

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Lincoln

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

11–22 November 2013

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 2014

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright material you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or:
hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prisons>

Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
Victory House
6th floor
30–34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	43
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	57
Section 6. Appendices	65
Appendix I: Inspection team	65
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	67
Appendix III: Prison population profile	75
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	79
Appendix V: Photographs	95

Introduction

HMP Lincoln is a 19th century local prison holding 700 remand and convicted adult and young adult prisoners. With significant overcrowding and an aging infrastructure Lincoln faced many of the challenges common to such institutions, and this provided the context for many of our criticisms when we last inspected in 2012. At the time we found a prison that was poorly led, unsafe and failing to provide a meaningful regime. We made a commitment to return quickly to the prison, announcing when we would arrive in the hope that this might help to encourage action and improvement.

The findings at this inspection have been very encouraging, with improvement evident across a broad base, affecting most aspects of the prison's work.

Lincoln was now a safer place. There was innovative work to identify the needs of new prisoners while they were still at court, and the newly built reception was a great improvement that facilitated early assessment. The first night wing, however, remained in a poor condition, leaving prisoners with an early impression of a chaotic environment. Separate arrangements for vulnerable prisoners were better.

At the time of our inspection the prison was dealing with the aftermath of a serious incident and the fatality of a prisoner. There had also been two self-inflicted deaths since our last visit. There was unquestionably more to do to improve safety and in our survey a significant number of prisoners suggested they had safety concerns, although findings were better among the vulnerable population. That said, overall levels of violence were now comparable with similar prisons and levels of self-harm were lower. Structures to ensure safer custody were improving but needed to be embedded further. Drug testing suggested illicit drug usage was relatively low, but there was evidence to indicate the increasing availability of new, less detectable drugs, such as 'Black Mamba'.

There were good levels of staff supervision around the prison's wings and security was proportionately applied. The use of segregation had reduced considerably but a new segregation facility was of such flimsy construction it was barely fit for purpose. The use of force was decreasing and was now comparable to similar prisons.

The prison's daily routine was applied with greater rigour and was now more predictable. The number of prisoners we found locked up during the working day had almost halved, although association opportunities remained limited and some poor sequencing of activity often led to poor attendance. The number of purposeful activity places had increased and was now sufficient to meet need, and provision was reasonably well managed. The range of learning opportunities was appropriate and the quality of vocational training good. The quality of teaching and levels of learner achievement, however, needed to be more consistent.

The prison's approach to resettlement, reasonable at the last inspection, continued to improve, but progress was slow. There was still a lack of meaningful needs assessment and a growing backlog of offender assessments. Sentence planning was variable and prisoners had fitful contact with their offender supervisors. Work was, however, being done to improve the coordination of formal offender management and all short-term prisoners had some custody planning. This was largely due to the prison's continuing partnership with the Lincolnshire Action Trust, who ensured an impressive case management approach to resettlement. The prison also needed to focus on its sex offender population. Most of the 80 such offenders were in denial of their offence and the prison lacked a strategy to manage this problem.

The prison was now much cleaner, which was indicative of the improvements at Lincoln. Communal areas were well maintained and cells, although often cramped and overcrowded, were generally clean. Access to showers and telephones was good but there was insufficient prison clothing, and this required improvement. Relationships between staff and prisoners, something we had previously identified as a strength, appeared to us to be supportive, but prisoners expressed more negative perceptions in our survey. Good work was being done to promote equality and diversity, bolstered by some useful peer support, but again our survey findings, notably from prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, were more negative. Health services were much improved but prisoners' views about food quality had deteriorated significantly. Prisoners also had limited confidence in the formal complaints process.

Overall Lincoln is a much improved prison from 15 months ago. There has been evident progress in all aspects of the prison's operation and, although there is much to do, work is incremental, grounded and feels sustainable. The prison is well led, motivated and working to a plan. There are grounds to be optimistic about the prison's future, although the perceptions of the prisoner population and structures to support effective communication with them should be explored further. The governor and his staff should, nevertheless, be congratulated for what they have achieved.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Lincoln is a category B local prison serving the courts of Lincolnshire. It also takes prisoners from other East Midland local prisons to relieve overcrowding. It currently holds both remand and convicted adult/young adult male prisoners, including foreign nationals, life-sentenced prisoners and prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection.

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

Public

Region/Department

East Midlands

Number held

698

Certified normal accommodation

408

Operational capacity

729

Date of last full inspection

20–24 August 2012

Brief history

HMP Lincoln opened in 1872 and parts of the prison are Grade II listed buildings. Three of the four main residential units are of the original Victorian design. E wing was opened in 1992.

Short description of residential units

A, B and C wings hold a mixture of remand, convicted and sentenced adult/young adult prisoners. A wing contains the first night centre and induction landing. E wing holds vulnerable prisoners, predominantly sex offenders.

Name of governor/director

Peter Wright

Escort contractor

GeoAmey

Health service provider

Lincolnshire Partnership Foundation Trust

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Helen Gillat

About this inspection and report

A1 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, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.

A2 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.

A3 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 tests 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.

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: 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.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**
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.**
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.**
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.

- A5 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 reviewed 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.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: 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 and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection, unless these have already been reviewed by a short follow-up inspection.

This report

- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ 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.

Summary

Safety

S1 *The new reception was welcoming but prisoners stayed there for too long. First night arrangements were poor, with dirty accommodation and a lack of support. Induction was reasonably good. Too many prisoners felt unsafe but arrangements for identifying violent incidents and reducing levels of harm had improved. Prisoners at risk of harm felt well supported but we were not assured that case management was always effective. Security arrangements, including dynamic security, were good. Drug availability was similar to that at other prisons but there was no supply-reduction plan. The number of incidents involving the use of force had reduced but processes were not effectively managed. The use of segregation had decreased considerably but the new unit was not fit for purpose. Drug and alcohol treatment had improved. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Lincoln were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 22 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 12 of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

S3 Most prisoners reported a good experience of transfers to the prison, although for many, journeys were long. An excellent project, known as Supporting People After Remand or Conviction (SPARC), provided support to new prisoners at Lincoln courts and identified immediate issues and needs before custody.

S4 The newly built reception area was bright, clean and well decorated. Reception staff and peer workers made prisoners feel welcome but prisoners remained in reception for far too long, with little to keep them occupied. All new prisoners were interviewed in private and good attention was paid to risk and vulnerability issues.

S5 Conditions on the first night centre for mainstream prisoners were poor; cells were dirty and unprepared, some communal areas were grubby and the environment was chaotic. New arrivals were often locked in their cells for the night without adequate support from staff or peer workers, and handover arrangements to night staff were inadequate. First night arrangements for vulnerable prisoners on E wing had improved and were good.

S6 Induction arrangements were good both for mainstream and vulnerable prisoners, covering relevant information about how to access available services and deal with prison life.

S7 There had been one recent fatal incident but generally levels of violence had reduced slightly and were now similar to those at other local prisons. However, too many prisoners felt unsafe and victimised. Far fewer vulnerable prisoners felt unsafe than at the time of the previous inspection. Organisational arrangements to deal with levels of violence and make the prison safer had improved. The newly published violence reduction policy document was relevant and based on an appropriate analysis of the pattern of violence in the prison, and further consultation with prisoners was being developed. Residential officers and managers were not yet fully aware of all aspects of the new policy and there was an over-reliance on the safer custody team to investigate and manage processes.

- S8 There had been two self-inflicted deaths in custody since the previous inspection and lessons learned were being managed proactively. Levels of self-harm were lower than those at other local prisons and the analysis of data to provide information about patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour had improved. Although the quality of entries in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm was sometimes cursory and care mapping was weak, our observations showed that staff knew and cared about the personal circumstances of individual prisoners in crisis and helped them to deal with their issues. There were too few Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) but they were well supported and prisoners had good access to them. The number of prisoners on ACCTs located in the segregation unit had reduced considerably.
- S9 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and well managed ensuring good dynamic security. Staff were clearly visible and interacted with prisoners on the wings. Good intelligence supported the local security objectives and focused on emerging threats.
- S10 Almost a third of prisoners said that illegal drugs were easily available in the prison. Although the random mandatory drug testing positive rate was relatively low, evidence indicated that the new psychoactive drug, 'Black Mamba', was increasingly available and used but was not detectable under the current drug testing arrangements. Too few prisoners suspected of taking drugs were either searched or tested. The prison was suitably focused on the threat of drugs but there was no supply-reduction strategy to provide a proactive approach.
- S11 Prisoners were negative about the fairness and effectiveness of the incentives and earned privileges scheme and we found that the new scheme was not well understood by prisoners or staff. Prisoners arriving on transfer were inappropriately placed on the entry level and the regime for the few prisoners on basic was far too punitive.
- S12 The number of adjudications remained high and was twice that at comparator prisons. The number of incidents involving use of force had decreased and was similar to that at other prisons. The monthly use of force meeting reviewed a wide range of data and monitored trends but failed to review recorded planned incidents. Use of special accommodation was relatively high and records did not assure us that use was always necessary.
- S13 The use of segregation had reduced considerably but the newly constructed segregation unit was not sufficiently robust to provide a safe and secure environment. Relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were good and staff clearly knew the prisoners in their care, although the regime was poor. Formal reintegration planning was weak and too many segregated prisoners were transferred to other establishments.
- S14 Drug and alcohol treatment had improved. The integrated clinical and psychosocial team delivered a well-resourced, good-quality range of group-work, with regular clinical reviews and one-to-one interventions. In the absence of a dedicated recovery unit, further progress was limited. Opiate substitution was administered too late in the day and the lack of privacy continued to be problematic.

Respect

- S15** *The cleanliness of the prison had improved and most areas were clean. There was good access to showers but insufficient prison clothing. Applications were not tracked. We saw good staff–prisoner relationships. The management of equality and diversity had improved and support for minority groups was evident but some basic needs remained unmet. The number of complaints was high and they were poorly managed. Health services, including access to key services, had improved and were good. A good level of primary and secondary mental health care was provided. The standard of food was reasonably good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S16** *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Lincoln were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 26 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*
- S17** The communal areas, cells and outside areas were mainly clean. Many prisoners shared cramped cells designed for one. Prisoners could shower daily and shower areas were mainly clean, but despite recent refurbishment, some showers had doors missing and unreliable water pressure and temperature. There was insufficient prison clothing and prisoners could not access their stored property or exchange clothes on visits.
- S18** Confidence in the applications process had decreased and applications were not tracked.
- S19** Prisoners were less positive than at the time of the previous inspection about staff–prisoner relationships but we saw consistently good levels of interaction across the prison. Electronic case notes showed a general lack of input from staff, with no evidence of any managerial oversight.
- S20** Equality and diversity provision had improved, with greater senior management leadership and the development of a strategy and action plan. There was no analysis of the treatment and conditions of those with protected characteristics, other than for race. Discrimination incident report forms were not always responded to adequately and quality assurance was poor. Prisoner equality representatives offered valuable support to other prisoners.
- S21** Formal consultation forums for all minority groups had been introduced. Black and minority ethnic prisoners responded less favourably than white prisoners across some key areas, including victimisation by staff and other prisoners. Foreign national prisoners had sufficient access to the Home Office Immigration Enforcement unit and to independent advice, and the prison closely monitored those who were detained beyond their sentence expiry date. There was little translated information available and inappropriate use of prisoners to interpret for confidential matters.
- S22** More prisoners with than without a disability reported feeling unsafe. Their clinical needs were well met by health services staff but there were no formal support or care planning arrangements on the wings. The needs of older prisoners were met reasonably well, although retired prisoners and those with a disability had little to occupy them when unlocked during the core day.
- S23** All faiths were provided for, although vulnerable prisoners could not attend Catholic Mass weekly. Links with local faith representatives were developing well, including some innovative work around resettlement support.

- S24 The number of prisoner complaints was high. Responses did not always address the issues raised, many were dismissive, and quality assurance and monitoring were poor.
- S25 A bail accommodation service was available but there was no systematic provision of bail support to remanded prisoners.
- S26 Health services had improved overall. We observed significant improvements in clinical governance arrangements, with good relationships established with the partnership board and active involvement of the governor and head of health care. The health services team was adequately staffed and well qualified to deliver a wide range of chronic disease clinics. Prisoners in our survey were critical of the waiting times for many of the clinics but we found that most clinics had acceptable waiting lists. The newly refurbished health centre provided a positive treatment environment but the treatment rooms on A and B wings were poor.
- S27 Pharmacy services were good. Prescribing practices had improved but medication administration on some of the wings lacked confidentiality and was poorly supervised. Dental services were good. An integrated mental health team provided a high level of primary and secondary care, with satisfactory access to the psychiatrist. The speed of transfers to secure mental health units had improved.
- S28 Prisoners' views on the quality of food had deteriorated but we found it to be varied and nutritious, although breakfast packs were inadequate. Consultation arrangements were good and led to improvements.

