally good and personal officer work was reasonable. Diversity work was improving but not enough was done to identify different minority groups and provide support. UK Border Agency provision was effective but access could be limited because of the lack of onsite provision. Legal services were underdeveloped. Faith provision was good. Complaint investigations were variable. Health care services were generally good. The range and quality of food were poor. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.
- HP19 The prison was clean, well maintained and free from graffiti. Mountbatten unit was noisy during the day, and exacerbated by prisoners having to bang on gates to gain entry. Cells were clean and the offensive displays policy was generally adhered to. Too many cells designed for one held two and lacked enough cell furniture, including lockable cupboards. Toilet screening was poor in most cells. Applications were not tracked and the applications system was the subject of a large number of formal complaints. Access to telephones, mail, showers and stored property was good.
- HP20 We observed reasonably good relationships between staff and prisoners (although less so on Mountbatten unit). However, a number of prisoners in our groups reported a lack of cultural sensitivity and awareness from a small number of staff. Staff told us that they would welcome training on the specific needs of foreign national prisoners. In our survey, about two-thirds of prisoners said that contact with personal officers was useful. Electronic case note entries were usually regular and showed knowledge of individuals, but there was little evidence of a focus on resettlement issues.
- HP21 Equality work was improving but much of it was embryonic. Prisoner equality representatives were positive about their role and well supported by the equality manager. There were no regular minority group forums. Discrimination incident report investigations were fairly thorough but some took too long to complete. Replies did not always adequately explain the evidence for findings. Useful diversity information, including the outcomes of investigations and equality meeting minutes, were displayed on the units.
- HP22 More black and minority ethnic than white prisoners said that they had been victimised by staff and other prisoners. Ethnic monitoring data had recently been supplemented by monitoring based on six broad geographical groupings. The data were considered at the bimonthly equality meetings. No Gypsy or Roma prisoners were known to the prison, although several had been identified in our survey.
- HP23 Interpreting services were rarely used. UK Border Agency (UKBA) staff attended the prison at least twice a week and saw all new arrivals. However, there was no onsite

UKBA presence, and prisoners complained about lack of access. A diligent chief immigration officer progressed the cases of prisoners intending to return to home countries.

- HP24 Older prisoners reported more positively on most areas in our survey but those with a disability were much more negative and under-identified by the prison. Care planning had only recently been implemented and less than half of identified prisoners with a disability had been assessed. The quality of those assessments was poor. No services were provided for gay prisoners.
- HP25 In our survey, most prisoners were positive about respect for religious beliefs, and access to religious leaders and services. Study classes were provided and there were links with local faith groups. Chaplains provided excellent bereavement care. The multi-faith area was appropriate and could accommodate the various services.
- HP26 Complaint forms were freely available but not in languages other than English. Complaint investigations and replies to complainants were variable. Some replies were written in unclear language, many were handwritten and hard to read, and not all addressed prisoners by name. Trend analysis was underdeveloped and outcomes of complaints were not monitored.
- HP27 The two legal services officers (LSOs) had limited time to develop the service. The service was not well advertised and few prisoners were seen. Staff from Migrant Helpline provided some support but this was not coordinated with the work of the LSOs and they could not provide legal representation. There were insufficient private consultation booths, and the length and frequency of legal visits were insufficient to meet demand.
- HP28 Health care was well managed and an appropriate range of clinics was delivered. The health care centre was very clean and well equipped. Prisoners were generally satisfied with access to and the quality of health care. Waiting times for appointments were generally short, but not for the optician. New arrivals underwent a comprehensive health care screening. Too many prisoners missed hospital appointments previously arranged as a result of being transferred to the establishment. There was no training for health care staff in assessing and responding to experiences of torture or trauma. Pharmacy services were satisfactory and dental care was good. There was an effective mental health service and mental health awareness training was provided monthly to prison staff. There was a mental health advocacy service but no professional counselling.
- HP29 Prisoners complained about the quality and cultural range of the food, and we saw some unimpressive meals. Many prisoners said that the prison shop did not sell a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. Prisoners were consulted on the content of the shop list and changes were subsequently made.

Purposeful activity

- HP30 Time out of cell was good and nearly all prisoners were involved in structured activity. There was good management and planning of learning and skills provision. A wide range of vocational training and education classes was offered. Achievement rates were very high. The library had recently been improved and provided a reasonably

good service. PE provision was impressive. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were good.

- HP31 Most prisoners could spend nearly 10 hours out of cell from Monday to Thursday and 8.5 hours from Friday to Sunday. Roll checks during the working day showed that only about 6% of the population was locked up, most because they had refused to work or were unwell. Association was predictable and prisoners had good access to the exercise yards on most units.
- HP32 The management of learning and skills and work was good. There was a needs analysis, but it did not reflect the current population. Links between prison and education and training staff were effective and self-assessment and quality improvement processes were well established across the prison. The analysis and use of data were good and contributed well to target setting.
- HP33 Around 95% of prisoners were employed. Most education and vocational training programmes and work were formally accredited and a range of full- and part-time education and training programmes aimed at developing employability skills was offered. Good use was made of prisoners as teaching assistants and peer mentors across the prison, and most were following a relevant qualification. However, there was insufficient support for dyslexia assessment and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) provision.
- HP34 Most teaching and learning was good, and in a few cases outstanding. Prisoners engaged well in learning, and attendance and punctuality were generally good. Toe by Toe programmes (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read) were well managed.
- HP35 Achievement of accredited qualifications was outstanding. Prisoners progressed well through their programmes, particularly those on literacy and numeracy courses. Their work was of a high standard, particularly in cookery, business enterprise, graphic design, horticulture, art and radio production.
- HP36 The library had recently improved the range of materials stocked and forged links with local libraries and prisons. There was a reasonable selection of newspapers, journals, books and DVDs for foreign national prisoners. However, some groups, such as Chinese prisoners, had not had up-to-date newspapers for some months. About 75% of prisoners regularly used the library for short periods but access was limited for those released on temporary licence, and the facility was not open in the evenings or at weekends.
- HP37 PE was well managed by highly qualified and experienced staff. Approximately 76% of prisoners used the facilities. There was a wide range of recreational and accredited programmes, and orderlies were used well to encourage prisoners and increase participation. There was high achievement of qualifications, which were offered up to level 4.

Resettlement

- HP38 The reducing reoffending strategy was not up to date, but a needs analysis had been completed for the new population. Prisoners were appropriately recategorised and

there was good use of release on temporary licence. Offending behaviour needs were largely met for low- and medium risk-offenders, but less so for higher-risk offenders. Offender supervisors' caseloads were high and they spent insufficient time seeing prisoners. Provision on the resettlement pathways was reasonably good and took some account of the needs of prisoners being deported. Visits provision was good. Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were reasonably good.

- HP39 The reducing reoffending strategy had not yet been fully updated for the new population, but was supported by an interim action plan pending completion of a new needs analysis. The recent introduction of an offender management forum and a quarterly newsletter had improved communication with prisoners.
- HP40 The creation of a bespoke landing for category D prisoners was a good initiative. Release on temporary licence procedures were sound and a number of category D prisoners were working outside the prison daily.
- HP41 In our survey, three-quarters of respondents said that they had a named offender supervisor. However, caseloads were high and formal contact time with prisoners was limited. All prisoners were subject to an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment and sentence planning, and the backlog had recently been substantially reduced. The quality of assessments for low- and medium-risk prisoners was generally good, with risk factors adequately identified. Sentence plan targets broadly addressed prisoners' risk factors but were more achievable for low- and medium-risk prisoners.
- HP42 Most high-risk prisoners required an accredited intervention unavailable at the establishment. Prisoners were referred to HMP Bullingdon for assessment, but the long waiting list meant that many prisoners were likely to be deported without completing suitable programmes. Approximately 10% of the population were sex offenders and a quarter of these did not have a completed OASys assessment. We were not assured their risks were being adequately addressed.
- HP43 Public protection arrangements were sound, with appropriate systems to identify and manage those highlighted. Interdepartmental risk management meetings were well attended and information sharing was good.
- HP44 Recategorisation reviews were considered, balanced and justifiable, with input from the prisoner. Some movement of category D prisoners to open prisons was taking place.
- HP45 New arrivals were seen during the induction programme by prisoner orderlies representing resettlement pathway providers, and referrals were made for further intervention. The coordination of pathway work was good. A well-organised pathways forum was held bimonthly for those nearing their release dates in order to pick up on any outstanding issues.
- HP46 St Giles Trust provided a good service to prisoners with accommodation needs. All prisoners were seen during induction and towards the end of their sentences. Useful information was available for prisoners of all nationalities about accommodation support in their home country. Citizens Advice and Jobcentre Plus staff provided only limited finance, benefit and debt support, and most prisoners did not know where they could obtain such advice.

- HP47 There were no formal pre-release courses but effective links with external agencies ensured that prisoners were given support to develop interview, CV writing, disclosure and job search skills. Good careers advice and guidance was provided by the National Careers Service and Jobcentre Plus. However, insufficient education, training and employment data were collected about prisoners released and sent abroad.
- HP48 Health discharge planning arrangements were good. Three months' medication was provided for prisoners being removed. The care programme approach was used for those with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care and an end-of-life programme were in place but had not yet been used. Prisoners were given appropriate harm reduction advice and information on substance use services available in destination countries before release.
- HP49 Facilities in the visitors centre were adequate. Prisoners reported positively about visits, and the visits hall provided a relaxed environment. Family visits took place bimonthly and were well attended, but prisoners had to pay for the lunches of family members over the age of five. The 'Fathers Inside' programme was run four times a year and was appreciated by prisoners.
- HP50 There were no accredited offending behaviour programmes. Although prisoners were referred to HMP Bullingdon for assessment, the referral list was long. The two non-accredited programmes for low- or medium-risk prisoners had a reasonable number of completions, but also had long waiting lists. More programmes were planned to alleviate this problem.

Main concerns and recommendations

- HP51 Concern: The special cell had been used excessively. Record keeping and quality assurance were weak. Recordings of planned interventions were not reviewed. Batons had been drawn but this had not been properly scrutinised.
- Recommendation: There should be rigorous governance of the use of force, including special accommodation, planned interventions and use of batons.**
- HP52 Concern: Most high-risk prisoners required an accredited intervention unavailable at the establishment, and OASys assessments had not been completed for a large number of high-risk sex offenders.
- Recommendation: All high-risk prisoners should have their risk factors addressed promptly after reception and before they are deported.**

Section 1: Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Some prisoners had long journeys to the establishment and few were offered toilet breaks. In our survey, less than half of prisoners said that they had known where they were being taken and over a quarter had not felt safe in the escort van. Prisoners were generally positive about escort staff but their property and cash did not always arrive with them.
- 1.2 Some prisoners had long journeys to the prison and in our survey 66%, against the 44% comparator, said that they had spent more than two hours in the van. Only 6% (in line with the comparator) said that they had been offered a toilet break, and this was echoed in our groups, where some prisoners told us that they had not been offered toilet stops or toilet bags. Prisoners were generally positive about the escort staff.
- 1.3 In our survey, less than half of prisoners said they had been told of their destination before their arrival at the establishment. On finding out that they were going to a foreign national prison, some had been anxious that deportation was imminent.
- 1.4 Too many prisoners arrived without their property and cash. Although staff followed up missing property, this was an avoidable problem.
- 1.5 We observed generally good information sharing about prisoners between reception staff and escorts. Staff worked through lunchtime when they received notice of an arrival at that time. However, during the inspection a vehicle arrived unannounced and a prisoner had to wait for an hour before being allowed to disembark.

Recommendation

- 1.6 Prisoners' property should arrive at the establishment with them.

Housekeeping point

- 1.7 Escort staff should contact reception staff well in advance of arrival.

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.

- 1.8 Reception was clean, well organised and had a relaxed atmosphere. There was good use of prisoner orderlies and Listeners. The reception process was efficient but there was insufficient use of professional telephone interpreting. The induction programme was generally well received and prisoners were not unnecessarily locked up during induction.
- 1.9 The reception area was clean and spacious, but there was insufficient storage space for property, some of which was kept in the toilet for prisoners with disabilities. Prisoners had access to a toilet and television while waiting and were offered a shower. In our survey, three-quarters of respondents said that they had been treated well in reception.
- 1.10 There was a generally relaxed atmosphere in reception. Orderlies offered food and drinks to new arrivals and provided information about the prison. Listeners (prisoners trained to support those at risk of self-harm) visited reception to see all new arrivals and explain their role and how to contact them. Some information was available in a small number of languages, but a useful guide to the prison was available only in English. New arrivals were given a rub-down search. All departing prisoners were strip-searched. Prisoners released on temporary license were given a rub-down search on their way out and were strip-searched on their way back into the prison (see recommendation 1.42).
- 1.11 The reception process was generally efficient and in our survey over half of respondents said that they had spent less than two hours there. New arrivals were offered a free telephone call, which could be made to an overseas number.
- 1.12 New arrivals were interviewed in private, but professional telephone interpreting had been used only once in the previous six months. One non-English-speaking prisoner said that he had been 'rushed through' reception without interpretation, and had signed documents he did not understand. A list of prisoners who could speak other languages was held in reception and they were sometimes used inappropriately for what should have been confidential cell sharing risk assessment interviews.
- 1.13 There were efficient arrangements for prisoners to attend reception to open parcels and recorded delivery letters sent to them by family or friends.
- 1.14 New arrivals were interviewed by an officer on the induction unit and were introduced to the induction orderly, who explained some procedures to them, including how to order food. Most prisoners in our survey said that they had felt safe on their first night.
- 1.15 Most prisoners were positive about the induction process, which lasted four days and kept them occupied throughout. Prisoner orderlies delivered much of the programme and prisoners were left unlocked if they finished a session before others returned from work or education. During induction, prisoners were used to interpret for non-English-speakers and written information was available only in English. The induction orderly followed up on prisoners two weeks after they finished induction to see if they had any outstanding queries. He was able to move freely between the different residential units to do this.
- 1.16 UK Border Agency (UKBA) staff saw prisoners during their first week at the prison. Allocation boards took place once a week, which meant that some prisoners could wait a few days between completing induction and being allocated work or education places.

Recommendations

- 1.17 Prisoners should not be used to interpret during interviews with other prisoners covering sensitive or personal issues.
- 1.18 A range of translated information about the prison should be available to prisoners soon after arrival.

Housekeeping point

- 1.19 Prisoners' property should not be stored in areas designed for prisoner use.

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.

- 1.20 The safer prison committee gave appropriate oversight to bullying and violence reduction work. Most prisoners felt safe and incidents were properly investigated. Some sex offenders reported that staff had been careless with their offence information and felt under threat as a result.
- 1.21 The monthly safer prison committee was regularly attended by most key staff as well as by Samaritans and prisoners, although not by UKBA. The meetings considered relevant data, including the number of fights, assaults, adjudications for violent behaviour and injuries to prisoners, but there was no long-term trend analysis. Short-term trends – for example, an increase in the number of fights in one particular month – were discussed.
- 1.22 There were few fights and assaults, and these were investigated properly and reviewed at the safer prison meeting. In our survey, 30% of prisoners said that they had been victimised by staff, against the 25% comparator, although there was little evidence of physical intimidation. A number of prisoners told us about comments from senior staff which they regarded as condescending or racist (see section on staff–prisoner relationships).
- 1.23 There was little evidence of bullying. Anti-bullying processes were explained to prisoners during induction. Potential bullying incidents were appropriately investigated and follow-up actions identified. These usually included opening a victim support or anti-bullying document, and sometimes involved a move to another unit for an alleged perpetrator or victim. A total of 21 anti-bullying and 29 victim support documents had been opened in 2012. The safer prison coordinator reviewed observation book entries each day to ensure that incidents were not being overlooked for investigation. The establishment had not carried out a violence reduction survey since its re-role.
- 1.24 About 10% of the prisoner population at the establishment were sex offenders. Sex offenders were reasonably well integrated into the population, but we met some who felt under threat

and could not participate in the full regime because their offences had become known to others. Prisoners reported that staff had, on occasion, not been careful with their offence information, and one man who felt under threat said that a prisoner orderly had been allowed to see his details on a computer screen.

Recommendation

- 1.25 Managers should ensure that prisoners' offence details are not revealed to other prisoners.

Housekeeping point

- 1.26 Safer custody data should be analysed for long-term trends.

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.

- 1.27 The number of self-harm incidents had increased. Although prisoners at risk of self-harm were generally well supported, there was poor access to Listeners at night. The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents was generally good. Some prisoners had been inappropriately located in the segregation unit because of their self-harm risk alone. There was no care suite.
- 1.28 Suicide and self-harm work was appropriately monitored and discussed at the monthly safer prison meeting (see paragraph 1.21). Levels of self-harm had increased in the previous year; there had been 39 instances of self-harm in 2012 compared with 23 in 2011. The reason was not clear but staff thought that it had resulted from an increase in the number of men with mental health problems and a greater turnover of prisoners.
- 1.29 Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents were mostly completed to a good standard and subject to robust internal quality assurance, although care maps were not always updated after every review. Post-closure reviews were held unless the prisoner had left the establishment. Learning points were shared at the safer prison meeting and across the staff group. There was continuity of case managers, and reviews took place on time. UKBA staff attended ACCT reviews when immigration uncertainty had been identified as a trigger. Seventy-seven per cent of operational staff were up to date with their ACCT training and the remainder were to start training in January 2013.
- 1.30 There were 12 trained Listeners and prisoners had reasonably good access to them during the day. There was no evidence of Listeners supporting men at night, and some prisoners said that they felt they should not use cell call bells to request a Listener at these times. Listeners received good support from the Samaritans and were working hard to improve their visibility,

including attending reception to greet all new arrivals (see section on early days in custody). All residential units had Samaritans telephones, which could be used during the night.

- 1.31 Eight prisoners on open ACCT documents had been located in the segregation unit between July and December 2012, some for self-harm risk alone. Although most had returned to their wings within a day or two (see section on discipline), this was not an appropriate environment in which to manage vulnerable people. There was no care suite to provide an alternative location.

Recommendations

- 1.32 Prisoners should have ready access to Listeners at night.
- 1.33 Prisoners should not be held in the segregation unit for self-harm risk alone. There should be a dedicated care suite.

Housekeeping point

- 1.34 Care maps should be updated after every review.

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

- 1.35 There was a formal safeguarding policy but there were no links with the local safeguarding board.

- 1.36 A member of the mental health in-reach team assessed the needs of newly arrived at-risk prisoners in reception, and reported their physical needs to the equality manager. Staff were not aware of formal safeguarding protocols but were focused on relevant issues and aware of their personal responsibility to protect prisoners at risk. A formal policy covered the safeguarding of prisoners at risk but there were no links with the local safeguarding board.

Recommendation

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

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).

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.

1.38 Security measures were generally proportionate. Dynamic security was good. The number of positive drug tests was reasonably low but there were gaps in drug testing arrangements. Some strip-searching was disproportionate. Closed visits were applied infrequently but reviews were not meaningful.

1.39 Security was well managed. The security committee was well attended and informed by comprehensive reports. Security objectives related to intelligence were set and appropriately monitored.

1.40 Security measures did not restrict prisoner access to the regime unnecessarily. Free-flow arrangements were effective. Dynamic security was well managed and mostly responsive. Over 1,200 security information reports (SIRs) had been submitted in the previous six months and were acted on appropriately. Target searches were timely and yielded good results. In our survey, only 12% and 6% of respondents, respectively, said that it was easy to get illegal drugs and alcohol, against the 30% and 18% comparators. The mandatory drug testing positive rate was 6.5%, against a target of 10.5%, with most tests positive for cannabis. However, few suspicion drug tests were positive and many were not completed within the set timescales.

1.41 Strip-searching was usually based on supporting intelligence. However, there was some routine strip-searching in reception (see paragraph 1.10), and 10% of prisoners were strip-searched at the end of visit sessions, which was unnecessary. Some prisoners had been placed on closed visits for incidents unrelated to visits, but this had been rectified and there were few prisoners subject to closed visits at the time of the inspection. We were not assured that monthly reviews of closed visits were meaningful as all prisoners remained on this measure for at least three months. Reasons for banning visitors were all appropriate.

Recommendation

1.42 Routine strip-searching in reception and after visits should cease. Strip searching and closed visits reviews should be conducted on the basis of supporting intelligence.

Housekeeping point

1.43 All suspicion testing should be completed within 72 hours of the security information report being logged.

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.

- 1.44 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was applied fairly overall. However, most prisoners reported that it did little to encourage positive behaviour. The basic regime was decent but reviews were mechanistic.
- 1.45 At the time of the inspection, 75% of prisoners were on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and only one prisoner was on the basic level. The IEP policy document had been reviewed but had not been updated to reflect the foreign national population, and prisoners said that they found it difficult to understand.
- 1.46 In our survey, 32% of respondents, against the 47% comparator, said that the IEP scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour, and this was reiterated by prisoners in our groups. We found that the differentials between the levels of the scheme were insufficient to encourage positive behaviour.
- 1.47 Prisoners who arrived from another establishment on the enhanced level were allowed to retain that level. Demotion usually only followed a pattern of negative behaviour, and the warnings we reviewed were appropriate.
- 1.48 Prisoners on the basic level had an appropriately decent regime, which included attendance at work and at least a daily 45-minute domestic period. Reviews were regular but perfunctory, and most prisoners stayed on basic for 28 days as a matter of course. Quality assurance was underdeveloped.

Recommendation

- 1.49 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should encourage positive behaviour through meaningful incentives and differentials between levels.

Housekeeping point

- 1.50 IEP level reviews should be meaningful and there should be systematic quality assurance of the scheme.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.51 Disciplinary procedures were well managed. There was relatively little use of force, but governance of both use of force and segregation was inadequate. Not all use of segregation was appropriate. Cells were clean but lacked toilet screening and electricity. Segregated prisoners had good access to the regime.

Disciplinary procedures

- 1.52 The number of adjudications was low, at 307 in the previous six months. Records showed that charges were laid for offences that warranted formal disciplinary procedures.
- 1.53 Records of hearings were generally good. Prisoners were given sufficient time to prepare their case and received adjournments to seek legal advice when requested. They were given the opportunity to present their version of events and there was good exploration before a finding of guilt. Punishments were fair and often took account of mitigation when offered. Adjudications were appropriately dismissed when there was insufficient evidence or as a result of procedural errors, and in the previous six months this had happened in almost a quarter of cases. They were rarely referred to the independent adjudicator. Quality assurance measures were effective.
- 1.54 The quarterly adjudication standardisation meeting was informed by comprehensive reports but had only recently resulted in analysis of trends and patterns, with appropriate action being taken.

The use of force

- 1.55 The recorded level of incidents involving force was low, at 16 in the previous six months. In nine of these, control and restraint techniques had been used initially but few had involved continued application of force. The use of handcuffs and moving prisoners to the segregation unit were not routine.
- 1.56 Use of force paperwork was of a reasonable standard but some lacked detail, and efforts to de-escalate were not always well recorded. Prisoners were routinely debriefed following any use of force against them. In the previous six months, there had been two planned interventions which had been video-recorded; one of these had been of good quality but the other had been poor and had not been reviewed. Batons had been drawn (but not used) in 2012. This had been warranted but not subject to close scrutiny.
- 1.57 Special accommodation had been used five times in 2012. The quality of authorising documentation was variable and we were not assured that all uses were justified, necessary, or applied for the minimum period of time or as a last resort. We were concerned to find that one man had been held for 13 hours (see main recommendation HP51).
- 1.58 A use of force committee met quarterly and discussed trends and patterns. Quality assurance measures had lacked rigour, but had recently improved and were now reasonable.

Good practice

- 1.59 *Prisoners were formally debriefed following any incident in which force had been used against them.*

Segregation

- 1.60 Fifty-five prisoners had been segregated between June and November 2012, which appeared high. The average length of stay was 6.3 days, with seven prisoners accounting for nearly half of the total of 349 days. Some of the seven had been held for too long while investigations had been carried out. Too many prisoners were located in the segregation unit pending adjudication.
- 1.61 Communal areas and showers on the segregation unit were clean and well maintained. The exercise yard was large and contained seating. All cells were clean but toilets were unscreened and there was no in-cell electricity.
- 1.62 New arrivals to the unit were strip-searched only on the basis of a risk assessment. In the previous six months, eight prisoners on open ACCT documents had been located on the unit (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention). We were assured that these prisoners had been subject to proper governance, received a good level of care and spent minimal time in segregation.
- 1.63 Prisoners on the unit had access to a reasonable regime, which included daily showers, use of telephones and time in the open air. Many prisoners had individualised risk-assessed regimes, which allowed association, use of the gym and main library, and corporate worship. The education department visited the unit daily and provided materials if requested.
- 1.64 Relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were good and this was confirmed in daily history sheets and electronic case notes.
- 1.65 There were timely multidisciplinary reviews of prisoners held in segregation but targets set were mostly perfunctory. There was regular and consistent input from the mental health team and some evidence of reasonable care and reintegration planning, but no formal care or reintegration plans.
- 1.66 Comprehensive data about all areas of discipline were collated but were not used effectively to analyse trends and patterns or to identify and take action where necessary.

Recommendations

- 1.67 **Prisoners should not be held for extended periods in segregation while investigations are carried out or pending adjudication.**
- 1.68 **Cells on the segregation unit cells should contain screened toilets and an electricity supply.**
- 1.69 **Information collated on the segregation unit should be analysed and used more effectively to inform strategy.**

Housekeeping point

- 1.70 Segregation review documentation and care/reintegration plans should be completed to a high standard and include meaningful targets.

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.

- 1.71 The range of provision for substance users was currently limited, but available services were good. There was good joint working with key prison departments.
- 1.72 There were no clinical services for substance users, but services were planned from March 2013 within the substance misuse service retendering process. Prisoners requiring detoxification or re-toxification could be transferred to HMP Bullingdon but none had been transferred in the previous year.
- 1.73 Prisoners with substance misuse problems received good recovery-focused, individual support. Ninety prisoners were engaged with the psychosocial team and those we spoke to were very positive about the service. As there were no drug awareness groups or targeted group programmes, prisoners did not receive a community-equivalent service. Extended provision was proposed under the retendering process.
- 1.74 Weekly Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous groups were well attended. There were regular service-user forums and a monthly substance use newsletter. All literature and displays promoting the services of the psychosocial team were in English only (see recommendation 1.18).
- 1.75 Psychosocial staff received effective management, supervision and training, and joint working with other prison departments was excellent. There were appropriate policies, including withdrawal management and joint working protocols.
- 1.76 The drug strategy was reviewed annually, informed by a needs assessment, and there was a comprehensive action plan. However, there was insufficient emphasis on alcohol use, and the action plan was not discussed at the quarterly multidisciplinary drug strategy meetings.

Recommendation

- 1.77 The range of services for substance users should meet assessed need and reflect best practice guidance.

Housekeeping point

- 1.78 The prison substance misuse strategy should include alcohol, and the action plan should be reviewed at quarterly drug strategy meetings.

Section 2: Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 Communal areas were clean and association facilities good. Accommodation standards were reasonable. Cells designed for one held two, and lacked appropriate privacy screening and furniture. Access to mail, telephones, showers and cleaning materials was good, but not to sheets. The application and property systems were problematic.
- 2.2 External and internal communal areas were clean, well maintained and had no graffiti. With the exception of Mountbatten, all wings had open access to exercise yards throughout the day. Wings contained a wide range of association equipment, microwave ovens and sandwich toasters, and prisoners could dine out of cell on all wings. Mountbatten unit was noisy during the day, particularly during association periods. Noise levels were exacerbated by prisoners having to bang on gates to gain entry; this was unlikely to be helped by plans to double up the cells on this unit.
- 2.3 Cells were clean and most did not display graffiti or offensive materials. Many cells designed for one prisoner were used to accommodate two, and lacked adequate toilet screening and furniture, including lockable cupboards. Prisoners in our groups complained about the condition of the beds, and we found many to be in a poor condition. Toilets in many of the cells we inspected were heavily stained and dirty. Cell call bells were answered quickly when we tested them.
- 2.4 There were sufficient showers on all units and, with the exception of Mountbatten unit, they were all in a reasonable condition and had appropriate screening.
- 2.5 Access to sheets and clothing was by application. In our survey, 72% of respondents, against the 64% comparator, said that they were usually offered enough prison-issue clean clothes for the week, and 80%, against the 75% comparator, that they could access cell cleaning equipment every week. We found access to hygiene products to be good. However, access to sheets was inadequate; only 34% in our survey against the comparator of 81% said they could obtain clean sheets each week.
- 2.6 Rules and routines were displayed on residential wings and staff enforced the rules fairly. We found evidence that applications were frequently not responded to and the tracking system was poor. A number of prisoners told us that they resorted to the complaints system to gain a response to issues. In our survey, only 51% of respondents, against the 63% comparator, said that applications were dealt with fairly.
- 2.7 Prisoners in our survey and our groups were negative about the property system. They could wear their own clothes but could have property sent in only once every six months. The catalogues used were frequently out of stock of the items ordered. There was good access to telephones, mail and stored property when it was allowed in.