Purposeful activity

S29 *Adherence to the daily regime had improved and was good. Time out of cell was reasonable for employed prisoners but poor for those who were unemployed. The new national core day allowed too little association. Learning and skills provision had improved. There were sufficient activity places for most of the population but attendance was poor. The range and variety of education, vocational training and work was generally appropriate but some higher-level qualifications were yet to be introduced. Prisoner functional skills were not sufficiently developed. The quality of teaching and learning was inconsistent. Achievements of qualifications were generally good. The libraries had been enhanced and usage was good. PE provision was reasonable. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S30 *At the last inspection in August 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Lincoln were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that 12 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, one had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S31 The daily regime was now predictable and rarely disrupted. Employed prisoners had reasonably good time out of cell during the day but opportunities for association were severely limited for all prisoners, with only one evening association per week. This had an impact on prisoners' ability to maintain contact with family and friends. Prisoners not involved in activities were unlocked for around three hours each day but far fewer prisoners (around a quarter of the population) were locked up during the day than at the time of the previous inspection.

- S32 A clear vision and strategy for learning, skills and work had been established. This was effectively underpinned by a recent survey of prisoners' needs and local/national employment information. Overall leadership and management of learning and skills had improved but further significant improvements were required. Some good partnership, working with employers had been maintained, but there were insufficient links to support prisoners into work.
- S33 The prison had increased the number of activity places and there were now sufficient to occupy most of the population, and effective allocation processes ensured that most prisoners were allocated to an activity. However, attendance was poor and we found only 47% of the population involved in activity at any one time. The range and variety of education, vocational training and work was generally appropriate. However, higher-level qualifications had yet to be introduced into some vocational and production workshops.
- S34 The quality of vocational training was good. Workshops were spacious, professional and well equipped. The quality of teaching and learning was inconsistent. Learners' functional skills were not sufficiently developed. Most areas offered prisoners the opportunity to gain qualifications. Achievement of accredited education and vocational training qualifications was generally good but pass rates in English and mathematics were low. Skills development in vocational training was good and focused well on the skills needed in employment, but were only available at level 1. The induction into education was good.
- S35 Prisoners' access to the two libraries had improved and both had been refurbished to a good standard and provided a welcoming environment. Over half of all prisoners used the library regularly. The library promoted the benefits of literacy through events such as the Six-Book Challenge and Books on Prescription scheme.
- S36 PE facilities were limited but adequate and all prisoners could now attend at least twice a week. Gym and health services staff liaised effectively to provide tailored fitness sessions to address a range of needs. A suitable range of part qualifications was delivered and pass rates were consistently high. Attendance at recreational PE disrupted the working day.

Resettlement

- S37** *The strategic management of resettlement was developing slowly but was still not informed by an effective needs analysis. Offender management had been restructured and provided a good platform for further development, although the backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments had increased. Short-term prisoners now had an effective custody plan. The number of category D prisoners was high and too many were not proactively managed. Reintegration planning was good. All prisoners had access to mostly good-quality resettlement provision. A large number of sex offenders underwent no meaningful offending behaviour work and had little opportunity for progression. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S38 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Lincoln were reasonably against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, six had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

- S39 The strategic management of resettlement had stalled but was developing slowly. The reducing reoffending strategy was not informed by a comprehensive needs analysis.
- S40 The offender management unit had been restructured and provided a more coordinated approach, with positive staff and good attention to training. However, offender supervisors were routinely cross-deployed and this had an impact on their ability to undertake their core work. Management oversight of workloads had been limited. The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments had increased, affecting prisoners' ability to transfer or progress. Prisoners did not see their offender supervisor promptly enough and subsequent contact was often reactive, lacking a focus on offending behaviour. The quality of OASys assessments was reasonable but some sentence plans lacked basic objectives about resettlement. Home detention curfew releases were generally timely but too many prisoners arrived at the prison with too little time left in their sentence to complete the process on time.
- S41 Public protection assessment and monitoring processes were adequate, and offender supervisors and case administrators were developing confidence in this role, but attendance at recent interdepartmental risk management team meetings by other departments had been poor.
- S42 Categorisation processes for most prisoners were good and staff pursued progressive moves. The number of category D prisoners had almost trebled since the previous inspection. The status of category D prisoners returned from open prisons was often unclear and they were not proactively managed. Too few open prison places were available.
- S43 Reintegration assessment and planning, provided by Lincolnshire Action Trust (LAT), was effective and had been enhanced by the introduction of assessment, case management and sentence planning arrangements for those serving less than 12 months.
- S44 For prisoners with accommodation needs, a wide range of help and support was provided, including links to community provision. Prisoners' education, training and employment needs were assessed effectively on reception and before release, and good-quality information, advice and guidance was provided.
- S45 Health care discharge arrangements were good. For prisoners with substance misuse issues, links with local drug intervention programme (DIP) teams were good, with DIP workers making pre-release visits to the prison. Links with community drug agencies further afield were less effective.
- S46 LAT provided advice to prisoners for managing priority debts and prisoners were helped to open bank accounts. There were no finance courses available.
- S47 The range and quality of parenting support and family work were good. Improvements had been made to the visitors waiting area and the number of visits sessions a week had increased. The visits hall facilities were good and prisoners and visitors were treated well.
- S48 Offending behaviour programme provision was extremely limited and there was no analysis or strategy to manage the needs of the population. Most of the large sex offender population were in denial of their offending, which meant that some stayed at the establishment far too long, with no meaningful offending behaviour work or clear progression plan. The prison showed a good commitment to restorative justice.

Main concerns and recommendations

S49 Concern: First night arrangements on A wing were poor. This wing was big, busy, sometimes chaotic and not a suitable environment for the first night. New prisoners were located in ill-prepared and dirty cells. They were often locked up for the night without any support from peer supporters or staff and there were no additional safety checks in place.

Recommendation: The first night environment should be relatively calm and quiet. Cells should be clean and prepared for use. New prisoners should be provided with support from staff and peer supporters.

S50 Concern: Too many prisoners continued to feel unsafe and/or victimised. New organisational arrangements to identify and analyse violent incidents had improved but they were still new and seen as the responsibility of safer custody staff.

Recommendation: New arrangements to identify incidents of victimisation and violence should be embedded. All staff should be aware of and use violence reduction processes to make the prison safer.

S51 Concern: There were sufficient activity places for most of the population and most prisoners were allocated to an activity, yet many failed to attend. We found less than half the population in activity at any one time.

Recommendation: Attendance at education, work and vocational training should be prioritised, non-attendance should be challenged and planned disruptions should be resolved.

S52 Concern: There was an increasing backlog of OASys assessments and offender supervisors did not always see prisoners promptly, regularly enough or with an adequate focus on setting suitable objectives. This affected prisoners' ability to progress or transfer.

Recommendation: The backlog of OASys assessments should be tackled and all prisoners should be seen by their offender supervisor promptly to be assessed, have relevant targets set, and have progression and/or transfer pursued.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1** *Most prisoners reported a good experience of transfers to the prison, although for many, journeys were long. Relationships between escort and reception staff were good and information about prisoners was shared appropriately. The service provided by the Supporting People After Remand or Conviction (SPARC) project at Lincoln courts was excellent.*
- I.2** Journey times to the prison varied considerably but in our survey 30% prisoners reported journey times of over 2 hours.
- I.3** Most prisoners reported a reasonable experience of transfers to the prison. In our survey, more respondents than at comparator establishments said that they had felt safe (82% versus 76%), that vans had been clean (69% versus 61%) and that escorting officers had treated them well or very well (78% versus 67%).
- I.4** Escort staff were polite and respectful and clearly focused on prisoner safety. Relationships between escort and reception staff were good. Information was shared systematically, and reception staff made appropriate use of it to inform initial risk assessments. Escort records were properly completed and legible.
- I.5** Resettlement workers from the Supporting People After Remand or Conviction (SPARC) project (see section on reintegration planning) saw prisoners at Lincoln courts to help to assess their needs and to give them information about the early days in custody.

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.

- I.6** *The new reception area was bright, clean and well decorated. Relationships between reception staff and prisoners were good but prisoners remained in reception for too long. Holding rooms were clean but contained little to keep prisoners occupied. Conditions for mainstream prisoners on the first night centre were poor. Communal areas were dirty and the environment was chaotic. The cells were dirty and not adequately prepared. Prisoners were often locked in their cells for the night without adequate support from staff or peer workers, and handover arrangements to night staff were inadequate. First night and induction arrangements for vulnerable prisoners on E wing had improved. The induction programme had improved and included relevant information about the prison.*

- I.7** Conditions in the new reception area were generally good. The communal corridor was bright, clean and well decorated and afforded good sight lines for the effective supervision of prisoners. The holding rooms were clean and well decorated but contained little to keep prisoners occupied. There was also a lack of up-to-date information noticeboards.
- I.8** On arrival, prisoners were offered a hot drink and a free telephone call. Those who had transferred to the establishment were asked if they understood what had happened to them before transfer and if they had any immediate needs. Searching procedures were carried out sensitively.
- I.9** Reception was welcoming, with a relaxed atmosphere. Staff were clearly aware of the potential risks to new prisoners and all prisoners received an interview in private with a reception officer. Good use was made of peer support. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) saw all new arrivals to explain how to use prison systems and how to access help.
- I.10** Many prisoners remained in reception for too long. Delays were often caused by waits for cell spaces on the first night centre or for interviews by health services staff. We saw many prisoners waiting in reception for more than three hours and a few for over five hours.
- I.11** For mainstream prisoners, conditions on the first night centre, which was part of A wing, were grim. Many communal areas were grubby and cells were dirty and poorly prepared. The environment was chaotic and noisy. Prisoners from the other landings mixed freely with new arrivals. Staff supervision was poor and use of peer support workers had not been developed. New prisoners we spoke to were often confused and uncertain and said that they had not received much support from staff. There was little to suggest that prisoners' identified first night needs were being met. Landing staff appeared busy but not adequately focused on first night risks. Handovers to night staff were cursory and prisoners were locked in their cells for the night without adequate support (see main recommendation S49).
- I.12** First night arrangements for vulnerable prisoners admitted directly to E wing had improved and were good. The environment there was calm and clean. Prisoners' immediate needs were dealt with by staff, and cells were clean and well prepared. Handover arrangements to night staff were good.
- I.13** Most prisoners received a full induction, beginning on the day after arrival. The induction programme had improved and included relevant information about how to access services and deal with prison life. The sessions were well presented by induction officers and peer supporters. Prisoners were given time for discussion and were encouraged to ask questions.
- I.14** All new arrivals were also interviewed by the Lincolnshire Action Trust (LAT) for resettlement pathway assessments (see also section on resettlement) and underwent an education evaluation.
- I.15** Vulnerable prisoners located on E wing received all elements of the induction programme, including assessments by LAT and education staff.

Recommendation

- I.16 Prisoners should not be delayed in reception.**

Housekeeping point

- I.17 Reception holding rooms should have up-to-date information on the noticeboards.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels and is 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.

I.18 Arrangements to deal with levels of violence and the collection of data had improved. Monitoring of the implementation of the policy at safer custody meetings had also improved but attendance from some key areas was inconsistent. Residential officers and managers were not yet fully aware of all aspects of the new policy and there was an over-reliance on the safer custody team to deal with the issues involved. The number of fights and assaults had reduced slightly but too many prisoners reported feeling unsafe, although most of the vulnerable prisoners on E wing felt safe.