Recommendations

- 2.8 Noise levels on Mountbatten unit should be reduced.
- 2.9 Cells designed for one should not hold two.
- 2.10 All cells should have appropriate privacy screening and furniture, and toilets should be kept clean.
- 2.11 Showers on Mountbatten unit should be refurbished.
- 2.12 Applications should be responded to promptly and appropriately.

Housekeeping point

- 2.13 Problems with obtaining property should be addressed effectively.

Staff–prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their time in custody, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

- 2.14 Staff–prisoner relationships were generally good, but prisoners complained of lack of cultural sensitivity from some staff. Personal officers usually made regular contact with prisoners.
- 2.15 We observed reasonably relaxed and cooperative relationships between staff and prisoners. This was less evident on Mountbatten unit, where we detected more tension and discontent. In our survey, 75% of prisoners said that most staff treated them with respect, which was in line with the comparator. Several prisoners in our groups reported offensive stereotyping and a lack of cultural sensitivity from a small number of staff. Staff told us that they would welcome training on the specific needs of foreign national prisoners, including immigration needs.
- 2.16 In our survey, 81% of prisoners, against the 76% comparator, said that they had a member of staff to turn to if they had a problem, and about two-thirds reported useful contact with personal officers. Entries in P-Nomis (electronic case notes) indicated that personal officers spoke to their allocated prisoners every two to four weeks, although in some cases initial contact took too long – up to three weeks in our sample. Personal officer notes suggested a good level of knowledge of individuals but there was little focus on resettlement issues. Management checks were regular and usually led to improvements.
- 2.17 There was one immigration detainee in the prison at the time of the inspection, whose behaviour and mental health had deteriorated in the two months since he had finished his sentence. However, P-Nomis showed that his personal officer had made no contact during this time. This had been picked up in a management check.

Recommendations

- 2.18 Staff should receive training in cultural awareness and the specific needs of a foreign national population.
- 2.19 Personal officers should make a particular effort to maintain contact with immigration detainees, and make early contact with all allocated prisoners.

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.

- 2.20 Equality work was in a state of change. Equality meetings were productive but the policy and action plan were out of date. Investigations into discrimination incidents were reasonable but some took too long to complete. Some minority groups were under-identified and lacked support. National Offender Management Service ethnic monitoring data were becoming irrelevant as the prison moved to a solely foreign national population but more useful monitoring by nationality had begun. The UK Border Agency had no permanent onsite presence but visited the prison regularly and assisted those wishing to return to their country of origin. Older prisoners reported more positively than those under 50. Gay or bisexual prisoners received no targeted support.

Strategic management

- 2.21 Equality management was in a state of flux, with much work embryonic but improving. A full-time equality manager had recently taken over the role but had received no training and had no other support. The equality policy had been written before the re-role and did not take account of the changed population. The equality action plan was large, unwieldy and out of date, although a smaller and more practical action plan was more effective in progressing equality issues. Bimonthly equality meetings were well attended and actions were progressed between meetings.
- 2.22 Ethnic monitoring data were analysed and out-of-range indicators were discussed. However, as National Offender Management Service (NOMS) ethnic monitoring data classified all non-British prisoners as black and minority ethnic, these data were now of little use in a foreign national prison. Shortly before the inspection, the equality team had started to monitor prisoners' treatment and conditions by nationality. Prisoners had been grouped into six broad

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

geographical groups and the results analysed appropriately at the equality meetings. There was no monitoring of other protected characteristics.

- 2.23 Two prisoners worked part time as equality orderlies (half a day, every day) and were supported by seven equality representatives. Representatives and orderlies were positive about their role and the support they received from the equality manager. They had been appointed following an open recruitment process and were known to prisoners. Ethnic monitoring data, information about discrimination incidents and equality meeting minutes were displayed on the units.
- 2.24 In the previous six months, 38 discrimination incidents had been reported. Investigations had been reasonable and replies polite but some had taken too long to complete. Some had been partially upheld but the reasons for findings were not always clear. A combined feedback/appeal form confused these two processes and not all complainants were systematically issued with a copy. A NOMS regional manager scrutinised a sample of the discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) but there was no independent external scrutiny. Data on the type and outcome of the discrimination incidents were discussed at the equality meetings but trends over time were not monitored. DIRFs were available on all units but only in English.
- 2.25 Mechanisms for identifying minority group prisoners were being revised. All prisoners had previously been interviewed by an equality representative but a more confidential system was being developed. More robust procedures to identify prisoners with a disability had recently been introduced (see section on protected characteristics).
- 2.26 There were no regular forums or meetings with members of minority groups. A programme of equality impact assessments had been re-launched following a priority-setting meeting in November 2012. Seven areas had been identified for assessment. Previous assessments had been of reasonable quality and contained action plans. All staff had received 'Challenge It, Change It' diversity training.

Recommendations

- 2.27 Prison life should be monitored by all relevant protected characteristics.
- 2.28 Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) should be freely available in a range of languages, replies should be timely and subject to independent scrutiny, and DIRF data should be analysed to identify long-term trends and patterns.
- 2.29 There should be regular minority group meetings to provide information and support and improve communication.

Housekeeping points

- 2.30 The equality manager should receive training for the role.
- 2.31 The equality policy and action plan should be updated and reflect the needs of the prison's population.

Protected characteristics

- 2.32 In our survey, more black and minority ethnic than white prisoners said that they had been victimised by other prisoners (26% versus 5%) and by staff (35% versus 19%), and more said that they had felt threatened or intimidated by staff (10% versus 3%). Although 4% of respondents to our survey identified themselves as Gypsy or Roma, which equated to approximately 16 prisoners, the prison had not identified any prisoners from these minority groups. Only one prisoner was being held beyond his sentence under immigration powers (see section on staff–prisoner relationships).
- 2.33 Although the prison was dedicated to foreign national prisoners, the UK Border Agency (UKBA) had no permanent onsite presence, and prisoners complained about lack of access to them. Instead, a chief immigration officer and three immigration officers attended the prison at least twice a week to see all new arrivals and liaise between prisoners and the criminal casework directorate of UKBA. The UKBA team worked diligently and successfully to ensure that prisoners who wanted to return to their country of origin did so as early as possible. The team was less successful at assisting those contesting their deportation but had helped at least one to find an immigration lawyer. The team could not access UKBA's case-working database inside the prison. Officials from UKBA's Criminal Casework Directorate had trained 61% of prison staff on immigration processes. This training was reinforced with a locally produced pocket information leaflet that explained the options available to foreign national prisoners.
- 2.34 Professional telephone interpreting was rarely used, in spite of some clear examples of need. In 2012 it had been used only 13 times. Dual-handset or conference telephones were not available on wing units. Lists of prisoners and staff who spoke languages other than English were held in wing offices. Staff primarily used other prisoners as interpreters when communicating with those who could not speak English.
- 2.35 In our survey, more prisoners with than without a disability said that they had been victimised by another prisoner (44% versus 17%) or by a member of staff (44% versus 28%). In spite of a recently introduced mechanism to identify prisoners with a disability, the prison had identified only 17 such prisoners, whereas our survey suggested the actual number was likely to be around 50. Care planning for such prisoners had only recently been implemented and was underdeveloped. Less than half the prisoners identified by the prison had been assessed (five out of the 17). Care plans were poor and not sufficiently multidisciplinary. A prisoner with mobility problems who did not speak English complained that it was difficult to use the showers on his unit safely as there were no grip rails. The prison's two cells for those with disabilities were unoccupied. Personal emergency evacuation plans for prisoners requiring assistance in the event of an emergency were in wing offices.
- 2.36 In our survey, older prisoners reported more positively than those under the age of 50. For example, 92% of older prisoners, against 72% of their younger counterparts, said that most staff treated them with respect. Older prisoners could meet once a week in the multi-faith area for a coffee and attend dedicated clinics in the health care department.
- 2.37 There was poor support for gay or bisexual prisoners. In our survey, 2% of prisoners said that they were gay or bisexual. The equality team was aware of three gay prisoners but did not provide any support. No external support agencies had been identified or visited the prison. There were no posters promoting positive images of gay prisoners.

Recommendations

- 2.38 Managers should investigate and act on the reasons for the more negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners.
- 2.39 Gypsy and Roma prisoners should be identified and supported.
- 2.40 The UK Border Agency should have a permanent onsite presence with access to their case-working database.
- 2.41 Staff should use telephone interpreting when communicating confidential or sensitive information to prisoners who do not speak English.
- 2.42 All prisoners with disabilities should be identified during their reception, and their needs should be met through multidisciplinary care planning where appropriate.
- 2.43 Gay and bisexual prisoners should be supported through specific groups and schemes in the prison and through referral to external support networks.

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.

- 2.44 The provision of faith and religious activities was good. The chaplaincy provided a full range of services, was well integrated into prison life, had good links with local faith groups and provided excellent bereavement care. The multi-faith area was fit for purpose.
- 2.45 Faith provision was good. In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments said that their beliefs were respected (68% versus 54%), that they were able to speak to a religious leader in private (68% versus 59%) and that it was easy to attend religious services (74% versus 52%). The full-time Christian coordinating chaplain was supported by a number of sessional chaplains and volunteers from a variety of faiths.
- 2.46 The team provided a full range of services and study classes. There were good links with local faith groups. The chaplain was well integrated into the life of the prison and attended a range of meetings across departments. Shortly before the inspection, the team had provided excellent care to a prisoner whose mother had died, providing bereavement support and facilitating extra visits from his wife.
- 2.47 The single multi-faith area was able to accommodate the various services. The coordinating chaplain was exploring links with the Salvation Army in Nigeria and the Caribbean in order to ensure that prisoners' faith needs were met after deportation.

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.

2.48 The number of complaints submitted was high. Complaint forms were available only in English. Complaint investigations were of variable quality. Few prisoners felt that their complaints were dealt with fairly. Some replies were perfunctory and unhelpful. Many replies were difficult to read, especially for prisoners whose first language was not English. Data analysis did not capture outcomes or trends over time.

2.49 The number of complaints submitted was high, at about 114 a month. In the previous six months, residential issues, education and employment-related issues had featured most often. Complaint forms were freely available on the units but only in English; wing staff were unaware that these were available from NOMS in other languages. Too many complaints were related to unanswered applications (see section on residential units).

2.50 In our survey, only 28% of prisoners, against the 34% comparator, said that their complaints were dealt with fairly. Complaints were responded to quickly but not all investigations were constructive and addressed the matters raised. Some replies were polite and addressed the prisoner by name but others were short and abrupt. Although English was not the first language for many prisoners, many replies were handwritten, difficult to read and did not use plain English. The data collected relating to complaints focused on timeliness, topic and protected characteristics but did not capture the outcome (for example, upheld, partially upheld, dismissed). The data were discussed at senior management meetings but did not examine trends over time. The deputy governor quality assured 10% of replies.

Recommendation

2.51 Responses to complaints should be polite, easy to understand and address the issues raised.

Housekeeping points

2.52 Complaint forms in languages other than English should be freely available.

2.53 The outcomes of complaints should be recorded and trends monitored over time.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.54 Legal services were underdeveloped and insufficiently promoted. Legal services officers did not have up-to-date training, an office or allocated time to dedicate to the service. They did not coordinate their activities with Migrant Helpline, which attended once a week to provide basic legal advice. The length and frequency of legal visits were insufficient. The visits hall lacked sufficient consultation booths, which meant that prisoners could not instruct their lawyers in private.
- 2.55 Almost all prisoners were facing deportation at the end of their sentence, and those contesting their deportation required legal representation. The two legal services officers (LSOs) had not received recent training, had no allocated time to dedicate to the service and did not have a dedicated office. The service was not well promoted and the LSOs saw only a handful of prisoners. One LSO had assisted some immigration detainees in making successful bail applications.
- 2.56 A third-sector organisation, Migrant Helpline, attended the prison weekly to provide immigration advice and assist prisoners in finding immigration lawyers, locating missing property and chasing UKBA for updates on their cases. They saw seven prisoners a week. Although their services were helpful and appreciated by many prisoners, they were unable to provide legal representation. The LSOs did not coordinate their activities with Migrant Helpline. Many wing staff were unaware of the LSOs or Migrant Helpline, and gave prisoners requiring legal representation a list of solicitors rather than referring them to these services.
- 2.57 Legal visits took place two mornings a week. The length and frequency of the sessions were insufficient to meet demand. In our survey, only 45% of prisoners, against the 53% comparator, said that it was easy to attend legal visits. A single consultation booth in the visits hall was rarely used and many prisoners instructed their lawyers within earshot of other prisoners. Lawyers we spoke to confirmed that they were able to communicate with prisoners and that security arrangements were proportionate on their visits.

Recommendations

- 2.58 The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) should consult the Legal Services Commission about providing the prison with a legal advice service similar to the detention duty advice service in immigration removal centres.
- 2.59 The legal services officers should receive updated training on prison, criminal and immigration law, and have a dedicated office with internet access, printers and a fax machine.
- 2.60 Prisoners should be able to consult their lawyers in private, and the frequency and length of visits should be increased to meet demand.

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.

2.61 A good level of health care service was provided by a small team. Access to the services was generally quick and prisoners were satisfied with the quality of care. The range of clinics had been developed effectively to accommodate the needs of the prison population. Pharmacy services were satisfactory and dental care was good. An integrated mental health team provided good primary and secondary care.

Governance arrangements

- 2.62 Health care services were commissioned by Oxford Primary Care Trust and provided by Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust. Relationships with the commissioners and providers were good and the governor had an active role in the partnership and clinical governance boards. The health care manager (locally referred to as the modern matron) had a good working relationship with the governor and was encouraged to attend the senior management team meeting regularly. In our survey, prisoners generally expressed satisfaction with the access to and quality of health care services, although in our discussion groups they were critical of the long waiting times for the optician and the dentist.
- 2.63 The health care centre was very clean and well equipped. It was located on the ground floor of the prison and all health care services were delivered from there. The centre comprised a range of large rooms with a large open waiting area. Some refurbishment and redesign of the treatment and consultation areas had recently taken place.
- 2.64 A health needs assessment had been completed in 2011 and a revised assessment was available in draft form. The assessment was pertinent in view of the re-role of the prison and the consequent changes to the health care demands of the population. The health care manager had been in post for almost a year and had made a large contribution to the development of the services. She was supported by a practice manager in an operational role and three clinical leads for primary care and mental health. The small team was currently almost fully staffed, with only two vacancies.
- 2.65 Prisoners had access to the health care services from 8am to 6.30pm each day, including weekends. The range of clinics available was appropriate for the prison population and included some visiting specialists. Two senior nurses divided the primary care requirements according to their expertise and this included care for older prisoners. Staff training was monitored effectively by the practice manager and supported by the provider trust. All staff were in date for the mandatory elements of their training and this included safeguarding issues. Clinical supervision was available informally but was not documented sufficiently.
- 2.66 The provider trust contracted one GP to deliver clinics three days a week; he also made himself available on the other days if required. The out-of-hours service was the same as in the local community. A pharmacy technician visited the establishment two days a week to assist with medicines management. The pharmacist had been in position for only three months and had not yet started visiting the prison routinely. There were no pharmacist-led medication reviews or clinics and prisoners could not readily consult a pharmacist or technician. Four dental sessions a week were provided by a dentist and dental nurse from a local practice, which also provided cover for holidays and sickness absence. Clinical records were well maintained using SystemOne (the electronic clinical record) and we saw samples that had been well written and demonstrated patient involvement. Paper records were stored appropriately. Staff were kept well informed of health care guidance and developments. Emergency resuscitation equipment was located in the health care centre and included an automated

external defibrillator, with an additional one located in the gym. All equipment was in date and checks were recorded regularly.

- 2.67 Each of the units provided a health care representative and there was also a prisoner who acted as the main representative for the patient advisory and liaison service for dealing initially with complaints. The representatives met monthly in a health care forum and shared the information that emerged with prisoners on their units. A health promotion strategy and action plan were well developed and evident in a number of initiatives throughout the prison to encourage active lifestyles and help to prevent the spread of diseases. There were policies and procedures for the control of communicable diseases. There were, on average, only eight health care-related complaints per month. The process was well managed and complaints were dealt with sensitively and swiftly.

Recommendation

- 2.68 **Patients should have access to pharmacist-led clinics.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.69 All episodes of clinical supervision should be recorded.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.70 Initial health care screening was performed by a general nurse in a dedicated room in reception that was suitably equipped for the process. All prisoners then underwent a more comprehensive secondary health care screen on the following day. They were provided with a booklet outlining the health services available and this was written in a range of different languages. Prisoners who were sick either attended the health care department at the start of the day or submitted a health care application to be seen. Applications were triaged by nursing staff daily and patients were allocated to an appropriate clinic. Patients needing to be seen by the GP were usually given an appointment within 72 hours. Nursing staff were able to see patients until 6.30pm each day.
- 2.71 Segregated prisoners were attended daily by a nurse and three times a week by the GP. They could be seen additionally if required and were referred to the mental health team when appropriate. Health promotion services were well developed, with a good range of vaccination and screening programmes. Health promotion information was widely available and healthy lifestyle days were held periodically, as well as following national campaign days. Condoms were available from the health care centre on request. The management of patients requiring outside hospital appointments was well organised, with sufficient escorts to meet the demand. However, too many prisoners had missed hospital appointments as a result of being transferred to the establishment.

Recommendation

- 2.72 **Prisoners should not be transferred to the prison if they have an outstanding hospital appointment at their previous location.**

Pharmacy

- 2.73 Medicines were stored and handed out from a recently refurbished location in the health care centre. Prescriptions were handwritten on standard HR013 forms, which were also used to record the administration of medicines. Prescriptions were managed well, with an appropriate arrangement for urgent orders when required. The pharmacy used the Ascribe patient medication record system, which could be accessed at the prison, and the technician updated this system when ordering so that clinical checks could then be carried out by a pharmacist remotely before items were dispensed.
- 2.74 Prescribing was appropriate to the population but there was no establishment-specific formulary (a list of medications used to inform prescribing). Prisoners were able to re-order medication. Most patients received their medication in-possession. There was a draft in-possession policy, with an associated risk assessment which had recently been reviewed and was due to be ratified by the medicines and therapeutics committee. Prisoners had lockable storage facilities for medicines held in-possession.
- 2.75 Supervised doses were administered twice daily, at around 8.30am and 6.30pm; midday doses could also be given if needed. As the latest administration time was too early for night-time doses, medication was usually supplied as daily in-possession in these circumstances. Medicines were generally stored appropriately but we saw some loose tablet strips and found some obsolete medicines in a cupboard alongside named-patient medicines.
- 2.76 The medicines management practice guidance policy did not cover all aspects of the pharmacy service. Pharmacy staff had not read or understood the pharmacy procedures.
- 2.77 Access to over-the-counter remedies was good but there was no policy to support 'special sick' (immediate health treatment without an appointment) medication supply. There were patient group directions for flu vaccination and the administration of adrenaline. There was a quarterly medicines and therapeutics committee meeting, attended by the pharmacist, which analysed the prescribing data.

Recommendations

- 2.78 The in-possession policy should be fully implemented and adhered to.
- 2.79 Pharmacy procedures and policies should be reviewed to ensure that they cover all aspects of the service. They should be agreed by the medicines and therapeutics committee and all staff should read and sign the adopted procedures.
- 2.80 The use of patient group directions should be extended to allow the supply of more potent medicines by the nursing staff where appropriate.

Housekeeping points

- 2.81 An establishment-specific formulary should inform prescribing.
- 2.82 Loose tablets and tablet foils should not be present in stock.
- 2.83 Medication for disposal should be segregated and dealt with promptly.

- 2.84 The 'special sick' policy should be formalised and agreed by the medicines and therapeutics committee.

Dentistry

- 2.85 The dental surgery comprised a large, well-equipped and clean room. Prisoners were generally satisfied with the level of care provided. At the time of the inspection, there was a short waiting list of 14 patients. Patients could wait up to six weeks to be seen for routine treatment. Those requiring urgent care were seen very quickly.
- 2.86 We saw patients being treated respectfully and their privacy was maintained when procedures were performed. There was a good level of interaction between dental staff and patients, and dental health information was available in a range of languages. Emergency resuscitation equipment was shared with the health care centre, with the dental staff maintaining their own emergency medications. Dental health records were managed by the dental team and appointments were managed electronically using SystemOne.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.87 The mental health team was integrated, with two mental health nurses providing primary care and two seeing secondary care referrals. The total caseload averaged 40 patients, with up to 20 initial referrals each month. Patients were satisfied with the level and quality of their treatment, and were involved in the planning of their care. The health care room used for most consultations did not have an alarm bell. The team provided cover on weekdays and there was an open referral system. Cases were managed in a multidisciplinary way, with case reviews and allocations taking place at a weekly meeting. Patients were seen by a forensic psychiatrist, who visited the prison weekly, seeing two patients each week and attending case reviews. Apart from access to a mental health advocacy team, prisoners did not have access to professional counselling services.
- 2.88 The mental health team also delivered group work for patients, including the management of anger, anxiety and low self-esteem. Care was available for the management of post-traumatic stress disorders, and at the time of the inspection seven such prisoners had been identified. Health services staff had not received any additional training in the identification and management of prisoners who may have been subjected to torture. Patients rarely needed to be transferred to a secure mental health hospital but when this was necessary they were moved quickly. Mental health awareness training was provided monthly for all prison staff.

Recommendation

- 2.89 Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services.

Housekeeping points

- 2.90 The health care room used for mental health consultations should be equipped with an alarm.
- 2.91 Health services staff should receive training in the identification and management of patients who allege that they have been tortured.

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.

- 2.92 Prisoners were consulted about the menu, and the dietary needs of minority groups were met. However, prisoners complained about the quality and cultural range of food and we saw some unimpressive meals. Prisoners working in the kitchen could attain relevant qualifications.
- 2.93 Prisoners were served cereals for breakfast; halal, non-halal and vegan options for lunch and could choose from five options (halal, non-halal, vegan, vegetarian and salad) for their evening meal. They preselected a week of meals three weeks in advance. They did not have the facility to cook for themselves but had access to microwave ovens and toasters on wing units.
- 2.94 In our survey, fewer prisoners (23%) than at comparator prisons (29%) said that the food was good. In our groups, prisoners complained about the quality and cultural range of food, and we saw some low-quality and unappetising meals being served.
- 2.95 Prisoners were consulted about the menu: a food survey was conducted annually and servery orderlies met the catering manager every week. Food comments books on the wings were checked by catering staff. Prisoners who complained were invited to the kitchens to speak to the catering manager.
- 2.96 The catering manager met minority groups of prisoners – for example, Rastafarians and diabetics – to discuss their dietary needs. He also consulted a dietician from the health care department. Although there was no additional budget, food for religious festivals was prepared. All prisoners could select food prepared for specific religious festivals. The 15 prisoners working in the kitchen could gain a range of relevant qualifications.

Recommendation

- 2.97 The quality and range of food should be improved.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.98 Prisoners were consulted about the content of the prison shop list but many said that it did not provide a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. Goods could also be purchased through a large selection of catalogues.
- 2.99 Fewer prisoners (36%) than at comparator prisons (45%) said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. However, they could purchase a wide range of

products through both the prison shop list and a large selection of catalogues, and changes had previously been made after consultation.

- 2.100 Products on the list could be changed four times a year. Prisoners had last been consulted about the content of the list in December 2012, but changes from this consultation were not due to take effect until two months after the inspection. The shop list was available in English only.

Housekeeping point

- 2.101 A pictorial shop list with pictures of the most popular items should be made available for prisoners who do not speak English.

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 Time out of cell was good. Association and exercise were predictable.
- 3.2 Most prisoners could spend nearly 10 hours out of their cell from Monday to Thursday and told us that this was never curtailed. There was no evening association from Friday to Sunday, but prisoners still had 8.5 hours out of cell. Roll checks during the working day showed that only about 6% of the population was locked up, most of whom had refused to work or were unwell.
- 3.3 Association was regular and we saw no examples of cancellation. Prisoners had good access to the exercise yards on most units, which were left open during the day. Association areas were generally well maintained and most included multi-gyms for prisoner use.

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.

- 3.4 The leadership and management of learning and skills and work were good and there was good capacity for further improvement. There were effective links between prison and learning and skills staff, ensuring a responsive approach to meeting prisoners' needs. Self-assessment was fully established, thorough and accurate, and reflected a prison-wide approach. There were sufficient purposeful activities for the whole population and the allocations process was well managed. Teaching, learning and assessment were good and the achievement of accredited qualifications was outstanding. Attendance and punctuality were generally good. The library was reasonably good, although there was insufficient access for some prisoners.
- 3.5 Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:
- Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities: **Good**

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.

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>.

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

Good

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

Good

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.6 The leadership and management of learning and skills and work were good. The learning and skills provider for the offender learning and skills service (OLASS) contract had recently changed to Milton Keynes College, and was working effectively. Strong relationships and communication between prison and education and training staff ensured that most prisoners' needs were met. The training needs analysis completed in July 2012, included reference to potential skill areas abroad. The analysis had been used effectively to develop accredited skills training and self-employment programmes. The analysis needed to be updated to reflect the current population.
- 3.7 Self-assessment, quality assurance and improvement processes were well established, covered most of the prison-wide activities and involved most staff. There was regular and effective monitoring of learning and skills performance, and data were used well to support decision making and target setting. The observation of teaching, learning and assessment was sound and generally provided an accurate reflection of staff performance. However, the process did not fully consider the quality of the integration of English and mathematics into education and vocational training programmes. The skills strategy for the implementation of functional skills of English, mathematics and information technology had been completed in 2011 and had not been reviewed. There was insufficient formal sharing of best practice between education and vocational training staff.
- 3.8 Staff managed the allocations process well and care was taken to allocate prisoners to their first choice of activity where possible. Most prisoners were allocated to their first or second choice of job. Waiting lists were minimal and managed fairly. Attendance and punctuality were generally good. However, prisoners sometimes had to wait too long at the gates on the residential units to access the vocational training. Toilet arrangements for prisoners on these programmes (for example, barbering) were inadequate. Prisoners had to return to their own wings to use toilet facilities. The pay structure was fair and equitable.

Recommendations

- 3.9 The training need analysis should be reviewed regularly to ensure that learning, skills and work remain relevant to prisoners' employment needs.
- 3.10 The skills strategy should be updated so that it provides a clear structure for the integration of English, mathematics and information technology into learning, skills and work.
- 3.11 Staff should formally share best practice in learning and skills.
- 3.12 There should be sufficient toilet facilities for prisoners undertaking vocational training on the residential units.

Provision of activities

- 3.13 The induction process was good, and effective use was made of the National Careers Service. Staff interviewed all prisoners and ensured that their aspirations and needs were fully considered when making recommendations for their progress. The use of initial assessment to plan purposeful activities was reasonably good, although there was no formal dyslexia assessment available. There were sufficient purposeful activities for the population and most prisoners (on average, 95%) were employed. Most places were offered on a part-time basis to enable prisoners to participate in education and training. Most education and vocational training programmes and work were accredited and relevant to prisoners' employability and resettlement needs. Approximately 60 prisoners worked as orderlies, supporting other prisoners or staff – for example, during induction and as peer mentors and PE trainers. Others worked as mentors for Toe by Toe (a scheme to help prisoners learn to read) and as resettlement advisers. Many of these were successfully following relevant qualifications at level 3 and some were following level 4 PE courses.
- 3.14 The education department provided approximately 150 full-time-equivalent places, including a range of literacy and numeracy and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) programmes, art, information and communications technology (ICT), business enterprise, retail, mentoring, book-keeping and graphic design. Programmes were offered from entry level to level 2, and a few to level 3. A small number of prisoners were following Open University and distance learning programmes. There was insufficient ESOL provision to meet the needs of the population. Approximately 180 places were available in vocational training programmes, which included catering, PE, horticulture, painting and decorating, tiling and flooring, radio production, environmental studies, industrial cleaning and barbering. At the time of inspection the brickwork and car mechanics workshops were closed because of staff vacancies. Safeguarding, equality and diversity arrangements were good.