- I.19 A new violence reduction policy had been published earlier in 2013. It was relevant, based on a detailed analysis of the patterns of violence, and supported by other local policies and procedures such as the incentives and earned privileges scheme and new security reporting systems. It was also informed through consultation with prisoners, and a survey about their feelings of safety had been conducted.
- I.20 The monthly safer custody committee monitored overall progress of the violence reduction and suicide prevention strategies. Meetings were usually well attended and minutes reflected appropriately focused discussions about all forms of violence. Links with the security and safer custody departments were good, and there was an unrestricted flow of relevant information, such as security information reports (SIRs), to the full-time violence reduction coordinator.
- I.21 Information about the number, type and location of violent incidents was comprehensive. The analysis of information to identify trends, patterns and problem areas had improved considerably and was now good.
- I.22 There had been a recent fatal incident, which was subject to criminal investigation and charges. In the previous six months, there had been about 30 fights and 25 assaults, which was similar to comparator rates and slightly lower than at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.23 In our survey, 21% of respondents said that they currently felt unsafe and 31% that they had been victimised by other prisoners, both figures being worse than the comparators of 16% and 24%, respectively (see main recommendation S50). However, far fewer vulnerable prisoners felt unsafe than at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.24 Formal arrangements to deal with bullying and other forms of antisocial behaviour had been reviewed and modified to produce a simple system to identify, monitor and change such behaviour. This system was based chiefly on incentives and earned privileges (IEP) sanctions and supported by regular reviews to monitor behavioural changes. Not all residential officers and managers were fully aware of the new policy and there was an over-reliance on the safer custody team to deal with such issues. The safer custody team investigated all alleged

incidents, reviewed prisoners on formal procedures and appeared to be solely responsible for monitoring entries in occurrence books and records about unexplained injuries to prisoners, to ensure that all incidents were reported and dealt with (see main recommendation S50).

- I.25** Protocols for the admission of prisoners onto the vulnerable prisoner unit on E wing had been published. Living conditions on this wing were reasonable, with a regime comparable with that in the rest of the prison. In our survey, only 22% of prisoners on E wing said that they currently felt unsafe, which was considerably better than the figure of 50% at the time of the previous inspection.

Self-harm and suicide

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.

I.26 *There was good analysis of patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour. Levels of self-harm were similar to those at comparable prisons. Entries in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents were sometimes cursory and care mapping was weak. Our observations showed that staff knew and cared about the personal circumstances of prisoners in crisis and helped them to deal with their issues. There were too few Listeners but the scheme was well supported and prisoners had good access to them.*

- I.27** Strategic protocols to prevent self-harm and suicide were managed by a nominated suicide prevention coordinator, supported by a team. This team was responsible for ensuring that procedures to manage prisoners at risk of self-harm were properly implemented, as well as acting as a central point of advice and guidance for staff.
- I.28** The safer custody committee used a wide range of information to identify trends and patterns of behaviour in terms of location, type, timing and peripheral circumstances of incidents to develop the strategy and update the continuous improvement plan. The analysis of these data had improved
- I.29** There had been two self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection. A senior manager reviewed the action plans each month and important items were included in the continuous improvement plan.
- I.30** There had been 84 incidents of self-harm in the previous six months. This was slightly higher than the 72 recorded at the time of the previous inspection but lower than the local prison comparator of 116. A small number of prisoners accounted for a disproportionate number of incidents and most were relatively minor.
- I.31** There had been 234 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm opened in the previous six months. About 80% of these had been raised during the early days of custody, either in reception or on the first night centre. The number of prisoners on ACCTs located in the segregation unit had reduced considerably. The quality of ACCT documents was inconsistent. Good initial assessments were undermined by poor case management. Reviews were often late and care maps did not always relate to identified needs. Entries in ACCT documents did not show a

dynamic response and there was little to indicate that actions were taken or followed through. However, our observations showed that staff knew and cared about the personal circumstances of prisoners and helped them to deal with their issues. Prisoners we spoke to who were on an ACCT told us that officers treated them well and were responsive to their needs.

- I.32** The Listener scheme was well established and access was good. It was explained during induction and publicised around the prison. There were eight Listeners – three on the vulnerable prisoner unit but only five for the rest of the prison, which was too few. The scheme was well supported and Listeners we spoke to said that they felt valued.

Recommendations

- I.33 Case management and review arrangements for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved.**
- I.34 The number of Listeners should be increased.**

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

- I.35** *Adult safeguarding policies were unclear and staff were not aware of a policy. The governor had been working closely with the Director of Adult Social Services and had become a member of the council's Adult Safeguarding Board.*

- I.36** Adult safeguarding policies were unclear and staff we spoke to were not aware of a policy. Formal links between the governor and the Director of Adult Social Services had been developed and the governor was a member of the Adult Safeguarding Board. The council had appointed a member of staff to support the introduction of safeguarding policies.
- I.37** Local vulnerability screening procedures were in place, and the assessments of risk carried out during prisoners' first few days in custody were reasonably good (see also section on health services).

Recommendation

- I.38 Formal adult safeguarding policies should be introduced.**

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.

- I.39** *Security arrangements were generally proportionate and were supported by good dynamic security. Intelligence was well managed and there was a high degree of engagement by the wider prison. Mandatory drug testing rates were low but too few suspicion tests were completed. There was no supply-reduction policy to underpin the work on managing the threat of illegal drugs.*
- I.40** Security arrangements were generally proportionate. A considerable improvement in (prisoner) accounting processes had removed the need for repeated roll checks throughout the day. All wings were able to report immediately on how many prisoners they currently held on the units.
- I.41** Dynamic security was effective, supported by good staff–prisoner interactions on the wings and other activity areas (see also section on staff–prisoner relationships). A large number of SIRs were submitted each month, including contributions from all relevant areas of the prison. At the time of the inspection, there was no backlog of unprocessed reports but too few requested target searches had been completed.
- I.42** The monthly security meeting was well attended by an appropriate range of staff, focused on emerging issues and threats to the prison such as drugs, violence and possession of unauthorised articles, and set well-publicised monthly objectives. A weekly intelligence meeting supplemented this meeting and provided regular and effective oversight of security matters.
- I.43** Although the level of strip-searching in reception had been reduced, all prisoners were strip-searched on location to the segregation unit, regardless of any risk-based assessment (see also section on segregation).
- I.44** The application of visits restrictions was proportionate and they were imposed in response to trafficking activity.
- I.45** In our survey, 32% of respondents said that it was easy or very easy to get illegal drugs in the prison, which was similar to the comparator and to the figure at the time of the previous inspection. Access to alcohol was also similar to that at comparator prisons, although availability had decreased since the time of the previous inspection. Despite the prison's acknowledgement of the threat posed from illegal drugs, and a regular dynamic assessment and response, there was no underpinning strategic drug supply-reduction policy to ensure a proactive approach.
- I.46** The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to October 2013 was 8.5%, against a comparator of 11.3%. The suspicion testing rate for this period was low, at 18.1%. A total of 92 suspicion tests had been requested but only 46 (50%) had been completed owing to staff shortages and slow processing of some SIRs. Prisoners' comments, drug finds and a few acute health-related incidents suggested a high level of availability of the new psychoactive substance, 'Black Mamba', which was not detectable under the current drug testing arrangements.

Recommendations

- I.47 A drug supply-reduction strategy should be developed and should include an action plan and performance measures.**
- I.48 The suspicion drug testing programme should be sufficiently resourced so that all prisoners suspected of taking drugs are tested within required timescales and without gaps in provision. (Repeated recommendation I.54)**

Housekeeping point

- I.49** The number of intelligence-led target searches conducted should be increased.

Incentives and earned privileges³

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.

I.50 *Prisoners and staff were unsure about how the new scheme operated. Our survey results about the fairness and motivational value of the scheme were negative and prisoners we spoke to did not think it was worth gaining enhanced status. The basic regime was poor.*

- I.51** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments said that they had been treated fairly in the incentives and earned privileges scheme, and that the scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour. Prisoners told us that it was not worth being on the highest level, apart from being able to wear their own clothes (see section on residential units).
- I.52** Staff and prisoners were unsure how the new scheme operated and there was evidence of transferred-in prisoners being wrongly placed on the entry level. We found almost no references to the scheme in electronic case notes and it was difficult to see how prisoners could evidence their suitability to gain enhanced status.
- I.53** The regime for the few prisoners on the basic level was inadequate and amounted to (a minimum of) 28 days of cellular confinement, with as little as one hour out of cell each day. Targets (if any) were generic and not suitably focused on individuals.

Recommendations

- I.54 Prisoners' negative perceptions of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be explored and steps taken to improve their understanding and confidence in it.**

³ In the previous report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- I.55** The regime for those on the basic level of the IEP scheme should provide the opportunity to demonstrate improvements in behaviour, as defined in individual and well-structured improvement targets.

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.

- I.56** *The number of adjudications was high. Use of force had reduced but managerial oversight of force, including special accommodation, was weak. The new segregation unit was poorly constructed and failed to provide a robust physical environment. Both the regime on the unit and reintegration planning were poor.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.57** The number of adjudications over the previous six months was high, at 1,200, which was almost twice as high as at comparator prisons but similar to the number at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.58** The adjudications we observed were conducted appropriately, with a good level of investigation throughout the hearing. The adjudication room was clean and reasonably comfortable but the use of a bolted-down chair for the prisoner was unnecessary.
- I.59** Quality assurance was undertaken, and the recently introduced standardisation meeting considered a reasonable amount of data.

Housekeeping point

- I.60** The chair used by prisoners in the adjudication room should not be bolted to the floor.

The use of force

- I.61** The number of incidents involving the use of force had decreased and was now similar to that at comparator prisons. Use of special accommodation had increased; it had been used at least six times in the previous six months, although we found evidence to indicate that not all uses had been recorded. We were not assured that all uses were entirely justified.
- I.62** The monthly use of force meeting reviewed and monitored a wide range of data in order to monitor trends but failed to review video-recordings of incidents to provide learning points. Of the 103 incidents in the previous six months, 32 had been planned but only a small number had been video-recorded.
- I.63** There had been three uses of batons during 2013, which, on the evidence presented, appeared to have been proportionate.

- I.64** The quality of use of force paperwork was mixed and there were too many dossiers lacking officers' reports (Annex A forms) and injury to prisoner reports (F213s), with no evidence of any robust attempt to ensure completion.

Recommendations

- I.65** **All planned uses of force should be video-recorded and reviewed.**
- I.66** **Use of force dossiers should be fully completed in all cases and should include completed F213 and Annex A forms.**

Housekeeping point

- I.67** All uses of special accommodation should be justified and fully recorded.

Segregation

- I.68** The use of segregation had reduced by about 50%, to 103 recorded uses in the previous six months.
- I.69** The newly built segregation unit, which had opened in May 2013, had sustained serious damage. Walls, fittings and ceilings had proved to be insufficiently robust to withstand the rigours sustained by such units. Two of the cells consisted of panelled walls fastened to wooden batten structures that had proved to be easily removed and damaged (see Appendix V). Ceilings in all the cells were susceptible to damage which resulted in the exposure of the underlying wire meshing, providing a potential ligature point (see Appendix V). Moulded furniture had been smashed, leaving sharp and dangerous debris in cells, which could potentially be used as weapons.
- I.70** At the time of the inspection, there were six prisoners on the unit, five subject to Rule 45 (good order or discipline) and one serving a term of cellular confinement. There were three other general cells on the unit but all were out of action due to damage. There were also two special cells, one of which was designated for dirty protests.
- I.71** The regime on the unit was poor, with no activities, either on or off the unit, with the exception of access to the main library at weekends, subject to risk assessment. Exercise yards were stark and bare and most prisoners exercised alone, without a supporting risk assessment.
- I.72** All prisoners were routinely strip-searched on location to the unit, regardless of any risk posed.
- I.73** Staff-prisoner relationships on the unit were effective and all staff we spoke to had a good understanding of those in their care. All prisoners we spoke to said that they were well treated but 'just wanted transfers out'.
- I.74** None of the prisoners on the unit were subject to any reintegration planning to encourage and manage their safe return to normal location. We calculated that around a third of all prisoners located on the unit and half of Rule 45 prisoners were transferred out of the unit without their underlying issues having been addressed.

Recommendations

- 1.75** The segregation unit should be made fit for purpose and robust enough to withstand the rigours of violent and disruptive prisoners.
- 1.76** The regime for prisoners in the segregation unit should be improved. (Repeated recommendation 1.76)
- 1.77** Prisoners should not be routinely strip-searched on location to the segregation unit.
- 1.78** Reintegration planning for those held in the segregation unit should be introduced and recorded.

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.