Recommendations

- 3.15 The prison should introduce a dyslexia assessment to ensure that all prisoners' support needs are identified and met fully.
- 3.16 There should be sufficient accredited English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) support to meet the needs of the population.
- 3.17 The brickwork and car mechanics workshops should be staffed and included as part of the vocational training offer.

Quality of provision

- 3.18 Teaching, training, learning and assessment were good, and in a few cases outstanding, in education and vocational training. Highly motivated staff provided stimulating learning opportunities. Prison and education/training staff relationships were excellent and promoted a strong learning and work ethos. Learners worked diligently and particularly valued the work skills/business enterprise programmes aimed at providing self-employment skills.
- 3.19 Staff utilised the diversity of learners' nationalities effectively to celebrate cultural aspects – for example, selecting various spices and flavourings in cookery classes and discussing their impact on the taste and appearance of food. Radio production celebrated cultural aspects of

music through discussions with prisoners, the choice of music and the presentations. ESOL staff used discussions well to identify and promote equality and diversity.

- 3.20 In some education and training programmes, staff integrated English and mathematics into learning, particularly in business enterprise, book-keeping and horticulture. However, staff awareness and knowledge of the importance of planning to engage prisoners and progress their English and mathematics skills were underdeveloped. Opportunities were often missed to recognise and record learners' development of employability skills, such as work ethos, reliability, and working on their own and as a member of a team.
- 3.21 Good use was made of prisoners as teaching assistants. The Toe by Toe programme was well managed and particularly effective in supporting prisoners with identified reading support needs. The prison had been recognised as a centre of excellence for the management and delivery of this programme by The Shannon Trust. The prison worked successfully with external agencies, and several prisoners were following a formal accredited mentor programme in advice and guidance.
- 3.22 Most learning and skills resources were used well and some staff had used the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) to develop and store learning resources for particular programmes – for example, horticulture and business enterprise. In some learning rooms, the interactive technology was poorly placed to facilitate learning. The barbering area was too cramped for all workstations to be used simultaneously for intricate cutting work.

Recommendations

- 3.23 **Staff should support and develop prisoners' English and mathematics knowledge and skills through vocational programmes.**
- 3.24 **Prisoners' interpersonal employability skills and vocational skills development should be recognised and recorded.**
- 3.25 **The resources for teaching, training, learning and assessment should be improved and the layout of some learning areas should be better planned to maximise learning opportunities.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.26 Achievement of accredited qualifications was outstanding on most education and vocational training programmes. Most prisoners made good progress through their learning, and approximately two-thirds of prisoners who started on literacy and numeracy programmes progressed by at least one level during their stay. Approximately 10% of those on Toe by Toe programmes achieved an accredited literacy and/or numeracy qualification. Achievements on ICT programmes were low, at 36–41%. The prison had identified concerns with staff and assessment processes for these programmes and was taking steps to address them. Although achievements had improved marginally at the time of the inspection, the full impact of the changes had yet to be felt and reflected in the figures. The standard of learners' work was good, particularly in art, cookery, business enterprise, horticulture and radio production. The waste management workshop and work ethic was impressive and demonstrated good industrial standards.

Recommendation

- 3.27 Low achievements and problematic assessment and verification processes for prisoners on information and communications technology courses should be addressed effectively.

Library

- 3.28 The library was managed by Oxford County Council and additional staff had recently been recruited to improve access. The library had adapted well since the re-role of the prison and had forged links with local prisons and libraries to provide a reasonably good stock of books, DVDs, reference material, newspapers and journals.
- 3.29 Approximately 75% of the prison population used the library regularly but access was limited for those released on temporary licence, as it was not open in the evenings or at the weekends. Access was limited to 30 minutes. There were three stand-alone computers for prisoners' use but little use was made of them because of limited space. Prison Service Instructions were available on request and Storybook Dads (a scheme whereby prisoners recorded stories for their children) was well supported; over 80 recordings had been produced over the previous year. Although there was a reasonable stock of newspapers and journals, books and DVDs for foreign nationals, there was an over-reliance on library staff to identify the needs of specific nationalities rather than using systematic processes, and some groups, such as Chinese prisoners, had not had up-to-date newspapers for some months.

Recommendations

- 3.30 Access to the library should be improved by opening it in the evenings and at weekends and extending sessions beyond 30 minutes.
- 3.31 A more systematic approach should be used to identify and supply appropriate and relevant newspapers and journals.

Housekeeping point

- 3.32 More space should be provided for prisoners to be able to use the computers.

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.

- 3.33 PE was well-managed and a highly qualified team provided a range of recreational activities and accredited programmes relevant to employment. Achievement rates for the accredited programmes were high. Prisoners qualified as personal trainers promoted fitness and healthy living. All prisoners had good access to recreational PE through two planned sessions on

weekdays as well as a choice of other evening and weekend activities. Residential units had small fitness suites for use during association.

- 3.34 PE staffing levels were good, with one senior PE officer and seven officers, and the provision was led well. Staff were highly qualified in a range of sports and PE specialisms and all held teaching qualifications. They were good role models and participated with prisoners in various sports and charity fundraising.
- 3.35 PE facilities were good and well maintained and there was a wide range of activities in the sports hall. The gym was well equipped and two classrooms near the PE area were used for accredited course theory work. Outside sports facilities were good and each residential unit had a small fitness suite off the main association area. Toilet and shower facilities were satisfactory. PE kits were readily available.
- 3.36 Opening times included weekends and evenings from Monday to Thursday. All prisoners had good access to recreational PE through two planned sessions on weekdays as well as a choice of other evening and weekend activities. Posters displayed in the main corridors and PE areas promoted a range of team and individual sports. Information from quarterly PE surveys was used to improve programmes.
- 3.37 PE and healthy living were well promoted. Prison records showed that around 76% of prisoners used the facilities regularly, which was high in comparison with similar prisons. The recent healthy living day had been successful in recruiting new users and had been well supported by health services, mental health and nutritional staff. PE staff provided specialist early evening sessions for prisoners referred for health reasons and also those new to using gym facilities. The PE induction process was thorough and prison identification cards clearly showed when this had been completed. Accidents were appropriately recorded and investigated.
- 3.38 Prisoners trained and qualified as personal trainers wore T-shirts with logos to identify them around the prison. They provided personal training to other prisoners and encouraged others to participate in PE activities, often by using the fitness suites on the residential units. PE participation data were systematically collected by prisoners' name, nationality and residential unit, and appropriate action was taken when required.
- 3.39 Achievement rates were high on all programmes. The prison offered an annual programme of accredited programmes ranging from levels 1 to 4, and all related well to gaining employment.

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 Although the foreign national population was relatively new, the prison had started to make progress in managing their resettlement needs. A comprehensive action plan was in place and a needs analysis had recently been carried out. Most prisoners were deported via immigration removal centres and only a small number were released into the community. Progression to category D was developing and there was good use of release on temporary licence.
- 4.2 The prison had only recently re-rolled from holding a category C to a foreign national population. The heads of reducing reoffending and offender management had shaped the resettlement strategy to meet the needs of foreign national prisoners. The reducing reoffending strategy document had not yet been fully updated for the new population. However, the prison had formulated a useful interim action plan pending completion of a new needs analysis. This was reviewed at the bimonthly reducing reoffending strategy meeting and was starting to be implemented.
- 4.3 A prisoner needs analysis had been completed in November 2012, with 50% of the population completing a questionnaire. Staff had also dip-sampled the needs that had been identified in the completed offender assessment system (OASys) assessments. The information had yet to be fully collated but it was anticipated that this needs analysis would be completed in time to inform the 2013/14 reducing reoffending strategy. The prison did not evaluate the effectiveness of its resettlement strategy for prisoners who had been released – particularly for those who had been deported.
- 4.4 In the previous six months, 102 prisoners had left the prison. Seventy-one had been deported, 83% via a short stay in an immigration removal centre. Twenty-four had been transferred for operational reasons, two had been repatriated and five had been released into the community. In our survey, respondents were negative against the comparator when asked if they knew of someone in the prison who could assist with their resettlement needs.
- 4.5 An offender management forum had recently been introduced and this was accompanied by a quarterly newsletter. This had improved communication with prisoners, and prisoners we spoke to were aware of these new initiatives.
- 4.6 There were 22 category D prisoners at the time of the inspection. Patterson unit had a specific category D landing, which afforded these prisoners more time out of cell (see also section on offender management and planning).
- 4.7 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was being developed, and at the time of the inspection seven prisoners were undertaking daily ROTL. It was planned that that all category D residents on the Patterson spur would eventually be on daily ROTL. ROTL was sequenced so that

prisoners would firstly undertake jobs outside the prison, such as in the gardens and the visitors centre, and then progress to work placements in the community. During the inspection, two prisoners were working daily in local stables.

Recommendations

- 4.8 The 2013/2014 reducing reoffending strategy should focus on the needs of the foreign national population and take account of specific resettlement needs in countries outside the UK.
- 4.9 The prison should evaluate the resettlement outcomes for prisoners, including those released into the UK, and use this to improve and develop resettlement services.

Good practice

- 4.10 *The offender management forum and the accompanying newsletter improved communication with 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.

4.11 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor but had no initial assessment of resettlement pathway needs. Offender supervisors carried high caseloads and contact time with prisoners was limited. The quality of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments for low- and medium-risk prisoners was good and sentence planning targets were appropriate. Low- and medium-risk prisoners had their needs addressed adequately but risk factors for high-risk prisoners, including sex offenders, were addressed less effectively. All new arrivals received a public protection assessment, information was shared with relevant departments and monitoring was discussed at interdepartmental risk management meetings. Recategorisation arrangements were fair and a few prisoners had progressed to category D prisons.

4.12 All prisoners were allocated to an offender supervisor and subject to an OASys assessment, regardless of whether they were in scope (prisoners serving 12 months or more and classified as posing a high risk to the public) or out of scope for offender management. In our survey, 75% of respondents, against the 67% comparator, said that they had a named offender supervisor. During the re-role, the prison had received many prisoners from other establishments without an up-to-date OASys assessment – 158 in June 2012. Since then, the prison had prioritised this work and at the time of the inspection the number of such prisoners had fallen to 27.

4.13 The 5.5 trained offender supervisors carried a caseload of approximately 75 prisoners each. Contact time with prisoners was limited and, apart from during completion of the OASys assessment, was reactive, usually taking place when a prisoner made an application. Electronic case history notes showed that offender supervisor contact time with prisoners

varied. Offender supervisors told us that clearing the backlog of OASys assessments had reduced the time they could spend with prisoners.

- 4.14 Initial contact with prisoners was timely, but offender supervisors did not assess prisoners' needs against resettlement pathways during induction. Although prisoner resettlement pathway representatives were involved in the induction programme, and referrals could be made, needs were not always fully identified. For in-scope cases offender managers from the community completed a prisoner's OASys assessment. For the 20 in-scope cases reviewed we found the quality of OASys assessments to be variable. Sentence plan targets were often perfunctory and many did not address community re-integration. A number of the sentence plan targets did not sufficiently address the likelihood of re-offending or the risk of harm posed by the prisoner.
- 4.15 Offender supervisors completed the assessment for low- and medium-risk prisoners. In the case files we reviewed, the quality of these OASys assessments was generally good. Sentence plans were completed to a reasonable standard and sentence plan targets usually addressed the risk factors identified in the OASys assessment.
- 4.16 Targets for low- and medium-risk prisoners were more achievable than those for high-risk prisoners (see paragraph 4.17 and main recommendation HP52). Contributions from departments outside the offender management unit (OMU) were rare, and personal officers were often unaware of the risk factors identified or the targets set for the prisoners in their care. In our survey, 69% of respondents (in line with the comparator) said that they had a sentence plan and 66% (against the 56% comparator) that they had been involved in its development. All cases that we reviewed had an OASys assessment and a sentence plan.
- 4.17 Most high-risk prisoners had been identified as requiring an accredited intervention to minimise their risk. As no such programmes were run at Huntercombe, they were referred to the programmes department at HMP Bullingdon for assessment and, if deemed suitable, were prioritised for transfer to other establishments to complete the required offending behaviour programme. However, prisoners were often deported before they could address their risk (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour). Approximately 10% of the prison population were sex offenders and a quarter of these had not had an OASys assessment completed by their offender manager in the community, so their risk factors were unknown.

Recommendation

- 4.18 **Offender supervisors should have regular, recorded contact with prisoners, and an initial assessment of prisoners' needs against the resettlement pathways should be made as soon as practical after their arrival at the establishment.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.19 Personal officer should be involved in the offender management of the prisoners in their care.

Public protection

- 4.20 All new arrivals received a public protection assessment as part of the transfer and recategorisation process. Information was shared appropriately with relevant departments and offender supervisors were fully briefed. Monitoring and analyses took place at the well-attended monthly interdepartmental risk meeting.

- 4.21 There were 18 prisoners subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) (levels 1 and 2) and 166 MAPPA nominals (individuals targeted for legitimate security reasons, but yet to have their MAPPA level determined by outside probation staff). Offender supervisors made efforts to advise external offender managers of these cases but progress from external sources was slow.

Recommendation

- 4.22 **NOMS should ensure expeditious assessment of multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels.**

Categorisation

- 4.23 Arrangements for recategorisation reviews were organised in the OMU and were triggered automatically at the prisoner's point of eligibility. Requests for documentation were undertaken in good time and prisoners were able to make representations. We reviewed a number of documents and found them to be considered, balanced and justifiable. The prison had recently forged links with two open prisons with a view to progressing prisoners through the system, and four category D prisoners had progressed to open conditions since the re-role.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.24 Of the 12 indeterminate-sentenced prisoners being held, six were from the previous population and remained at the establishment to meet their individual needs. The remaining six foreign nationals were subject to the tariff-expired removal scheme.

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.