1.79 *There had been drug and alcohol programme improvements but progress had stalled owing to the lack of a stabilisation unit and recovery unit. Medication administration facilities were inappropriate. Delays in security vetting were hampering the development of a peer supporter scheme.*

- 1.80** Drug and alcohol treatment had improved. The integrated clinical and psychosocial team, run by Addaction, delivered a well-resourced range of appropriate group-work and one-to-one interventions, including an in-house designed, high-quality group-work programme called the 'Substance Use Course that Can Enhance Effective Development' (SUCCEED). However, in the absence of a dedicated recovery unit, as recommended at the previous inspection, service development had stalled.
- 1.81** At the time of the inspection, 112 prisoners were receiving opiate substitution treatment, of which 71 were maintained and 41 were reducing. The Addaction clinical and psychosocial team worked closely with prisoners and prescribers to deliver regular clinical reviews in line with national guidelines.
- 1.82** There was no stabilisation unit and observation hatches had not been fitted on the first night landing.
- 1.83** Opiate substitution treatment rooms were shared with primary health services and, except on E wing, controlled drug administration started late in the morning. There was inconsistent officer supervision and a lack of privacy during this time, with prisoners queuing in the corridor in full view of others.
- 1.84** As there was no dedicated recovery unit, prisoners who were on reducing opiate doses and those trying to stay drug free were mixed with others still using and/or dealing. In our survey, more than at comparator prisons said that they had been helped with their drug and alcohol problems (72% versus 62%) and that the support was helpful (85% versus 77%). However, some prisoners told us that, although interventions were helpful, most wings did not provide a sufficiently safe environment for them to anticipate being able to stay drug free.

- I.85** A peer support scheme was in the early stages of development but delays in the vetting process meant that only one peer supporter was in place at the time of the inspection.
- I.86** The drug and alcohol strategy committee had been reconvened in June 2013 following a long period of inactivity but a strategic action plan had yet to be developed (see section on security).

Recommendations

- I.87** **Support services should be extended and include the development of a recovery unit.**
- I.88** **There should be appropriate facilities to observe and monitor prisoners during stabilisation/detoxification. In the absence of a designated unit, observation hatches should be fitted on the first night landing.** (Repeated recommendation I.85)
- I.89** **Controlled medication should be administered in a safe and suitable environment, and wing officers should be consistently available to supervise prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation I.87)

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** *The cleanliness of the prison had improved considerably. Showers and access to cleaning materials were reasonable. Prisoners shared cells designed for single occupancy and there was inadequate provision of clothing.*
- 2.2** The overall cleanliness of the prison had improved considerably. External areas were cleaned daily and communal areas were maintained to a good standard. Cells were generally clean, and access to cleaning materials was adequate. However, most cells designed for single occupancy were shared and cramped. There was an offensive display policy but this was not enforced across all residential units.
- 2.3** Access to showers was good and shower areas were mainly clean but, despite a programme of refurbishment, showers on the upper landings of some wings had low pressure and unreliable water temperature, making them virtually unusable, and some were already showing signs of damage, with broken screens and doors. At the time of the inspection, one shower room had been out of action for some weeks.
- 2.4** Only remand prisoners, detainees and those on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme were able to wear their own clothes, although many chose not to, owing to the lack of access to stored property and not being able to obtain replacements through visits, which meant that clothing had to be purchased from the relatively expensive prison catalogue service. For the majority of prisoners (around 60%) who wore prison clothes, there was insufficient clothing to ensure weekly exchange. This resulted in prisoners keeping any good-quality clothes they obtained and washing them in their cells. Wing laundries were available for washing prisoners' own clothes and were in good order at the time of the inspection.
- 2.5** In our survey, fewer than at the time of the previous inspection said that applications were dealt with fairly, and fewer than elsewhere and than at the time of the previous inspection said that responses were timely. Applications were logged in a wing book but there was no tracking or monitoring of responses.
- 2.6** Access to telephones was good and there were sufficient telephones to meet the needs of the population. Mail systems (including the 'email a prisoner' scheme) were expedient and mail was distributed on the day of delivery.

Recommendations

- 2.7** **Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two.** (Repeated recommendation 2.10)

- 2.8 All wing showers should be maintained in good working order and any repairs effected quickly.**
- 2.9 There should be adequate clothing available each week for all prisoners.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.13)
- 2.10 Responses to applications should be tracked and monitored.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.11** The offensive display policy should be consistently enforced.
- 2.12** Access to stored property should be allowed.

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.

2.13 *Our survey results about staff–prisoner relationships were mostly negative, although prisoners we spoke to were more positive. The interactions we observed were appropriate and supportive. Case note recording was poor. Consultation arrangements were satisfactory.*

- 2.14** Fewer prisoners in our survey than at the time of the previous inspection said that staff treated them respectfully, that they had a member of staff they could go to for help and that staff interacted with them. Most survey results in this area were more negative than the comparators. We were not able to qualify this view and most prisoners we spoke to told us that staff were supportive and treated them decently. The interactions we observed across the prison were respectful, supportive and demonstrated an appropriately collaborative approach to day-to-day relationships. However, the good levels of interaction we observed were not captured in the electronic case note records we viewed, almost all of which showed a general lack of input from personal officers and no managerial oversight. Consultation arrangements were effective and held regularly, with a reasonable level of attendance from prisoners and key staff.
- 2.15** The personal officer scheme was not fully effective and many prisoners told us that they rarely had any contact with their personal officer. However, they were able to identify someone who would help them if the need arose.

Recommendations

- 2.16 Prisoners’ negative perceptions of staff–prisoner relationships should be explored and acted on.**
- 2.17 Electronic case note entries should be regularly updated to provide general oversight of a prisoner’s behaviour and progress.**

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 characteristic⁴ 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.

2.18 *Equality and diversity provision had improved with the development of a comprehensive strategy and action plan. Discrimination incident report forms were not always investigated to an adequate standard and quality assurance was poor. Peer representatives offered good support to other prisoners. Formal forums for all minority groups had been introduced. Black and minority ethnic prisoners reported less favourably across some areas of our survey but those we spoke to were more positive. Foreign national prisoners had sufficient access to Home Office Immigration Enforcement staff and to independent advice. Prisoners with disabilities reported feeling unsafe, and their social care needs were not being met, although health services staff provided good support to this group. The needs of older prisoners were met reasonably well, although they had little to occupy them when unlocked during the core day.*

Strategic management

- 2.19** Equality and diversity provision had improved, with greater senior management leadership, the development of a strategy and action plan, and the development of links with external organisations. The strategy, which covered all protected characteristics, was clear and comprehensive. There was good attendance at the monthly equality meetings, chaired by the governor or deputy governor, but prisoner representatives had not been able to attend owing to clashes with regime activities. The range of data analysed at the meetings focused on race and there was no analysis of other protected characteristics. An action plan had been drawn up to address the concerns raised by prisoners in the minority group support forums (see below), as well as matters arising from the equality meetings, and showed that action had been and was being taken.
- 2.20** The eight prisoner equality representatives provided valuable support to prisoners. They had received some advice about their role and had been provided with information packs.
- 2.21** Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were freely available. A total of 41 had been received in the previous six months. Records we saw showed that investigations were not always carried out to a satisfactory standard, and responses in some instances showed that the complainant had not been spoken to. Internal quality assurance was poor, with only 10% signed off by a senior manager, and there was no external scrutiny.

⁴ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Recommendations

- 2.22** **Equality of prisoner treatment and access to the regime should be monitored for all protected characteristics and appropriate action taken to rectify any inequalities.** (Repeated recommendation 2.29)
- 2.23** **Discrimination incident report forms should be fully investigated and the complainant interviewed as part of the investigation. All should be signed off by a senior manager and quality assurance processes should be introduced.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.24** Prisoner representatives should attend the equality meeting.

Protected characteristics

- 2.25** New receptions were able to report protected characteristics in confidence. Information about equality was given during the induction process but there was little available in languages other than English. Prisoner support forums for all minority groups had started at the beginning of 2013 and had been welcomed by prisoners.
- 2.26** Approximately 20% of prisoners were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. In our survey, this group reported more negatively than white prisoners across a range of areas. For example, more said that they had been victimised by staff (50% versus 25%), and by other prisoners (42% versus 29%). Monitoring had identified some areas of inequality, such as use of wing accommodation, access to complaints and representation on IEP levels. These had been well investigated, with continued monitoring where needed.
- 2.27** In our survey, 6% of prisoners identified themselves as Gypsy, Romany or Travellers. The equality team had struggled to identify these prisoners and had recruited a prisoner representative from among their peers to try to develop better support for this group.
- 2.28** Foreign nationals represented just over 13% of the population. At the time of the inspection, 25 prisoners were being held solely under immigration powers (IS91s) beyond their sentence expiry date. Six of these were more than a year past sentence expiry, and the longest-held had been detained for almost two years. The equality team had worked hard to ensure that these cases were managed well and the equality manager maintained close contact with the Home Office Immigration Enforcement unit to monitor them. Immigration staff attended the prison monthly. Foreign national prisoners had access to information about independent immigration advice and could apply for a free international telephone call but only if they had not received a visit. Prisoners were often used to interpret for other foreign nationals, including for confidential matters. Professional telephone interpreting services were rarely used by staff to communicate appropriately with prisoners whose first language was not English.
- 2.29** In our survey, more prisoners with than without a disability reported feeling unsafe. Health services staff provided good clinical support to this group of prisoners but we found some whose social care needs had not been adequately met. These included a prisoner with limited mobility who relied on the goodwill of other prisoners to collect his meals each day and who struggled to use the showers. Shower facilities were not sufficiently well adapted for all prisoners with disabilities. There were no care plans on residential units. There were no formal prisoner carers but some prisoners received informal, unpaid help from cellmates and friends. Adaptations had been made to some cells and some prisoners had been

provided with aids. One of the two adapted cells on A wing was in a poor condition, dirty and not sufficiently adapted for the occupant. Personal emergency evacuation plans were of a good standard and included identified support in both the residential and workplace areas. Staff on the units were aware of the prisoners who would need help in the event of an emergency.

- 2.30** At the time of the inspection, there were 79 prisoners over the age of 50, the oldest being 81. There was no formal provision of care for older prisoners. There were no activities for these prisoners or for those with disabilities, apart from dedicated sessions in the gym for the former. Those we spoke to who were unlocked during the core day and not working complained of boredom. Older prisoners on E wing had access to their own association room but no such facility was available on the other wings.
- 2.31** There was no policy to address the needs of young adult prisoners and no monitoring of their access to regime activities. Provision for this group was underdeveloped, despite their increasing number in the prison.
- 2.32** In our survey, 5% of prisoners identified themselves as gay or bisexual. A monthly support group, Xpressions, was held.

Recommendations

- 2.33** **Prison information should be provided in the most commonly used languages. Professional telephone interpreting services should be used for confidential matters.**
- 2.34** **Foreign national prisoners should be reliably provided with free monthly telephone calls, irrespective of visits.**
- 2.35** **Social care plans should be developed for all prisoners with disabilities who require additional help to complete everyday tasks.**
- 2.36** **Older prisoners and those with disabilities unlocked during the core day should have access to appropriate activities.**
- 2.37** **A strategy and action plan should be introduced specifying how the specific needs of young prisoners will be met.**

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.

- 2.38** *Facilities were adequate for all faiths, although our survey results in this area were negative. Vulnerable prisoners could not attend Catholic Mass weekly. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison regime and links with local faith representatives were developing well, including some innovative work around resettlement support.*

- 2.39** Faith facilities were good, with a large multi-faith area. Chaplaincy staff provided for all faiths in the prison. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that their religious beliefs were respected, that they could access a chaplain if they wanted to and that they could attend religious services easily. However, the chaplaincy met all new arrivals and ensured that those who wanted to attend services could do so. Chaplaincy staff visited the residential units regularly to see prisoners and to carry out generic duties. Prisoners in our groups were positive about the chaplaincy, so we were unable to find a reason for the survey result.
- 2.40** Vulnerable prisoners could choose to attend services with the rest of the prison population or separately. However, they could not attend Catholic Mass weekly.
- 2.41** The chaplaincy was well integrated into the regime, attended key meetings and provided a number of additional faith activities, including study classes and a bereavement group. Chaplaincy staff attended assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management reviews. We saw evidence of pastoral support being given to prisoners and their families at times of bereavement, and chaplains regularly acted as family liaison officers. There were good links with local faith-based groups, including contacts with resettlement services. A newly set-up community chaplaincy mentoring scheme to assist prisoners on release was developing and there were plans to provide through-the-gate support for over 50 prisoners. The prison visitor scheme was administered through the chaplaincy, with four visitors available.

Recommendation

- 2.42** **A weekly Mass should be provided for all Catholic prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 2.42)

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.

- 2.43** *The number of complaints received was higher than at comparator prisons. In our survey, fewer prisoners than elsewhere and than at the time of the previous inspection said that complaints were dealt with fairly. Responses did not always address the issues raised, and many were dismissive. Quality assurance and monitoring were poor.*

- 2.44** The number of complaints received was higher than at comparator prisons, with 1,100 submitted in the previous six months. In our survey, only 27% of prisoners said that complaints were dealt with fairly, against the 32% comparator and 51% at the time of the previous inspection. Prisoners told us that they had limited confidence in the system and difficulties in getting a response that addressed the matters raised.

- 2.45** The responses to complaints that we sampled were often dismissive or curt. We found many where insufficient enquiry had been made into the matters raised and the responses had not answered the questions posed. Some prisoners had been asked to contact members of staff themselves for a response and this had sometimes led to prisoners having to submit additional complaints before a final response was received.
- 2.46** There had been no recent monitoring of complaints, apart from timeliness against the performance target. Quality assurance had been discontinued.

Recommendations

- 2.47** **The data on complaints should be analysed to identify and take action as necessary.** (Repeated recommendation 2.47)
- 2.48** **Quality assurance of complaints should be introduced.**

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.

2.49 *In our survey, prisoners were negative about access to legal advice. Trained legal services officers were available but bail support was not routinely offered to remand prisoners. Legal visits provision was reasonable.*

- 2.50** Prisoners could apply to see the two officers trained in legal rights and were told about this facility during induction. A wide range of legal documents was available in printed form and online in the library.
- 2.51** A bail accommodation service was available on application but had received just 10 referrals in the year to date. Remanded prisoners were not routinely asked if they wished to make a bail application and there was no provision for supplying risk assessments to local courts.

Recommendation

- 2.52** **A full bail information and support service should be developed and offered to all newly remanded prisoners.**

Health services

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.

2.53 *Health services had improved with the development of clinical governance arrangements and the refurbishment of the health centre. Access to services was satisfactory, with recent improvements in attendance at clinics. Treatment areas were generally good, apart from those on A and B wings. Pharmacy services were good and prisoners had quick access to a good level of dental service. The mental health care service was fully staffed and provided a range of services, with a swift transfer time to secure units when required.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.54** Relationships with the health services commissioners and providers had improved. The governor and head of health care were active members of the partnership board and the head of health care ensured that information was passed on from clinical governance meetings and the senior management team meetings. Prisoners had access to a 24-hour service that was wing based initially, with clinics then held in the health centre. The refurbishment of the ground floor of the health centre had been completed and this now provided a good area, although the treatment rooms on A and B wings were poor.
- 2.55** The last health needs assessment (HNA) was a refresh, presented to the partnership board in March 2013. No HNA for 2013 had been completed. The head of health care managed two teams, providing primary care and mental health services. At the time of the inspection, there were only two vacancies and the teams were well qualified to provide a wide range of care for the prison population.
- 2.56** Access to health services had improved and the waiting times generally were much shorter than at the time of the previous inspection, although prisoners in our survey were critical of the waiting times for many of the clinics. Attendance rates had improved and were monitored effectively. Nurses were qualified to deliver a wide range of in-house chronic disease clinics and one of the nurses managed the care needs of older prisoners. Training requirements were overseen by the provider, with mandatory elements highlighted. Clinical supervision was provided through the specialist teams.
- 2.57** One GP and one medical officer provided eight clinics weekly. Regular locum GPs had been used extensively in the past but a medical officer had started working at the establishment four months before the inspection and provided most of the clinics, improving the continuity of care. The pharmacy service was provided by an in-house team, led by a pharmacy technician. Four dental sessions and two dental triage sessions were provided weekly and there was a short waiting list, with patients seen within three weeks.
- 2.58** The electronic record SystemOne was used for all clinical records, and those that we saw were generally well written. Paper records were stored appropriately and managed effectively.

- 2.59** Emergency resuscitation equipment was located on each of the wings and was well maintained and checked appropriately. Additional automated external defibrillators had been distributed around the prison and discipline staff had started a rolling programme of training.
- 2.60** At the time of the inspection, a number of prisoners were completing their training as health care champions and were due to meet shortly as a health care forum. There were an average of 30 health care complaints each month, most of which concerned queries about medication or appointments. Those that we saw had been dealt with professionally and sensitively. Health promotion was evident throughout the prison in a range of clinics and displayed information but there was no strategic lead from the health services team.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.61** The new reception facilities provided a good, dedicated health care room for the initial screening of prisoners. The screening process was carried out effectively but we were told that the reception nurse was occasionally delayed while performing other duties elsewhere in the prison. Prisoners were provided with information about health services and health promotion but this was available only in English. Prisoners were seen during their first week at the establishment for a more comprehensive secondary health care screen. Access to services was made through the nurses on the wings and via health care applications, which were triaged daily. Patients could be seen by a GP within just over two weeks.
- 2.62** Health services staff attended prisoners in the segregation unit daily, including visits by a GP three times a week. A range of health promotion clinics was available and additional outside screening services regularly attended the prison. Condoms were available in the health centre and in reception.
- 2.63** A total of 18 escort opportunities were provided each week for patients to attend outside hospital appointments. The process was hampered by a lack of communication between discipline and health services staff. One or two escorts were cancelled most weeks.

Recommendations

- 2.64** **An up-to-date health needs assessment should be completed to inform healthcare delivery.**
- 2.65** **The reception of prisoners should not be delayed because of a lack of availability of health services staff.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.66** Prisoners should have access to health care information and health promotion material in a range of languages.

Pharmacy

- 2.67** The pharmacy team offered a range of services, and the pharmacy technician provided support and information to the health services team on SystmOne, which had recently been installed for electronic prescribing. There were up-to-date standard operating procedures in place, signed by staff.

- 2.68** Supplies were made on the authority of legally valid prescriptions that were generated electronically from SystmOne. Most medicinal products were supplied for named patients and appropriately labelled. Patients requiring help with medicine compliance were given a monitored dosage system but patient information leaflets were not always supplied. We saw patients waiting to be given their daily methadone dose standing in a line close to the treatment room, which afforded them no privacy, and the process was poorly supervised (see also section on substance misuse). Easy-read leaflets, including the use of pictograms, were available for patients receiving mental health treatments. Controlled drugs were supplied as stock in accordance with the appropriate signed orders.
- 2.69** Patients were responsible for ordering their in-possession medication using the health care application forms located on each wing. Requests were processed within five working days unless there was an immediate need. There was an up-to-date in-possession policy. The risk assessment included a list of medications and the risk ranking. However, the risk assessment template did not include the identity of the medication that was being assessed.
- 2.70** An emergency stock cupboard was available on E wing to enable a range of medicines to be supplied out of hours. There was an audit trail of the supply of out-of-hours medicines. There were a variety of patient group directions (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine), which included analgesic products, antibiotic eye drops, diarrhoea treatments and salbutamol inhalers.
- 2.71** There were good systems to ensure safe pharmaceutical stock management. The medicines management committee met every month, attended by the pharmacy technician and a representative from Lincolnshire Partnership Foundation Trust.

Recommendations

- 2.72 Arrangements for medication administration should ensure that prisoners are given their medication in confidence and safely.** (Repeated recommendation 2.90)
- 2.73 The in-possession risk assessment should include the identity of the medication being assessed.** (Repeated recommendation 2.92)

Housekeeping point

- 2.74** Patient information leaflets should be supplied to all patients, including those on a monitored dosage system.

Dentistry

- 2.75** Dental care was provided by a local practice and access for care and treatment had improved. The dental surgery was clean and well equipped, with clean instruments provided by an outside contractor. At the time of the inspection, there were only 51 patients waiting for an appointment. A triage system ensured that patients needing urgent treatment were seen quickly. We saw patients being treated well, with their privacy respected. Emergency drugs and oxygen were available in the surgery and resuscitation equipment could be accessed easily. Dental records were maintained on paper and transcribed to SystmOne.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.76** The mental health care service was fully staffed, with two large teams providing an integrated service for primary and secondary care. The teams were based in the health care centre and had improved access to new consultation facilities following the refurbishment. An ‘improving access to psychological therapy’ and cognitive analytical therapy service was provided in the mornings, from Monday to Saturday. A forensic psychiatrist provided two sessions a week. The total caseload averaged about 100 patients. All care was recorded on SystemOne and Silverlink (for the Trust) and information was shared between the two systems.
- 2.77** There was an open referral system and cases were allocated at a single point referral meeting each week that was also attended by the substance misuse team. Multi-agency team meetings took place monthly. One counsellor was employed to provide services to those on the mental health caseload but there were no professional counselling services for the wider population, apart from bereavement counselling through the chaplaincy.
- 2.78** Transfers to secure mental health units took place more quickly than at the time of the previous inspection, with delays rarely exceeding four months. There were no patients awaiting transfer at the time of the inspection. Mental health awareness training was provided on a rolling programme for all discipline staff.

Recommendation

- 2.79 All relevant prisoners should have access to professional counselling services.**

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.

2.80 *In our survey, prisoners reported more negatively than at the time of the previous inspection about the quality of the food. We found that food and hygiene standards were good but breakfast packs were issued on the night before consumption. There were effective consultation arrangements. The risk to vulnerable prisoners of contamination of their food was managed well.*

- 2.81** In our survey, 23% of respondents said that the food provided was good, which was in line with the comparator but much worse than at the time of the previous inspection (42%). Most dissatisfaction voiced during the inspection concerned the quantity of food provided.
- 2.82** The four-week menu cycle provided a wide range of choices and a nutritious diet which included fruit and vegetables. Special dietary needs were catered for and the food we tasted was good. Breakfast packs were provided on the night before consumption.
- 2.83** Hygiene standards were good. The kitchen and serveries were kept clean, appropriate serving utensils were provided and prisoners working with food wore clean clothing and were appropriately trained in food hygiene.

- 2.84** There was good consultation with prisoners about food through the general prisoner forum, food comments books and a survey. Changes to the menu had been made in response to the survey and consultation.
- 2.85** In our survey, vulnerable prisoners reported in line with other prisoners but complained to us that their food had been contaminated. We were satisfied that appropriate measures had been taken to ensure that their food could not be identified in the kitchen and that a recent incident of contamination was being investigated.

Recommendation

- 2.86** **Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are meant to be eaten.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.87** *Prisoners could buy a reasonable range of goods but some waited too long to access a full shop order.*

- 2.88** The shop arrangements were effective for most prisoners. New arrivals were offered a smoker's pack, and there was a grocery pack for non-smokers. Prisoners could buy a reasonable range of goods to meet their diverse needs. Canned products and fresh fruit were available.
- 2.89** Order forms were collected on Wednesday mornings, which meant that some prisoners could wait up to 11 days before receiving a full shop order, depending on the day they arrived.
- 2.90** Catalogue orders could be made and prisoners could order newspapers and magazines each week, but these all incurred a delivery charge of 50 pence.

Recommendation

- 2.91** **Prisoners should be able to access a full prison shop order within 72 hours of arrival and should not be charged for the delivery of catalogue items, newspapers and magazines.**

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.⁵

3.1 *Adherence to the regime had improved and was good. There was too little association for some but fewer prisoners were locked up during the core day than at the previous inspection.*

3.2 The regime operated as outlined in the core day routine. The difficulties and disruptions we had found at the previous inspection in accounting for prisoners had been resolved.

3.3 Time out of cell was good for employed prisoners, at around nine hours a day. For others, this figure was about three hours (on most days) and was less for those on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme (see section on incentives and earned privileges). Prisoners who remained on the wings were unlocked for a period of association in the morning or afternoon, and again between 5.15pm and 6.15pm. Each landing then had a single opportunity each week to remain unlocked until 7.15pm. This meant that prisoners in full-time employment had less opportunity to access association periods, which severely restricted their ability to contact family and friends. We found around 26% of prisoners locked up during our roll checks, which was a considerable improvement on the percentage we found during the previous inspection (44%).

3.4 Association equipment was mostly in good condition and was well used during periods of unlock. Exercise periods were regular and rarely cancelled but, at around 30–45 minutes, they were too short.

Recommendations

3.5 **Access to evening association should be increased.**

3.6 **All prisoners should have access to at least an hour's daily exercise in the open air.**

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.

⁵ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

3.7 *The management of learning and skills had improved but needed further development. The prison had established a clear vision and strategy for learning and skills. There were sufficient activity places to occupy most of the prison population but too few prisoners were engaged in purposeful activity. Quality improvement and self-assessment processes were appropriately used to identify and contribute to improvements. The use of data and targets to support performance monitoring was inadequate. Partnership working was underdeveloped. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was not consistently high enough. The range and variety of the learning and skills provision were limited but generally appropriate. Pass rates were usually good but not for some English and mathematics and information technology qualifications. Library services were good.*

3.8 *Ofsted⁶ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Good</i>
<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

3.9 Since the previous inspection, a clear vision and strategy for learning, skills and work had been developed. This was effectively underpinned by a recent survey of prisoners' needs and local/national employment information.

3.10 Standards had been raised and addressed many performance shortfalls but further significant improvements across all of the learning and skills provision were needed. Performance management of the education provision had improved but this had yet to have a substantial impact on the quality of teaching. Attendance at learning and skills activities was poor and had declined since the previous inspection (see main recommendation S51).