- 4.25 There was good coordination of resettlement pathway work, both on arrival and within three months of a prisoner's potential release. Good accommodation services were provided and information was available on accommodation support in a number of countries. Finance, benefit and debt advice was limited to information from the UK. A range of education and vocational training was provided, informed by the skill areas needed in the countries to which prisoners could be sent. Insufficient data were collected about the education, training and employment success of those sent abroad. Health care arrangements for prisoners before release were timely and appropriate. Discharge planning for those with substance misuse problems was good. Prisoners reported positively about visits, and well-attended family days were offered. There were no accredited offending behaviour programmes.

- 4.26 There was good coordination of resettlement pathway work by the interventions manager. All new arrivals were seen during the induction programme by a prisoner pathway orderly. Each prisoner was given information about the pathways and an assessment was made by the

orderly. Referrals were made and passed to the relevant pathway lead member of staff. A well-organised pathways forum was held bimonthly and was attended by prisoners whose earliest date of release or early removal scheme date was within the following three months. This forum consisted of all pathway providers and enabled prisoners to discuss any outstanding resettlement issues, which were then acted on before they left the establishment.

Accommodation

- 4.27 St Giles Trust provided a good accommodation service. All prisoners were seen during their early days in custody and then again towards the end of their sentence. Useful information was available for prisoners of all nationalities about accommodation support in their home country. St Giles Trust was responsible for finding accommodation for prisoners if and when the UK Border Agency determined that they were no longer of interest to them.

Education, training and employment

- 4.28 There were no formal pre-release courses but the prison provided a wide range of education and vocational training (see section on learning and skills and work activities). The programmes were influenced by the training needs analysis, which was well informed and identified the skill areas needed in the countries to which prisoners could be sent.
- 4.29 Jobcentre Plus staff, who worked at the prison one day a week, and full-time National Careers Service advisers provided good careers advice and guidance, support for CV writing, job search and dealing with disclosure.
- 4.30 Effective links with The Buck Project and Job Deal provided support for interview techniques and developing communications skills, and also through-the-gate support for prisoners following release. A total of 134 prisoners were being supported by The Buck Project at the time of the inspection. Little data was available about the education, training and employment success of those sent abroad.

Recommendation

- 4.31 The prison should explore ways of identifying education, training and employment success for those being sent abroad.

Health care

- 4.32 Health care arrangements for prisoners before release were timely, and sufficient preparation was made for the continuation of care and treatment when required. Prisoners were provided with written information outlining their care while in prison and up to three months of medication. Prisoners with enduring mental health problems were managed using the care programme approach. There were arrangements and policies for the palliative care of patients but these had never been used.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.33 Discharge planning for those with substance misuse problems was good. Before release, such prisoners were given information on harm minimisation and services available in destination countries.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.34 Citizens Advice attended the establishment every two weeks to see prisoners but the information they provided was limited and did not cover advice about finance, benefit and debt in countries other than the UK. Similarly, Jobcentre Plus staff attended the establishment weekly but provided limited information. In our survey, fewer respondents than at comparator prisons knew whom to speak to at the prison about benefits (23% versus 42%) and finances (20% versus 30%) on release.

Recommendation

- 4.35 Information and advice on finance, benefit and debt should be available for those returning abroad.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.36 In our survey, more respondents than at comparator prisons (54% versus 46%) said that they had received relevant information about their entitlement to visits on their arrival. The visitors centre was small but suitable for the number of visitors passing through it. It was run by prison staff and a prisoner on ROTL. Facilities included a small play area, refreshments, seating and baby changing facilities. The visits hall was large and included a children's play area. Prisoners we spoke to were positive about their experiences on visits, and the sessions we observed were calm and relaxed.
- 4.37 Family visits took place bimonthly in the family liaison centre in the prison, and included a range of activities. They were open to all prisoners, subject to appropriate security checks. In the previous six months, 76 prisoners had attended a family visit. There were no restrictions on the number of visitors allowed, although each prisoner was required to pay £2.80 per family member over the age of five for their lunch. Given the low wages that some prisoners earned, this was both disproportionate and inappropriate.
- 4.38 A 'Fathers Inside' course was run four times a year to help prisoners develop parenting skills and 29 had attended it in the previous 12 months. Prisoners who had attended the course spoke positively about it. Storybook Dads (a scheme whereby prisoners recorded stories for their children) ran through the prison library (see also section on learning and skills and work activities).

Recommendation

- 4.39 Prisoners should not be required to pay for the lunches of family members attending family days.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.40 There were no accredited offending behaviour programmes. At the time of the inspection, 83 high-risk prisoners had been referred to HMP Bullingdon to await assessment for transfer to other establishments to undertake such programmes (see section on offender management and planning), and only two prisoners had moved to other establishments to complete a programme.
- 4.41 The prison ran two non-accredited offending behaviour programmes for low- or medium-risk prisoners: the Forgiveness Project, which dealt with victim empathy, and the Geese Theatre Project, which dealt with thinking skills. An adequate number of courses had been run to ensure that all low- and medium-risk prisoners could address their identified risk factors, but there were long waiting lists. More programmes were planned to alleviate this problem.

Recommendation

- 4.42 Prisoners assessed as needing accredited offending behaviour interventions should be able to complete them during sentence.

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 There should be rigorous governance of the use of force, including special accommodation, planned interventions and use of batons. (HP51)
 - 5.2 All high-risk prisoners should have their risk factors addressed promptly after reception and before they are deported. (HP52)

Recommendations

To NOMS

-
- 5.3 Prisoners' property should arrive at the establishment with them. (1.6)
 - 5.4 Cells designed for one should not hold two. (2.9)
 - 5.5 The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) should consult the Legal Services Commission about providing the prison with a legal advice service similar to the detention duty advice service in immigration removal centres. (2.58)
 - 5.6 Prisoners should not be transferred to the prison if they have an outstanding hospital appointment at their previous location. (2.72)
 - 5.7 NOMS should ensure expeditious assessment of multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels. (4.22)

Recommendation

To Home Office

-
- 5.8 The UK Border Agency should have a permanent onsite presence with access to their case-working database. (2.40)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

-
- 5.9 Prisoners should not be used to interpret during interviews with other prisoners covering sensitive or personal issues. (1.17)
 - 5.10 A range of translated information about the prison should be available to prisoners soon after arrival. (1.18)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.11 Managers should ensure that prisoners' offence details are not revealed to other prisoners. (1.25)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.12 Prisoners should have ready access to Listeners at night. (1.32)
- 5.13 Prisoners should not be held in the segregation unit for self-harm risk alone. There should be a dedicated care suite. (1.33)

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

- 5.14 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.37)

Security

- 5.15 Routine strip-searching in reception and after visits should cease. Strip searching and closed visits reviews should be conducted on the basis of supporting intelligence. (1.42)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.16 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should encourage positive behaviour through meaningful incentives and differentials between levels. (1.49)

Discipline

- 5.17 Prisoners should not be held for extended periods in segregation while investigations are carried out or pending adjudication. (1.67)
- 5.18 Cells on the segregation unit cells should contain screened toilets and an electricity supply. (1.68)
- 5.19 Information collated on the segregation unit should be analysed and used more effectively to inform strategy. (1.69)

Substance misuse

- 5.20 The range of services for substance users should meet assessed need and reflect best practice guidance. (1.77)

Residential units

- 5.21 Noise levels on Mountbatten unit should be reduced. (2.8)

- 5.22 All cells should have appropriate privacy screening and furniture, and toilets should be kept clean. (2.10)
- 5.23 Showers on Mountbatten unit should be refurbished. (2.11)
- 5.24 Applications should be responded to promptly and appropriately. (2.12)

Staff–prisoner relationships

- 5.25 Staff should receive training in cultural awareness and the specific needs of a foreign national population. (2.18)
- 5.26 Personal officers should make a particular effort to maintain contact with immigration detainees, and make early contact with all allocated prisoners. (2.19)

Equality and diversity

- 5.27 Prison life should be monitored by all relevant protected characteristics. (2.27)
- 5.28 Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) should be freely available in a range of languages, replies should be timely and subject to independent scrutiny, and DIRF data should be analysed to identify long-term trends and patterns. (2.28)
- 5.29 There should be regular minority group meetings to provide information and support and improve communication. (2.29)
- 5.30 Managers should investigate and act on the reasons for the more negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners. (2.38)
- 5.31 Gypsy and Roma prisoners should be identified and supported. (2.39)
- 5.32 Staff should use telephone interpreting when communicating confidential or sensitive information to prisoners who do not speak English. (2.41)
- 5.33 All prisoners with disabilities should be identified during their reception, and their needs should be met through multidisciplinary care planning where appropriate. (2.42)
- 5.34 Gay and bisexual prisoners should be supported through specific groups and schemes in the prison and through referral to external support networks. (2.43)

Complaints

- 5.35 Responses to complaints should be polite, easy to understand and address the issues raised. (2.51)

Legal rights

- 5.36 The legal services officers should receive updated training on prison, criminal and immigration law, and have a dedicated office with internet access, printers and a fax machine. (2.59)

- 5.37 Prisoners should be able to consult their lawyers in private, and the frequency and length of visits should be increased to meet demand. (2.60)

Health services

- 5.38 Patients should have access to pharmacist-led clinics. (2.68)
- 5.39 The in-possession policy should be fully implemented and adhered to. (2.78)
- 5.40 Pharmacy procedures and policies should be reviewed to ensure that they cover all aspects of the service. They should be agreed by the medicines and therapeutics committee and all staff should read and sign the adopted procedures. (2.79)
- 5.41 The use of patient group directions should be extended to allow the supply of more potent medicines by the nursing staff where appropriate. (2.80)
- 5.42 Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (2.89)

Catering

- 5.43 The quality and range of food should be improved. (2.97)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.44 The training need analysis should be reviewed regularly to ensure that learning, skills and work remain relevant to prisoners' employment needs. (3.9)
- 5.45 The skills strategy should be updated so that it provides a clear structure for the integration of English, mathematics and information technology into learning, skills and work. (3.10)
- 5.46 Staff should formally share best practice in learning and skills. (3.11)
- 5.47 There should be sufficient toilet facilities for prisoners undertaking vocational training on the residential units. (3.12)
- 5.48 The prison should introduce a dyslexia assessment to ensure that all prisoners' support needs are identified and met fully. (3.15)
- 5.49 There should be sufficient accredited English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) support to meet the needs of the population. (3.16)
- 5.50 The brickwork and car mechanics workshops should be staffed and included as part of the vocational training offer. (3.17)
- 5.51 Staff should support and develop prisoners' English and mathematics knowledge and skills through vocational programmes. (3.23)
- 5.52 Prisoners' interpersonal employability skills and vocational skills development should be recognised and recorded. (3.24)

- 5.53 The resources for teaching, training, learning and assessment should be improved and the layout of some learning areas should be better planned to maximise learning opportunities. (3.25)
- 5.54 Low achievements and problematic assessment and verification processes for prisoners on information and communications technology courses should be addressed effectively. (3.27)
- 5.55 Access to the library should be improved by opening it in the evenings and at weekends and extending sessions beyond 30 minutes. (3.30)
- 5.56 A more systematic approach should be used to identify and supply appropriate and relevant newspapers and journals. (3.31)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.57 The 2013/2014 reducing reoffending strategy should focus on the needs of the foreign national population and take account of specific resettlement needs in countries outside the UK. (4.8)
- 5.58 The prison should evaluate the resettlement outcomes for prisoners, including those released into the UK, and use this to improve and develop resettlement services. (4.9)

Offender management and planning

- 5.59 Offender supervisors should have regular, recorded contact with prisoners, and an initial assessment of prisoners' needs against the resettlement pathways should be made as soon as practical after their arrival at the establishment. (4.18)

Reintegration planning

- 5.60 The prison should explore ways of identifying education, training and employment success for those being sent abroad. (4.31)
- 5.61 Information and advice on finance, benefit and debt should be available for those returning abroad. (4.35)
- 5.62 Prisoners should not be required to pay for the lunches of family members attending family days. (4.39)
- 5.63 Prisoners assessed as needing accredited offending behaviour interventions should be able to complete them during sentence. (4.42)

Housekeeping point

To NOMS

- 5.64 Escort staff should contact reception staff well in advance of arrival. (1.7)

Housekeeping points

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.65 Prisoners' property should not be stored in areas designed for prisoner use. (1.19)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.66 Safer custody data should be analysed for long-term trends. (1.26)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.67 Care maps should be updated after every review. (1.34)

Security

- 5.68 All suspicion testing should be completed within 72 hours of the security information report being logged. (1.43)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.69 IEP level reviews should be meaningful and there should be systematic quality assurance of the scheme. (1.50)

Discipline

- 5.70 Segregation review documentation and care/reintegration plans should be completed to a high standard and include meaningful targets. (1.70)

Substance misuse

- 5.71 The prison substance misuse strategy should include alcohol, and the action plan should be reviewed at quarterly drug strategy meetings. (1.78)

Residential units

- 5.72 Problems with obtaining property should be addressed effectively. (2.13)

Equality and diversity

- 5.73 The equality manager should receive training for the role. (2.30)

- 5.74 The equality policy and action plan should be updated and reflect the needs of the prison's population. (2.31)

Complaints

- 5.75 Complaint forms in languages other than English should be freely available. (2.52)
- 5.76 The outcomes of complaints should be recorded and trends monitored over time. (2.53)

Health services

- 5.77 All episodes of clinical supervision should be recorded. (2.69)
- 5.78 An establishment-specific formulary should inform prescribing. (2.81)
- 5.79 Loose tablets and tablet foils should not be present in stock. (2.82)
- 5.80 Medication for disposal should be segregated and dealt with promptly. (2.83)
- 5.81 The 'special sick' policy should be formalised and agreed by the medicines and therapeutics committee. (2.84)
- 5.82 The health care room used for mental health consultations should be equipped with an alarm. (2.90)
- 5.83 Health services staff should receive training in the identification and management of patients who allege that they have been tortured. (2.91)

Purchases

- 5.84 A pictorial shop list with pictures of the most popular items should be made available for prisoners who do not speak English. (2.101)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.85 More space should be provided for prisoners to be able to use the computers. (3.32)

Offender management and planning

- 5.86 Personal officer should be involved in the offender management of the prisoners in their care. (4.19)