3.11 Effective use of the quality improvement group and self-assessment process had been made to identify shortfalls and inform improvements. However, the use of data and targets needed improvement. Quality assurance processes required further implementation, including the assessment of the quality of sessions by direct observation.

3.12 There was effective partnership working with employers. The construction employer, the Gelder Group, provided high-quality construction training and guidance in gaining work experience. Links with local employers offered learners the opportunity to work and train in workshops that reflected realistic commercial pressures. An employer open day had recently been held but more links were needed to support resettlement.

Recommendations

3.13 **Data and targets should be more widely used to aid monitoring and raise standards.**

3.14 **Quality assurance arrangements across all learning and skills provision should be implemented.**

⁶ 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>.

Housekeeping point

- 3.15** Links with employers should be further developed to support resettlement.

Provision of activities

- 3.16** Since the previous inspection, the number of full-time activity places had increased and was now sufficient to occupy most of the population. However, attendance at activities remained poor and we found that only 47% of the prison population was involved in purposeful activity at any one time (see main recommendation S51). Poor sequencing of regime activities and regime clashes accounted for much of the poor attendance.
- 3.17** Allocation of prisoners to activities was fair and equitable. Waiting lists were generally short and well managed. The pay policy had been recently reviewed and wage rates did not act as a disincentive to participation in education or training.
- 3.18** Prisoners received an appropriate assessment of need during induction. At the time of the inspection, 36% of prisoners had been assessed as having English skills below level 1 and 45% had mathematic skills below this level. All prisoners with only entry-level English and mathematics assessment scores were required to undertake education courses.
- 3.19** Most activity areas offered prisoners the opportunity to gain qualifications. At the time of the inspection, 130 learners attended education classes part time. Education provision included courses in literacy, numeracy and functional skills from entry level to level 2; English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) at entry level; and information technology (IT) and business studies at levels 1 and 2. Personal and social development courses included basic food preparation and cookery, art and design and peer mentoring. Toe by Toe (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read) was managed by the activities department but at the time of the inspection had just three learners, supported by four peer mentors.
- 3.20** There were 30 full-time equivalent places in the vocational workshops, providing carpentry and joinery, painting and decorating, and building crafts programmes. The prison had 323 full-time-equivalent work places. The breadth of work was appropriate to meet the needs of the prison population and provided suitable opportunities to develop useful employability skills. Typically, 17% of prisoners undertook accredited training while working but qualifications were only available at level 1.
- 3.21** The range and variety of the learning and skills provision were limited but generally appropriate for the prison population. However, higher-level qualifications had yet to be introduced within some vocational and production workshops. The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) had been installed but its potential had yet to be fully exploited.

Recommendations

- 3.22** **Higher-level qualifications should be introduced in some vocational and production workshops to enable prisoners to progress.** (Repeated recommendation 3.21)
- 3.23** **The virtual campus should fully support learners' development.**

Quality of provision

- 3.24** The quality of teaching was inconsistent. In the less effective lessons, teachers talked too much and did not plan a sufficiently varied and interesting range of activities to engage and challenge prisoners. They did not always manage behaviour sufficiently well, allowing prisoners to use inappropriate language and have discussions that were not relevant to the lesson.
- 3.25** In the best lessons, teachers used a wide variety of activities to make sessions inclusive and interesting. They made good use of interactive learning technology and skilfully engaged prisoners in discussion. In these lessons, teachers were responsive to the needs of all learners.
- 3.26** Prisoners' English and mathematics skills were underdeveloped. Some teachers skilfully included this in their lessons, but others did not. Not all marked work gave learners sufficient guidance on how to improve.
- 3.27** Vocational training was good. Workshops were spacious, professional and well equipped. Skills development was good and focused strongly on employment skills such as the need for accuracy and efficiency. Use of peer mentors was good and education representatives were effective in supporting learners in class.
- 3.28** The prison had an appropriate focus on developing prisoners' employability skills, and in the best sessions this had a high profile.
- 3.29** The induction into education was good. Prisoners' literacy and numeracy needs were appropriately assessed. Information about the range of education and training was clear and the benefits of improving skills were promoted well.

Recommendations

- 3.30 The quality of teaching and learning should be improved so that it is all of a high standard.**
- 3.31 The English and mathematics skills of all learners should be improved considerably.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.32** Prisoners' behaviour in sessions should be improved by challenging all unsuitable conduct and not tolerating inappropriate language.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.33** The achievement of accredited education and vocational training qualifications was generally good. Pass rates in areas such as textiles and laundry were high but pass rates for English and mathematics at entry and intermediate level were low. IT qualifications at intermediate level were not consistently high enough.
- 3.34** In the better lessons, prisoners made good progress and were able to demonstrate sound improvements in skills and knowledge. In most workshops and education classes, learners developed a wide range of employability skills and a good appreciation of how newly

acquired skills could support successful resettlement on release. Prisoners in the vocational training workshops made good progress, showed pride in their work and achieved high standards of work. Those on ESOL courses usually made good progress. Prisoners at work usually developed an appropriate work ethic.

Recommendation

- 3.35 Pass rates in English and mathematics at entry and intermediate level, and information technology qualifications at intermediate level should be significantly improved.**

Library

- 3.36** Two libraries were provided by Lincolnshire County Council. They had been refurbished to a good standard and provided a welcoming environment. Prisoners' access to the libraries had improved and sessions were available at least twice per weekday and once on Saturdays for mainstream prisoners. Vulnerable prisoners received exclusive access to an extended session on Friday afternoon to compensate for the lack of access at weekends. Before use, all prisoners received a timely and effective induction. Approximately two-thirds of the prison population were library members, and in our survey 55% of respondents identified themselves as regular users.
- 3.37** The library stock comprised a wide variety of books, music CDs and audio-book DVDs, and was based on a survey of prisoners' needs. The library met the needs of the learning and skills provision effectively. Prison Service Instructions were held, with printed copies available on request. Both libraries offered an appropriate range of legal practitioner texts. The benefits of literacy were promoted to prisoners through events such as the Six-Book Challenge and Books on Prescription scheme.

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.

3.38 *PE provision was reasonable, and prisoners had appropriate access to the limited but satisfactory range of indoor facilities. Some prisoners attended recreational gym during the core day, which disrupted learning. Links between health services and gym staff were effective. Prisoners acted as 'health champions' and promoted personal fitness and healthy lifestyles appropriately to their peers. Staff were well qualified and experienced. Not all prisoners could routinely obtain a clean gym kit.*

- 3.39** Access to recreational PE had improved, and all prisoners could attend at least twice a week. However, some prisoners attended recreational PE during the working day, which disrupted work, learning and training.
- 3.40** Before using the gym, prisoners attended a thorough induction process. Gym and health services staff liaised effectively with each other to identify and provide prisoners with tailored fitness sessions that addressed a range of needs such as mental health, drug rehabilitation and weight loss. Prisoners undertook the role of 'health champions' and promoted personal fitness and healthy lifestyles appropriately to their peers.

- 3.41** PE facilities were limited but adequate and included a main hall that offered a range of indoor sports, including basketball, football, soft tennis, badminton, hockey, cricket and circuit training. Specialist provision was offered to cater for the needs of specific groups – for example, sessions for vulnerable prisoners aged over 60. In addition, a free weights area and cardiovascular suite provided a satisfactory range of equipment. The available outdoor facilities were unused as they were not fit for purpose.
- 3.42** Staff were appropriately qualified and experienced in delivering accredited and non-accredited PE programmes within a prison setting. The gym provided an appropriate range of part-qualifications and pass rates were consistently high.
- 3.43** Following the previous inspection, the shower and changing facilities had been repaired and were now of a satisfactory standard. However, not all prisoners were able to obtain a clean gym kit before attending PE.

Recommendation

- 3.44** **Recreational PE should not disrupt learning, training or work.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.45** All prisoners should routinely receive clean gym kit.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on their arrival at the prison.

Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need.

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *The lack of a comprehensive needs analysis undermined strategic oversight and provision. Lincolnshire Action Trust provided an excellent service but fewer prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that they knew whom to turn to for help across most of the resettlement pathways. The offender management unit had developed well, with good attention to training needs.*

4.2 The reducing reoffending strategy had been reviewed recently but the supporting action plan was in an early stage of development. A prisoner survey had been undertaken in July 2013 but had yielded a low return rate. Local offender assessment system (OASys) data had not been used and not enough had been done to assess the needs of the complex population, including minority groups such as indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs), sex offenders in denial and young adults.

4.3 The strategic management of resettlement had stalled over the previous year owing to significant staff changes. A committee had been reinstated in May 2013 and attendance was adequate. The informal links between the Lincolnshire Action Trust (LAT) and the offender management unit (OMU) had improved and relationships were positive (see section on re-integration planning).

4.4 LAT provided an excellent range of resettlement support. However, in our survey, fewer prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that they knew whom to turn to for help across most of the resettlement pathways. LAT was planning to run focus groups to explore prisoners' perceptions about access to and the range of resettlement services.

4.5 Good attention had been given to addressing the training needs of OMU staff, including some input about working with sex offenders in denial. OMU staff were clear about their role and committed to the work.

Recommendation

4.6 **A comprehensive needs analysis should inform the reducing reoffending strategy and action plan, including provision for minority groups such as indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and young adults.**

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.

4.7 *The structure and function of the offender management unit had improved but there was a lack of management oversight. The backlog of assessments and plans had increased and there was too much cross-deployment of offender supervisors. Contact between prisoners and offender supervisors was poor and too reactive. Home detention curfew releases were generally timely but many prisoners arrived at the prison with too little time left in their sentence to complete the process on time. Public protection work was adequate but too many offender assessment system (OASys) assessments failed to identify risk of harm to others in custody. Categorisation operated adequately but those deemed to be in denial of their offending remained too long at the establishment, with inadequate attention paid to their offending behaviour. The number of category D prisoners had increased considerably. Provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was too limited.*

4.8 The OMU had been restructured and provided a more coordinated approach, with positive staff and good attention to training. The unit now included the full range of functions, including public protection and categorisation. There had been a lack of management oversight over the previous year and there was too little attention to slippage or prioritisation of cases. Too much time was lost through cross-deployment of uniformed offender supervisors. The backlog of OASys assessments had increased from 40 at the time of the previous inspection to 64, which represented about a third of the OASys assessments that needed to be completed. We also found many examples of OASys assessments that had been completed too late (see main recommendation S52).

4.9 In our survey, more prisoners than at other local prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had an offender supervisor (51% versus 31% and 33%, respectively).

4.10 The quality of OASys assessments was reasonable but some risk of harm assessments were inadequate (see section on public protection) and in our survey fewer prisoners than at other local prisons said that they had a sentence plan. The quality of sentence plans was variable. Although our sample was small, objectives relating to basic issues such as financial problems, employability and resolving relationship difficulties were not included, even though they had played a significant part in the offending.

4.11 In most cases, offender supervisors did not make initial contact with prisoners sufficiently promptly; in one case, the prisoner had not been seen by his offender supervisor for eight months following reception. Subsequent contact was too often reactive, responding to events such as home detention curfew (HDC) applications rather than being regular, structured and focused on progressing the plan or challenging offending behaviour. We saw some high risk of harm cases that had not been seen for several months. In our survey, far fewer prisoners than at other local prisons (40% versus 60%) said that they could achieve their targets at the establishment and far fewer (19% compared to 26%) said that they had plans to complete targets at another prison. In the small number of cases we saw where offender supervisors were working proactively with prisoners, we found some examples of good practice, particularly in regard to liaising with other establishments to arrange a transfer to complete an intervention. However, in most cases opportunities to address offending-related problems were missed.

- 4.12** HDC releases were generally timely but many prisoners arrived at the prison with too little time left in their sentence to complete the process on time.

Recommendation

- 4.13** **Offender supervisors should not be cross-deployed and their workloads should be more closely managed to avoid slippages and promote a more proactive approach.**

Public protection

- 4.14** Public protection screening was carried out on arrival and the interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) provided good oversight of restrictions. These were reviewed regularly and removed when evidence suggested that it was safe to do so.
- 4.15** Offender supervisors and case administrators were developing confidence in this role but attendance at recent IRMT meetings by other departments had been poor.
- 4.16** In only seven of the 13 cases we inspected, the risk of harm screening was accurate and risk management plans were reasonable, identifying measures to be taken in custody and on release. However, risks to others while in custody were inadequately identified. In one case, a prisoner had used extreme violence on two occasions when he had felt victimised by others but the risk to staff and other prisoners had been incorrectly assessed as low. Another with a history of racist violence had not been assessed as being a risk to other prisoners.
- 4.17** Some case administrators in the OMU had been trained in the use of the violent and sexual offenders register (ViSOR) and entered data as required. We were told that no one in the security department was currently trained in the use of ViSOR; this meant that information from security information reports was not being input.