Examples of good practice

Discipline

- 5.87 Prisoners were formally debriefed following any incident in which force had been used against them. (1.59)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.88 The offender management forum and the accompanying newsletter improved communication with prisoners. (4.10)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Hindpal Singh Bhui	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Caroline Elwood	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Specialist inspectors	
Majella Pearce	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Sharon Monks	Pharmacist
Vivienne Clarke	Offender management inspector
Paddy Doyle	Offender management inspector
Iolo Madoc-Jones	Offender management inspector
Mike Lane	Offender management inspector
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Julia Horsman	Ofsted inspector
Ian Craig	Care Quality Commission inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Status	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced		392	99.5
Recall		1	0.3
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand			
Civil prisoners			
Detainees		1	0.3
Total		394	100

Sentence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		1	0.3
Less than 6 months			
6 months to less than 12 months			
12 months to less than 2 years			
2 years to less than 4 years		52	13.2
4 years to less than 10 years		291	73.9
10 years and over (not life)		38	9.6
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)			
Life		12	3.0
Total		394	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:		
Under 21 years		
21 years to 29 years	156	39.6
30 years to 39 years	128	32.5
40 years to 49 years	71	18.0
50 years to 59 years	30	7.6
60 years to 69 years	9	2.3
70 plus years		
Please state maximum age here:		
Total	394	100

Nationality	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British		12	3
Foreign nationals		382	97
Total		394	100

Security category	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B			
Category C		370	93.9
Category D		23	5.8

Other		1	0.3
Total		394	100

Ethnicity	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
<i>White</i>			
British		6	1.5
Irish		2	0.5
Gypsy/Irish Traveller			
Other white		125	31.6
<i>Mixed</i>			
White and black Caribbean		1	0.3
White and black African		5	1.3
White and Asian		1	0.3
Other mixed		6	1.5
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>			
Indian		15	3.8
Pakistani		10	2.5
Bangladeshi		4	1.0
Chinese		1	0.3
Other Asian		13	3.3
<i>Black or black British</i>		96	24.4
Caribbean		67	17.0
African			
Other black		22	5.6
<i>Other ethnic group</i>		11	2.8
Arab		2	0.5
Other ethnic group		7	1.8
<i>Not stated</i>			
Total		394	100

Religion	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		4	1.0
Church of England		41	10.4
Roman Catholic		97	24.6
Other Christian denominations		89	22.6
Muslim		96	24.4
Sikh		12	3.0
Hindu		7	1.8
Buddhist		5	1.3
Jewish		6	1.5
Other		10	2.5
No religion		1	0.3
Total		394	100

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			21	5.3
1 month to 3 months			65	16.5
3 months to 6 months			90	22.8
6 months to 1 year			208	52.8
1 year to 2 years			7	1.8
2 years to 4 years			2	0.5
4 years or more				
Total			393	99.7

Sentenced prisoners only

	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry		1	0.3 (IS91)
Public protection cases <i>(this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).</i>			
Total		1	0.3

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month				
1 month to 3 months				
3 months to 6 months				
6 months to 1 year				
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total				

Main offence	18-20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		55	
Sexual offences		21	
Burglary		15	
Robbery		46	
Theft and handling		3	
Fraud and forgery		2	
Drugs offences		46	
Other offences		19	
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
Total		394	

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 12 December 2012, the prisoner population at HMP Huntercombe was 407. The sample size was 173. Overall, this represented 43% 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 that every second person is selected from a P-Nomis list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled.

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

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 134 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 33% of the prison population. The response rate was 77%. In addition to the three respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, 21 questionnaires were not returned and 15 were returned blank.

Comparisons

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

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

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2012 against comparator figures for all prisoners surveyed in category C trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 38 category C trainer prisons since April 2007.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2012 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

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

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

Summary

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

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

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

Survey summary

Section 1: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	45	(34%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	47	(35%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	28	(21%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	10	(7%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0	(0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>	131	(98%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	2	(2%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	2	(2%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	1	(1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	4	(3%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	27	(20%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	80	(60%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	12	(9%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	4	(3%)
	<i>Life</i>	3	(2%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?		
	<i>Yes</i>	110	(85%)
	<i>No</i>	19	(15%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	122	(92%)
	<i>No</i>	11	(8%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>	117	(89%)
	<i>No</i>	15	(11%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish).....</i>	6	(5%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	32	(24%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	23	(17%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	31	(23%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2	(2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> ..	1	(1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	3	(2%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	4	(3%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	5	(4%)
	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	0	(0%)
	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	4	(3%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Arab</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	5 (4%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	8 (6%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)		

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

Yes.....	5 (4%)
No.....	118 (96%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	8 (6%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	18 (14%)	<i>Jewish</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Catholic</i>	32 (24%)	<i>Muslim</i>	33 (25%)
<i>Protestant</i>	7 (5%)	<i>Sikh</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	18 (14%)	<i>Other</i>	6 (5%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	3 (2%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/straight</i>	120 (98%)
<i>Homosexual/gay</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	2 (2%)

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

Yes.....	17 (13%)
No.....	115 (87%)

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

Yes.....	9 (7%)
No.....	119 (93%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes.....	105 (78%)
No.....	29 (22%)

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

Yes.....	87 (65%)
No.....	46 (35%)

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>	36 (27%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	89 (66%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (7%)

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>	36 (28%)
Yes.....	67 (52%)
No.....	23 (18%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (3%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	36 (27%)
---	----------

Yes.....	6 (5%)
No.....	86 (66%)
Don't remember	3 (2%)

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

Yes.....	83 (62%)
No.....	43 (32%)
Don't remember	8 (6%)

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

Yes.....	90 (70%)
No.....	33 (26%)
Don't remember	6 (5%)

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

Very well.....	28 (21%)
Well.....	53 (40%)
Neither.....	38 (29%)
Badly.....	4 (3%)
Very badly	7 (5%)
Don't remember	3 (2%)

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

Yes, someone told me	61 (46%)
Yes, I received written information.....	33 (25%)
No, I was not told anything.....	36 (27%)
Don't remember	4 (3%)

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

Yes.....	113 (84%)
No.....	20 (15%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?

Less than 2 hours.....	71 (54%)
2 hours or longer.....	50 (38%)
Don't remember	11 (8%)

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

Yes.....	109 (83%)
No	19 (14%)
Don't remember	4 (3%)

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

Very well.....	41 (31%)
Well.....	61 (46%)
Neither.....	22 (16%)
Badly.....	3 (2%)
Very badly	6 (4%)
Don't remember	1 (1%)

- Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | | | |
|--|----------|--|----------|
| <i>Loss of property</i> | 15 (11%) | <i>Physical health</i> | 15 (11%) |
| <i>Housing problems</i> | 12 (9%) | <i>Mental health</i> | 10 (8%) |
| <i>Contacting employers</i> | 3 (2%) | <i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>Contacting family</i> | 29 (22%) | <i>Getting phone numbers</i> | 26 (20%) |
| <i>Childcare</i> | 4 (3%) | <i>Other</i> | 3 (2%) |
| <i>Money worries</i> | 9 (7%) | Did not have any problems | 58 (44%) |
| <i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 18 (14%) | | |
- Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Yes | 29 (23%) |
| No..... | 41 (32%) |
| Did not have any problems | 58 (45%) |
- Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| <i>Tobacco</i> | 67 (51%) |
| <i>A shower</i> | 43 (33%) |
| <i>A free telephone call</i> | 92 (70%) |
| <i>Something to eat</i> | 90 (68%) |
| <i>PIN phone credit</i> | 65 (49%) |
| <i>Toiletries/basic items</i> | 76 (58%) |
| Did not receive anything | 4 (3%) |
- 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> | 68 (53%) |
| <i>Someone from health services</i> | 108 (84%) |
| <i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> | 28 (22%) |
| <i>Prison shop/canteen</i> | 40 (31%) |
| Did not have access to any of these | 12 (9%) |
- 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> | 68 (55%) |
| <i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> | 54 (44%) |
| <i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> | 68 (55%) |
| <i>Your entitlement to visits</i> | 67 (54%) |
| <i>Health services</i> | 77 (62%) |
| <i>Chaplaincy</i> | 69 (56%) |
| Not offered any information | 20 (16%) |
- Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**
- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Yes | 100 (78%) |
| No..... | 21 (16%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 8 (6%) |
- Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| Have not been on an induction course | 8 (6%) |
| <i>Within the first week</i> | 111 (85%) |
| <i>More than a week</i> | 8 (6%) |
| <i>Don't remember</i> | 4 (3%) |

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?
Have not been on an induction course..... 8 (6%)
 Yes 87 (66%)
 No..... 32 (24%)
 Don't remember 4 (3%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?
Did not receive an assessment..... 9 (7%)
 Within the first week 63 (48%)
 More than a week 44 (34%)
 Don't remember 14 (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?	20 (17%)	37 (31%)	21 (18%)	15 (13%)	14 (12%)	13 (11%)
Attend legal visits?	19 (17%)	31 (28%)	21 (19%)	9 (8%)	12 (11%)	19 (17%)
Get bail information?	6 (6%)	10 (10%)	20 (20%)	16 (16%)	12 (12%)	35 (35%)

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 31 (24%)
 Yes 48 (37%)
 No..... 51 (39%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?
 Yes 54 (42%)
 No..... 32 (25%)
 Don't know 44 (34%)

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?	93 (72%)	34 (26%)	3 (2%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	126 (96%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	43 (34%)	82 (64%)	3 (2%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	104 (80%)	24 (18%)	2 (2%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	65 (50%)	29 (22%)	35 (27%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	99 (76%)	32 (24%)	0 (0%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	37 (29%)	64 (50%)	28 (22%)

Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	Very good.....	4	(3%)
	Good.....	26	(20%)
	Neither.....	27	(21%)
	Bad.....	36	(28%)
	Very bad.....	36	(28%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?		
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>	5	(4%)
	Yes.....	47	(36%)
	No.....	78	(60%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?		
	Yes.....	60	(46%)
	No.....	16	(12%)
	Don't know.....	54	(42%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	Yes.....	89	(68%)
	No.....	22	(17%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	20	(15%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	Yes.....	90	(68%)
	No.....	11	(8%)
	Don't know/N/A.....	31	(23%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	9	(7%)
	Very easy.....	51	(39%)
	Easy.....	46	(35%)
	Neither.....	13	(10%)
	Difficult.....	4	(3%)
	Very difficult.....	2	(2%)
	Don't know.....	6	(5%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?		
	Yes.....	106	(80%)
	No.....	21	(16%)
	Don't know.....	6	(5%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications:		
	<i>(If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</i>		
		Not made one	Yes No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	17 (14%)	53 (43%) 52 (43%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	17 (14%)	48 (40%) 55 (46%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?		
	Yes.....	84	(65%)
	No.....	25	(19%)
	Don't know.....	21	(16%)

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?	39 (31%)	24 (19%)	62 (50%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	39 (32%)	33 (27%)	51 (41%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes.....		19 (15%)	
	No.....		106 (85%)	
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>		35 (27%)	
	Very easy.....		18 (14%)	
	Easy.....		24 (19%)	
	Neither.....		29 (23%)	
	Difficult.....		10 (8%)	
	Very difficult.....		12 (9%)	

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>		14 (11%)	
	Yes.....		68 (54%)	
	No.....		37 (29%)	
	Don't know.....		8 (6%)	
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)			
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>		14 (11%)	
	Yes.....		39 (32%)	
	No.....		57 (46%)	
	Don't know.....		13 (11%)	
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?			
	Yes.....		6 (5%)	
	No.....		121 (95%)	
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?			
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>		110 (89%)	
	Very well.....		4 (3%)	
	Well.....		1 (1%)	
	Neither.....		7 (6%)	
	Badly.....		0 (0%)	
	Very badly.....		2 (2%)	

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?		
	Yes.....		96 (74%)
	No.....		33 (26%)

Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	102 (81%)
	No.....	24 (19%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	48 (37%)
	No.....	82 (63%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	5 (4%)
	Never	25 (20%)
	Rarely	25 (20%)
	Some of the time.....	42 (33%)
	Most of the time.....	16 (13%)
	All of the time.....	13 (10%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	19 (14%)
	In the first week.....	58 (44%)
	More than a week.....	34 (26%)
	Don't remember	21 (16%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her	19 (15%)
	Very helpful.....	39 (31%)
	Helpful.....	33 (26%)
	Neither.....	17 (13%)
	Not very helpful.....	14 (11%)
	Not at all helpful	4 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes.....	43 (33%)
	No.....	87 (67%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes.....	19 (16%)
	No.....	102 (84%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	87 (69%)
	Everywhere.....	17 (13%)
	Segregation unit.....	1 (1%)
	Association areas	5 (4%)
	Reception area.....	2 (2%)
	At the gym.....	5 (4%)
	In an exercise yard	3 (2%)
	At work.....	5 (4%)
	During movement	7 (6%)
	At education.....	7 (6%)
	At mealtimes.....	5 (4%)
	At health services	2 (2%)
	Visits area	2 (2%)
	In wing showers	6 (5%)
	In gym showers.....	5 (4%)
	In corridors/stairwells	3 (2%)
	On your landing/wing	7 (6%)
	In your cell.....	11 (9%)
	At religious services	3 (2%)

- Q8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?**
 Yes 27 (20%)
 No..... 105 (80%)
- 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> | 5 (4%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> | 3 (2%) |
| <i>Sexual abuse</i> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> | 9 (7%) |
| <i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> | 5 (4%) |
| <i>Medication</i> | 2 (2%) |
| <i>Debt</i> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>Drugs</i> | 3 (2%) |
| <i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> | 9 (7%) |
| <i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> | 2 (2%) |
| <i>Your nationality</i> | 9 (7%) |
| <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> | 1 (1%) |
| <i>Your age</i> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>You have a disability</i> | 1 (1%) |
| <i>You were new here</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>Your offence/crime</i> | 3 (2%) |
| <i>Gang related issues</i> | 2 (2%) |
- Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?**
 Yes 39 (30%)
 No..... 91 (70%)
- 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> | 7 (5%) |
| <i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> | 2 (2%) |
| <i>Sexual abuse</i> | 1 (1%) |
| <i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> | 10 (8%) |
| <i>Medication</i> | 5 (4%) |
| <i>Debt</i> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>Drugs</i> | 2 (2%) |
| <i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> | 12 (9%) |
| <i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> | 4 (3%) |
| <i>Your nationality</i> | 11 (8%) |
| <i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> | 2 (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> | 0 (0%) |
| <i>You were new here</i> | 2 (2%) |
| <i>Your offence/crime</i> | 5 (4%) |
| <i>Gang related issues</i> | 3 (2%) |
- Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?**
Not been victimised 84 (71%)
 Yes..... 14 (12%)