Recommendations

- 4.18** **Risk of serious harm assessments should always accurately identify risks to others while in custody.**
- 4.19** **Information from security information reports should be entered onto the violent and sexual offenders register.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.20** Attendance at interdepartmental risk management team meetings should be improved.

Categorisation

- 4.21** Initial categorisation and reviews were up to date. However, not all paperwork was adequately completed, with gaps in the identification of issues relevant to progression.
- 4.22** Links with HMP Whatton had been developed for the progression of sex offenders suitable to participate in a sex offender treatment programme. We saw examples of some men being

transferred quickly for this and other purposes (see also section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).

- 4.23** The number of category D prisoners had almost trebled since the previous inspection (from 26 to 68), mainly because of an increase in the number of ISPs being returned from open prisons, but also owing to a lack of places in open conditions for determinate-sentenced prisoners. In one case, category D had been awarded in October 2012 but progression to an open prison had not been pursued, reflecting the lack of proactive offender management (see above).
- 4.24** For many of the prisoners returned from open prisons over the previous year, it took too long for their issues to be resolved and for the open prison to come to a decision about the next steps for the prisoner (a return to an open prison or a request for recategorisation and for the prisoner to remain in closed conditions). This uncertainty left prisoners frustrated and unclear about their future.

Recommendations

- 4.25** **Decisions about the future categorisation of prisoners returned from open conditions should be made at the earliest opportunity.**
- 4.26** **Category D prisoners should be transferred quickly to an open prison.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.27** Recategorisation paperwork should be completed comprehensively, identifying the issues that might impact on the prisoner's future progression and how risk has changed since the previous review.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.28** There were 39 life-sentenced prisoners and 45 serving indeterminate sentences for public protection (IPP) held at the establishment. Many of these had been returned from open conditions and, at the time of the inspection, were unclear about their future (see section on categorisation).
- 4.29** ISPs were supervised by a fully trained offender supervisor who was familiar with these cases and proactively pursued a progressive move where possible.
- 4.30** Parole reports were up to date. Provision for ISPs was limited and there were no consultation forums or family days to provide them with support or information.

Recommendation

- 4.31** **Provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be improved and include forums and family days.** (Repeated recommendation 4.25)

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners' resettlement needs are addressed 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.

4.32 *Reintegration assessment and planning provided by Lincolnshire Action Trust was effective and supported by the provision of good case management and sentence planning for all prisoners serving under 12 months. An innovative project, called Supporting People After Remand or Conviction (SPARC), provided good support to those received into custody. Help with housing was good but there was inadequate provision for finance and debts. Prisoners' education, training and employment needs were assessed on arrival and before release. Bank accounts could be opened before release but there were no financial management courses. Health discharge planning and worked aimed at alcohol and drug use were good. The children and families pathway was positive. There was no offending behaviour needs analysis or strategy to manage those in denial of their offending.*

4.33 LAT provided an impressive case management approach to resettlement, including a plan for those serving less than 12 months and an immediate needs assessment for those on remand. The team had grown and communication with the OMU had been formalised. There were also good links to LAT workers in the community to support those on release.

4.34 A pilot project known as Supporting People After Remand or Conviction (SPARC) was in operation at the Lincoln courts (see section on courts, escorts and transfers). This provided contact with LAT workers at court and an opportunity to identify issues relating to prisoners' arrival in custody and the identification of their resettlement needs. There were significant benefits to this project. For example, on returning to custody, one young man had met his previous SPARC practitioner in court, and he had been able to pick up with his previous housing application. He had been allocated supported accommodation and put in contact with his YMCA worker before leaving custody. Following release, he had maintained his tenancy, attended all his support meetings and worked on a plan to gain employment.

Accommodation

4.35 Prisoners' accommodation needs were assessed on arrival and before release. A wide range of help and support was provided by LAT, including links to community provision. A 'good tenant' course and support in sustaining or giving up tenancies were available.

4.36 The percentage of those released homeless was about 10%. LAT collected data on the number of homeless men they had helped to find accommodation on release but this information was not reported to the reducing reoffending committee to provide evidence of their effectiveness or identify trends. These data showed that in the previous three months, 49 out of 59 homeless prisoners had been helped to secure accommodation on release.

Housekeeping point

4.37 The data showing the number of homeless prisoners helped to find accommodation on release should be reported to the reducing reoffending committee to enable the effectiveness of the service to be monitored.

Education, training and employment

- 4.38** LAT assessed prisoners' education, training and employment needs on arrival and before release. Prisoners attended helpful courses, including those which addressed disclosure rights, CV writing, interview skills and job searching. Sessions to raise prisoners' awareness of specific careers were offered by the National Careers Service.
- 4.39** Prisoners were able to apply for jobs and development opportunities before release. The tracking of prisoners had improved since the previous inspection and included the collection of information on prisoners' destinations following release. According to the prison's data, 31% of the prisoners released between April 2012 and March 2013 had gone into employment and 15% into further education or training.

Health care

- 4.40** Health care discharge planning started two weeks before release and, those on medication were given a supply to take out. Prisoners were provided with GP letters and information about NHS services. The care programme approach was used for those with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care and end-of-life policies and protocols were available.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.41** Links with Lincolnshire-based Addaction drug intervention programme (DIP) teams were good, and DIP workers made regular pre-release visits to the prison. Links with community drug agencies further away were less good but the in-house psychosocial team prioritised pre-release preparation and referrals to community support.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.42** Provision for the finance, benefit and debt pathway was underdeveloped. LAT provided advice and help to prisoners for managing priority debts but there were insufficient resources to meet need. Jobcentre Plus offered comprehensive benefits advice.
- 4.43** All prisoners could open a bank account before release but there were no finance courses available.

Recommendations

- 4.44** **Resources to help prisoners in managing debt should be increased to meet demand.**
- 4.45** **Prisoners should be able to access a financial capability course.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.46** There was a wide range of help for prisoners to maintain contact with their families and to develop parenting skills but there had been a break in provision of the Storybook Dads scheme (in which prisoners record stories for their children) and of Reading Together, which developed prisoners' skills in reading with their children. The Being Dads parenting skills course continued to be run and culminated in a family visit.

- 4.47** There was a full-time children support officer, who provided individual support to prisoners in liaising with local authority child protection services, facilitating contact visits with children and advising on family law procedures. She also arranged farewell visits for prisoners whose children were being adopted.
- 4.48** The number of social visits sessions had increased since the previous inspection, with three on weekdays and two at weekends. Visitors and prisoners were positive about access to visits and the ease of booking them.
- 4.49** Facilities for arriving visitors had improved with the opening of a comfortable waiting area. At the time of the inspection, it was still being developed and had no refreshment facilities and insufficient visitor information, but it had great potential.
- 4.50** The new facilities, and adjustments by staff, allowed for better access to visits, and the timeliness of visits start times had improved, although there were still some delays at times of high demand. The reception and searching of visitors that we observed was respectful and friendly.
- 4.51** The visits area was impressive, with comfortable seating, a good refreshments bar and trained children's play workers in a well-appointed play area. Staff were vigilant but not intrusive. Prisoners were allowed reasonable physical contact with visitors and were not required to wear distinguishing bibs or sashes.
- 4.52** Waiting arrangements for prisoners had improved and they were no longer required to stay in the holding areas until visitors arrived. However, holding facilities and arrangements for vulnerable prisoners were poor and some complained of abuse from other prisoners. Their separate holding room was scruffy, cramped and hot. They were required to sit behind a window in plain view of the other prisoners while they waited for them to be returned to their wings.
- 4.53** There were monthly family visits for all prisoners and the chaplaincy provided volunteer visitors for prisoners who did not receive visits.

Recommendation

- 4.54** **Vulnerable prisoners leaving social visits should not be required to wait in cramped, hot and scruffy conditions in full view of other prisoners and visitors.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.55** Refreshment facilities and a range of visitor information should be provided in the visitors waiting area.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.56** There was no analysis or strategy to manage the offending behaviour needs of the population. Most (63 out of 79) of the sex offenders were in denial of their conviction. There was no strategy to manage this specific population and, as a result, some stayed at the establishment far too long, with no meaningful offending behaviour work or clear progression plan and limited access to psychological work. A RM2000 (an assessment tool to identify the level of risk) was not always completed, which further hindered the progression of some sex offenders. In one case, the prisoner had arrived at the establishment in

November 2012 but at the time of the inspection neither his OASys assessment nor an RM2000 had been completed.

- 4.57** The thinking skills programme was delivered only a couple of times a year and the I-gap programme, aimed at motivating those in denial of their offending, had been delivered only once in the year to date. The waiting list for I-gap was short but this was a reflection of offender supervisors not making referrals, rather than prisoner need.
- 4.58** The prison showed a good commitment to restorative justice. Staff training had been rolled out to raise skills and awareness. One face-to-face conference had been held to date.

Recommendation

- 4.59** **The offending behaviour needs of the population, including sex offenders in denial of their offending, should be analysed and a comprehensive strategy put in place.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.60** RM2000 assessments and referrals to the I-gap programme should be completed promptly to support progression.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points 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, and in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1** The first night environment should be relatively calm and quiet. Cells should be clean and prepared for use. New prisoners should be provided with support from staff and peer supporters. (S49)
- 5.2** New arrangements to identify incidents of victimisation and violence should be embedded. All staff should be aware of and use violence reduction processes to make the prison safer. (S50)
- 5.3** Attendance at education, work and vocational training should be prioritised, non-attendance should be challenged and planned disruptions should be resolved. (S51)
- 5.4** The backlog of OASys assessments should be tackled and all relevant prisoners should be seen by their offender supervisor promptly to be assessed, have relevant targets set, and progression and/or transfer pursued. (S52)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.5** Prisoners should not be delayed in reception. (1.16)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.6** Case management and review arrangements for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved. (1.33)
- 5.7** The number of Listeners should be increased. (1.34)

Safeguarding

- 5.8** Formal adult safeguarding policies should be introduced. (1.38)

Security

- 5.9** A drug supply-reduction strategy should be developed and should include an action plan and performance measures. (1.47)
- 5.10** The suspicion drug testing programme should be sufficiently resourced so that all prisoners suspected of taking drugs are tested within required timescales and without gaps in provision. (1.48, repeated recommendation 1.54)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.11** Prisoners' negative perceptions of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be explored and steps taken to improve their understanding and confidence in it. (1.54)
- 5.12** The regime for those on the basic level of the IEP scheme should provide the opportunity to demonstrate improvements in behaviour, as defined in individual and well-structured improvement targets. (1.55)

Discipline

- 5.13** All planned uses of force should be video-recorded and reviewed. (1.65)
- 5.14** Use of force dossiers should be fully completed in all cases and should include completed F213 and Annex A forms. (1.66)
- 5.15** The segregation unit should be made fit for purpose and robust enough to withstand the rigours of violent and disruptive prisoners. (1.75)
- 5.16** The regime for prisoners in the segregation unit should be improved. (1.76, repeated recommendation 1.76)
- 5.17** Prisoners should not be routinely strip-searched on location to the segregation unit. (1.77)
- 5.18** Reintegration planning for those held in the segregation unit should be introduced and recorded. (1.78)

Substance misuse

- 5.19** Support services should be extended and include the development of a recovery unit. (1.87)
- 5.20** There should be appropriate facilities to observe and monitor prisoners during stabilisation/detoxification. In the absence of a designated unit, observation hatches should be fitted on the first night landing. (1.88, repeated recommendation 1.85)
- 5.21** Controlled medication should be administered in a safe and suitable environment, and wing officers should be consistently available to supervise prisoners. (1.89, repeated recommendation 1.87).