No..... 21 (18%)

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	9 (7%)	12 (9%)	28 (22%)	30 (23%)	26 (20%)	23 (18%)
The nurse	6 (5%)	16 (13%)	58 (46%)	18 (14%)	16 (13%)	11 (9%)
The dentist	16 (13%)	5 (4%)	15 (12%)	11 (9%)	30 (24%)	50 (39%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	8 (6%)	27 (21%)	45 (35%)	16 (13%)	18 (14%)	14 (11%)
The nurse	5 (4%)	23 (18%)	47 (38%)	24 (19%)	13 (10%)	13 (10%)
The dentist	26 (21%)	9 (7%)	43 (34%)	19 (15%)	11 (9%)	17 (14%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Very good</i>	14 (11%)
<i>Good</i>	45 (36%)
<i>Neither</i>	25 (20%)
<i>Bad</i>	20 (16%)
<i>Very bad</i>	18 (14%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	53 (41%)
No.....	77 (59%)

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>	77 (61%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	36 (28%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	12 (9%)
<i>No</i>	2 (2%)

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

Yes	29 (23%)
No.....	98 (77%)

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>	98 (77%)
Yes.....	18 (14%)
No.....	11 (9%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

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

Yes	15 (12%)
No.....	115 (88%)

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

Yes.....	12 (9%)
No.....	118 (91%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	10 (8%)
	<i>Easy</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	7 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	93 (74%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Easy</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	97 (78%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	6 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	123 (95%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	122 (95%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have a drug problem</i>	109 (87%)
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (4%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (e.g. substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i>	118 (91%)
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (2%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/did not receive help</i>	110 (89%)
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (9%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (2%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	
						<i>Very difficult</i>	
	Prison job	16 (13%)	14 (11%)	29 (23%)	21 (17%)	21 (17%)	23 (19%)
	Vocational or skills training	9 (8%)	16 (14%)	31 (26%)	19 (16%)	25 (21%)	18 (15%)
	Education (including basic skills)	7 (6%)	26 (21%)	37 (31%)	21 (17%)	17 (14%)	13 (11%)

Offending behaviour programmes	30 (26%)	6 (5%)	17 (15%)	17 (15%)	20 (17%)	27 (23%)
--------------------------------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

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

Not involved in any of these	11 (9%)
Prison job	62 (50%)
Vocational or skills training.....	32 (26%)
Education (including basic skills).....	56 (46%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	8 (7%)

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

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	8 (9%)	34 (37%)	40 (43%)	10 (11%)
Vocational or skills training	13 (14%)	53 (58%)	20 (22%)	6 (7%)
Education (including basic skills)	7 (6%)	69 (63%)	22 (20%)	11 (10%)
Offending behaviour programmes	16 (20%)	31 (39%)	24 (30%)	9 (11%)

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

Don't want to go	7 (5%)
Never.....	1 (1%)
Less than once a week.....	22 (17%)
About once a week.....	68 (53%)
More than once a week.....	31 (24%)

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

Don't use it	9 (7%)
Yes.....	28 (22%)
No.....	92 (71%)

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

Don't want to go	7 (6%)
0.....	13 (10%)
1 to 2.....	37 (29%)
3 to 5.....	47 (37%)
More than 5.....	22 (17%)

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

Don't want to go	12 (10%)
0.....	24 (19%)
1 to 2.....	36 (29%)
3 to 5.....	28 (22%)
More than 5.....	26 (21%)

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

Don't want to go	1 (1%)
0.....	5 (4%)
1 to 2.....	10 (8%)
3 to 5.....	19 (15%)
More than 5.....	92 (72%)

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

Less than 2 hours	7 (6%)
--------------------------------	--------

2 to less than 4 hours.....	14 (11%)
4 to less than 6 hours.....	13 (10%)
6 to less than 8 hours.....	34 (27%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	28 (22%)
10 hours or more.....	17 (13%)
Don't know	14 (11%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	46 (38%)
	No.....	75 (62%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	55 (43%)
	No.....	74 (57%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	26 (20%)
	No.....	103 (80%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	29 (23%)
	Very easy	7 (6%)
	Easy.....	22 (17%)
	Neither.....	11 (9%)
	Difficult.....	15 (12%)
	Very difficult.....	41 (32%)
	Don't know	2 (2%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	Not sentenced	2 (2%)
	Yes	87 (71%)
	No.....	34 (28%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Not sentenced/N/A	36 (29%)
	No contact.....	43 (35%)
	Letter.....	21 (17%)
	Phone	15 (12%)
	Visit	21 (17%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	92 (75%)
	No.....	31 (25%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	2 (2%)
	Yes.....	85 (68%)

No..... 38 (30%)

Q13.5 How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 40 (33%)
 Very involved..... 30 (24%)
 Involved..... 25 (20%)
 Neither..... 8 (7%)
 Not very involved..... 7 (6%)
 Not at all involved..... 13 (11%)

Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 40 (34%)
 Nobody..... 34 (29%)
 Offender supervisor..... 29 (25%)
 Offender manager..... 16 (14%)
 Named/ personal officer..... 6 (5%)
 Staff from other departments..... 9 (8%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 40 (33%)
 Yes..... 44 (36%)
 No..... 26 (21%)
 Don't know..... 13 (11%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 40 (33%)
 Yes..... 27 (22%)
 No..... 40 (33%)
 Don't know..... 14 (12%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?
Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced..... 40 (34%)
 Yes..... 26 (22%)
 No..... 37 (31%)
 Don't know..... 16 (13%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?
 Yes..... 11 (9%)
 No..... 61 (51%)
 Don't know..... 47 (39%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?
 Yes..... 24 (19%)
 No..... 100 (81%)

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	31 (27%)	28 (24%)	57 (49%)
Accommodation	44 (40%)	17 (15%)	50 (45%)
Benefits	39 (36%)	16 (15%)	54 (50%)
Finances	35 (33%)	14 (13%)	58 (54%)
Education	34 (30%)	27 (24%)	52 (46%)

Drugs and alcohol	52 (50%)	17 (16%)	36 (34%)
-------------------	----------	----------	----------

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	2 (2%)
Yes	60 (52%)
No	54 (47%)

Main comparator



Prisoner survey responses HMP Huntercombe 2012

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

Key to tables

		HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		134	6030
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	2%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	99%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	6%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	10%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	85%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	92%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	89%	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)?	71%	25%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	25%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	78%	36%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	65%	52%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	66%	44%
	For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:		
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	71%	70%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	6%	9%
2.4	Was the van clean?	62%	67%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	70%	81%
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?	46%	61%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	25%	18%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	84%	89%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	54%	54%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	72%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	56%	61%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	17%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	22%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	7%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	14%	13%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	12%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	8%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	3%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%	19%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	41%	39%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	51%	79%
3.6	A shower?	33%	33%
3.6	A free telephone call?	70%	42%
3.6	Something to eat?	68%	69%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	49%	54%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	58%	45%

Main comparator

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued		
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	53%	53%
3.7 Someone from health services?	84%	71%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	22%	35%
3.7 Prison shop/ canteen?	31%	17%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	55%	53%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	44%	46%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	55%	45%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	54%	46%
3.8 Health services?	62%	57%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	56%	51%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	83%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	94%	93%
For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	71%	66%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	93%	84%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody		
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	47%	49%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	45%	53%
4.1 Get bail information?	16%	15%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	37%	41%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	42%	45%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	72%	64%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	92%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	34%	81%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	80%	75%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	50%	40%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	76%	71%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property if you need to?	29%	29%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	23%	29%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	36%	45%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	46%	58%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	68%	54%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	68%	59%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	74%	52%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	85%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	51%	63%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	47%	52%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	63%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	28%	34%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	39%	39%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	17%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	33%	31%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	54%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	32%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	5%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit, were you treated very well/well by staff?	36%	43%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	81%	76%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	37%	30%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	23%	20%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	86%	75%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	67%	64%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	13%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	20%	20%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	4%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	12%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	3%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	30%	25%
Since you have been here, have staff:			
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:			
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	40%	38%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	31%	35%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	59%	58%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16%	14%
	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?	60%	49%
9.2	The nurse?	58%	62%
9.2	The dentist?	53%	43%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	48%	45%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	41%	46%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	96%	86%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	23%	25%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	63%	49%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	12%	23%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	9%	17%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	30%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	6%	18%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	5%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	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?	69%	63%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	82%	62%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	85%	81%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	35%	43%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	40%	37%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	52%	50%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	20%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	50%	62%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	26%	18%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	46%	29%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	6%	15%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	91%	84%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	40%	44%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	86%	75%
	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?	67%	61%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	94%	81%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	68%	63%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	80%	73%
	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?	49%	55%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	77%	49%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	22%	51%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	55%	37%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	43%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	73%	78%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	14%	15%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	38%	36%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	43%	44%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	26%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	23%	25%

Main comparator

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Huntercombe 2012	Category C Trainers prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	72%	83%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	49%	33%
13.2	Contact by letter?	24%	37%
13.2	Contact by phone?	17%	24%
13.2	Contact by visit?	24%	35%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	75%	67%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	69%	73%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	66%	56%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	45%	45%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	38%	35%
13.6	Offender manager?	21%	27%
13.6	Named/personal officer?	8%	14%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	12%	18%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	53%	68%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	33%	21%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	33%	28%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	9%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	19%	18%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
13.12	Employment?	33%	36%
13.12	Accommodation?	26%	41%
13.12	Benefits?	23%	42%
13.12	Finances?	20%	30%
13.12	Education?	34%	39%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	32%	47%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	53%	56%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Huntercombe 2012

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		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							
Number of completed questionnaires returned		94	38	110	19	33	98
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	100%	99%	95%	97%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	88%	81%			88%	85%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	84%	91%	95%	94%	92%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	81%	87%	95%	91%	89%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			73%	61%	88%	66%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	6%	5%	0%	6%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	30%	11%	26%	22%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	14%	11%	13%	10%	12%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	16%	8%	0%	3%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	82%	69%	83%	53%	76%	79%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64%	55%	63%	47%	55%	64%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	45%	47%	44%	63%	41%	46%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	84%	81%	95%	75%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	77%	77%	79%	70%	79%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	61%	46%	54%	56%	62%	54%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	82%	86%	81%	95%	72%	88%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	77%	78%	74%	66%	82%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	92%	94%	95%	94%	94%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	53%	44%	77%	41%	51%

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						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	66%	84%	76%	58%	72%	71%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	95%	96%	95%	94%	97%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	52%	43%	53%	42%	49%	50%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	20%	30%	26%	16%	25%	23%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	38%	32%	40%	22%	32%	38%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	47%	42%	45%	61%	52%	45%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	67%	69%	71%	69%	70%	68%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	72%	58%	70%	69%	73%	68%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	77%	80%	85%	85%	77%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	68%	54%	66%	74%	70%	62%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	53%	54%	52%	61%	53%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	17%	31%	35%	41%	30%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	10%	6%	0%	6%	4%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	73%	76%	74%	85%	73%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	82%	79%	78%	95%	78%	81%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	20%	26%	20%	47%	16%	25%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	81%	95%	84%	90%	79%	88%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	35%	33%	31%	37%	30%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	21%	15%	23%	14%	15%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	26%	5%	22%	5%	30%	17%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	9%	3%	6%	5%	9%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	9%	3%	6%	5%	6%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	0%	2%	0%	6%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	10%	0%	6%	5%	6%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%

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?	35%	19%			27%	37%			30%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	10%	3%			6%	16%			6%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	12%	3%			8%	5%			3%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	4%	0%			3%	5%			6%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	10%	5%			8%	5%			6%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	0%			0%	0%			0%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	24%			30%	37%			26%	34%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	61%	56%			59%	63%			50%	62%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	24%			39%	53%			53%	37%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	24%	18%			24%	16%			38%	17%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	13%			11%	22%			12%	12%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	45%	61%			46%	78%			40%	54%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	28%	22%			27%	22%			20%	27%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	49%	39%			48%	39%			44%	47%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	6%			7%	6%			0%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	77%	76%			76%	79%			81%	75%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	50%	67%			51%	79%			44%	60%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	47%			42%	47%			47%	40%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	72%	79%			74%	69%			58%	78%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	12%	14%			13%	16%			12%	13%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	41%	46%			39%	53%			28%	48%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	19%	21%			22%	16%			9%	23%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability and age over 50) HMP Huntercombe 2012

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		17	115	13	121
1.3	Are you sentenced?	94%	99%	100%	98%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	88%	85%	77%	86%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	77%	95%	92%	92%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	71%	92%	85%	89%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	77%	71%	85%	70%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	6%	4%	15%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	23%	25%	39%	24%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			8%	14%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	8%	8%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	100%	75%	85%	78%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	44%	63%	62%	61%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	56%	44%	31%	47%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	65%	85%	100%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	53%	79%	92%	75%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	94%	50%	62%	55%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	82%	84%	92%	83%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	53%	83%	85%	77%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	94%	100%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	6%	54%	46%	48%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	25%	78%	85%	70%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	82%	98%	100%	96%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	47%	50%	62%	49%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	23%	39%	22%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	31%	37%	46%	35%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	44%	47%	62%	44%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	41%	72%	83%	66%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	71%	85%	66%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	47%	84%	92%	78%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	65%	92%	62%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	36%	57%	62%	53%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	43%	31%	42%	31%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	20%	3%	8%	4%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	69%	75%	92%	72%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	64%	83%	85%	81%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	31%	22%	46%	20%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	82%	86%	85%	86%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	63%	28%	8%	36%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	33%	13%	8%	17%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	44%	17%	8%	22%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	12%	6%	0%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	7%	0%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	0%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	7%	0%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	0%	0%	1%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	28%	15%	32%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	6%	8%	15%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	12%	9%	8%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	12%	1%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	9%	0%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	32%	31%	31%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	47%	61%	85%	56%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	75%	37%	77%	37%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional wellbeing/mental health issues?	57%	19%	8%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	0%	14%	8%	13%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	47%	51%	50%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	40%	24%	25%	26%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	73%	42%	75%	42%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	7%	8%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	69%	78%	85%	76%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	58%	39%	57%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	33%	44%	54%	42%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	53%	75%	83%	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.)	12%	13%	23%	12%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	56%	41%	31%	44%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	44%	17%	15%	21%