Residential units

- 5.22** Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two. (2.7, repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 5.23** All wing showers should be maintained in good working order and any repairs effected quickly. (2.8)
- 5.24** There should be adequate clothing available each week for all prisoners. (2.9, repeated recommendation 2.13)
- 5.25** Responses to applications should be tracked and monitored. (2.10)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.26** Prisoners' negative perceptions of staff–prisoner relationships should be explored and acted on. (2.16)
- 5.27** Electronic case note entries should be regularly updated to provide general oversight of a prisoner's behaviour and progress. (2.17)

Equality and diversity

- 5.28** Equality of prisoner treatment and access to the regime should be monitored for all protected characteristics and appropriate action taken to rectify any inequalities. (2.22, repeated recommendation 2.29)
- 5.29** Discrimination incident report forms should be fully investigated and the complainant interviewed as part of the investigation. All should be signed off by a senior manager and quality assurance processes should be introduced. (2.23)
- 5.30** Prison information should be provided in the most commonly used languages. Professional telephone interpreting services should be used for confidential matters. (2.33)
- 5.31** Foreign national prisoners should be reliably provided with free monthly telephone calls, irrespective of visits. (2.34)
- 5.32** Social care plans should be developed for all prisoners with disabilities who require additional help to complete everyday tasks. (2.35)
- 5.33** Older prisoners and those with disabilities unlocked during the core day should have access to appropriate activities. (2.36)
- 5.34** A strategy and action plan should be introduced specifying how the specific needs of young prisoners will be met. (2.37)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.35** A weekly Mass should be provided for all Catholic prisoners. (2.42, repeated recommendation 2.42)

Complaints

- 5.36** The data on complaints should be analysed to identify and take action as necessary. (2.47, repeated recommendation 2.47)
- 5.37** Quality assurance of complaints should be introduced. (2.48)

Legal rights

- 5.38** A full bail information and support service should be developed and offered to all newly remanded prisoners. (2.52)

Health services

- 5.39** An up-to-date health needs assessment should be completed to inform healthcare delivery. (2.64)
- 5.40** The reception of prisoners should not be delayed because of a lack of availability of health services staff. (2.65)
- 5.41** Arrangements for medication administration should ensure that prisoners are given their medication in confidence and safely. (2.72, repeated recommendation 2.90)
- 5.42** The in-possession risk assessment should include the identity of the medication being assessed (2.73, repeated recommendation 2.92).
- 5.43** All relevant prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (2.79)

Catering

- 5.44** Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are meant to be eaten. (2.86)

Purchases

- 5.45** Prisoners should be able to access a full prison shop order within 72 hours of arrival and should not be charged for the delivery of catalogue items, newspapers and magazines. (2.91)

Time out of cell

- 5.46** Access to evening association should be increased. (3.5)
- 5.47** All prisoners should have access to at least an hour's daily exercise in the open air. (3.6)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.48** Data and targets should be more widely used to aid monitoring and raise standards. (3.13)
- 5.49** Quality assurance arrangements across all learning and skills provision should be implemented. (3.14)
- 5.50** Higher-level qualifications should be introduced in some vocational and production workshops to enable prisoners to progress. (3.22, repeated recommendation 3.21)
- 5.51** The virtual campus should fully support learners' development. (3.23)
- 5.52** The quality of teaching and learning should be improved so that it is all of a high standard. (3.30)
- 5.53** The English and mathematics skills of all learners should be improved considerably. (3.31)
- 5.54** Pass rates in English and mathematics at entry and intermediate level, and information technology qualifications at intermediate level should be significantly improved. (3.35)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.55** Recreational PE should not disrupt learning, training or work. (3.44)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.56** A comprehensive needs analysis should inform the reducing reoffending strategy and action plan, including provision for minority groups such as indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and young adults. (4.6)

Offender management and planning

- 5.57** Offender supervisors should not be cross-deployed and their workloads should be more closely managed to avoid slippages and promote a more proactive approach. (4.13)
- 5.58** Risk of serious harm assessments should always accurately identify risks to others while in custody. (4.18)
- 5.59** Information from security information reports should be entered onto the violent and sexual offenders register. (4.19)
- 5.60** Decisions about the future categorisation of prisoners returned from open conditions should be made at the earliest opportunity. (4.25)
- 5.61** Category D prisoners should be transferred quickly to an open prison. (4.26)
- 5.62** Provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be improved and include forums and family days. (4.31, repeated recommendation 4.25).

Reintegration planning

- 5.63** Resources to help prisoners in managing debt should be increased to meet demand. (4.44)
- 5.64** Prisoners should be able to access a financial capability course. (4.45)
- 5.65** Vulnerable prisoners leaving social visits should not be required to wait in cramped, hot and scruffy conditions in full view of other prisoners and visitors. (4.54)
- 5.66** The offending behaviour needs of the population, including sex offenders in denial of their offending, should be analysed and a comprehensive strategy put in place. (4.59)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.67** Reception holding rooms should have up-to-date information on the noticeboards. (1.17)

Security

- 5.68** The number of intelligence-led target searches conducted should be increased. (1.49)

Discipline

- 5.69** The chair used by prisoners in the adjudication room should not be bolted to the floor. (1.60)
- 5.70** All uses of special accommodation should be justified and fully recorded. (1.67)

Residential units

- 5.71** The offensive display policy should be consistently enforced. (2.11)
- 5.72** Access to stored property should be allowed. (2.12)

Equality and diversity

- 5.73** Prisoner representatives should attend the equality meeting. (2.24)

Health services

- 5.74** Prisoners should have access to health care information and health promotion material in a range of languages. (2.66)
- 5.75** Patient information leaflets should be supplied to all patients, including those on a monitored dosage system. (2.74)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.76** Links with employers should be further developed to support resettlement. (3.15)
- 5.77** Prisoners' behaviour in sessions should be improved by challenging all unsuitable conduct and not tolerating inappropriate language. (3.32)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.78** All prisoners should routinely receive clean gym kit. (3.45)

Offender management and planning

- 5.79** Attendance at interdepartmental risk management team meetings should be improved. (4.20)
- 5.80** Recategorisation paperwork should be completed comprehensively, identifying the issues that might impact on the prisoner's future progression and how risk has changed since the previous review. (4.27)

Reintegration planning

- 5.81** The data showing the number of homeless prisoners helped to find accommodation on release should be reported to the reducing reoffending committee to enable the effectiveness of the service to be monitored. (4.37)
- 5.82** Refreshment facilities and a range of visitor information should be provided in the visitors waiting area. (4.55)
- 5.83** RM2000 assessments and referrals to the I-gap programme should be completed promptly to support progression. (4.60)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Catherine Shaw	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Michael Bowen	Health services inspector
Helen Jackson	Pharmacist
Karena Reed	CQC
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Phil Romain	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

The following is a summary of the main findings from the last report and a list of all the recommendations made, organised under the four tests of a healthy prison. The reference numbers at the end of each recommendation refer to the paragraph location in the previous report. If a recommendation has been repeated in the main report, its new paragraph number is also provided.

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2012, prisoners spent too long in reception and the environment was poor. First night arrangements were inconsistent and accommodation was dirty and ill prepared. Induction was reasonably good. Too many prisoners, particularly vulnerable prisoners, felt unsafe and there were high levels of violence. Prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm did not always receive adequate care. There was little done to improve safety by identifying and addressing patterns or trends in violent and self-harm incidents. Security was reasonably well managed but closed visits were overused. Too few prisoners suspected of taking drugs were tested. The incentives and earned privileges scheme was reasonably good. The use of force was low but insufficiently monitored and analysed. The use of segregation was high and the unit had a poor environment and regime, but stays were short. The integrated drug treatment system was hampered by staff shortages and an unsuitable environment. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

All incidents of violence should be addressed and reported. Prisoners should be consulted on their perceptions of safety, and all data relating to violence should be collated and analysed to identify trends and take action to improve safety. (HP47)

Achieved

Segregation should only be used exceptionally and as a last resort for prisoners in crisis and at risk of suicide and self-harm. The constant observation cell in segregation should not be used, and the constant observation cells in E wing should not be used for mainstream prisoners. (HP48)

Achieved

Recommendations

Trained prisoner peer supporters should be available in reception. (1.13)

Achieved

Staff should have a meaningful private interview with all new arrivals before they are locked up on their first night to identify and address any needs or concerns. (1.14)

Achieved

New arrivals should be able to make a free telephone call. (1.15)

Achieved

A formal intervention should be introduced to deal with prisoners who persistently bully others. (1.28)

Partially achieved

There should be a protocol and criteria for admission to the vulnerable prisoner unit, and the reasons for prisoners applying to go on the unit should be fully investigated and recorded. (1.29)
Achieved

Case management arrangements for prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) monitoring should be improved and should be evidenced by good quality interactive and supportive entries in monitoring documents and support plans. (1.37)
Partially achieved

Information on self-harming behaviour should be used to identify trends and patterns of behaviour by location, type, age, timing and peripheral circumstances of individual incidents, and this analysis should be updated regularly. (1.38)
Achieved

There should be a sufficient number of trained Listeners. (1.39)
Partially achieved

All prisoners should have good access to the Samaritans telephone. (1.40)
Achieved

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. (1.45)
Not achieved

The suspicion drug testing programme should be sufficiently resourced so that all prisoners suspected of taking drugs are tested within required timescales and without gaps in provision. (1.54)
Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.48)

Closed visits should only be applied when there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits, and prisoners should not be required to provide a negative drug test before closed visits are lifted. (1.55)
Achieved

All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached, and the quality assurance of adjudication records should be improved. (1.65)
Achieved

Information collated for all areas of discipline, including disciplinary procedures, use of force and segregation, should be analysed and used more effectively. (1.66)
Achieved

Managerial oversight of all aspects of use of force should be improved. (1.70)
Partially achieved

The regime for prisoners in the segregation unit should be improved. (1.76)
Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.75)

There should be appropriate facilities to observe and monitor prisoners during stabilisation/detoxification. In the absence of a designated unit, observation hatches should be fitted on the first night landing. (1.85)
Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.87)

Prescribing regimes for opiate-dependent prisoners should adhere to national guidance, and there should be regular multidisciplinary treatment reviews. (1.86)
Achieved

Controlled medication should be administered in a safe and suitable environment, and wing officers should be consistently available to supervise prisoners. (1.87)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.88)

Support services should be extended and include a structured drug/alcohol programme, peer support and the development of a recovery unit. (1.88)

Partially achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2012, outside and communal areas were dirty and littered. Cells were generally clean but poorly ventilated. Access to daily showers was good. Clothing supplies and laundry arrangements were inadequate. Applications and complaints were generally fair and timely but the number of complaints was very high. Staff-prisoner relationships were reasonable and most prisoners said staff treated them with respect. The standard of food was good. Equality and diversity work was poorly managed and underdeveloped. Black and minority ethnic and foreign national prisoners said they were treated less favourably than white and British prisoners across many areas. Clinical support for prisoners with disabilities was good but care planning on the wings was poor. Facilities for older prisoners were very limited. Health provision was reasonably good but prisoners waited too long to access key services, including the doctor and dentist. Mental health services were satisfactory. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test

Main recommendations

Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners with protected characteristics are identified, assessed and met, and any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (HP49)

Achieved

The prison should work with the United Kingdom Border Agency to ensure that decisions on the future of foreign national prisoners are expedited. (HP50)

Achieved

Recommendations

The standards of cleanliness in communal and outside areas should be improved and maintained. (2.9)

Achieved

Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two. (2.10)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.7)

Toilets in all cells should be adequately screened. (2.11)

Achieved

Communal showers should provide privacy and be kept clean and in a good state of repair. (2.12)

Partially achieved

There should be adequate clothing available each week for all prisoners. (2.13)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.9)

Equality of prisoner treatment and access to the regime should be monitored for all protected characteristics and appropriate action taken to rectify any inequalities. (2.29)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.22)

All staff should be given cultural awareness training. (2.30)

Not achieved

A weekly Mass should be provided for all Catholic prisoners. (2.42)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.42)

The prison should analyse the data on complaints to identify and take action as necessary. (2.47)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.47)

A senior manager should represent the prison at the prison partnership board. (2.66)

Achieved

There should be a health needs assessment to ensure that services meet prisoner health needs. (2.67)

Achieved

Prisoners should be taken to their health care appointments on time, and reasons for late or non-attendance should be investigated and addressed. (2.73)

Achieved

Prisoners should have access to pharmacy clinics and medication advice. (2.89)

Achieved

Arrangements for medication administration should ensure that prisoners are given their medication in confidence and safely. (2.90)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.71)

Prescribing for pain management should adhere to best professional practice and national guidelines for safe prescribing in prisons. (2.91)

Achieved

The in-possession risk assessment should include risk ranking of individual medications. (2.92)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.72)

Prisoners with urgent dentistry need, such as pain or infection, should be seen within a reasonable timescale. (2.105)

Achieved

The reasons for non-attendance at dental appointments should be explored. (2.106)

Achieved

Mental health service staff vacancies should be filled as soon as possible. (2.113)

Achieved

There should be adequate consultation spaces to ensure prompt mental health treatment. (2.114)

Achieved

All key clinical and risk information on mental health service patients should be accessible to all health professionals. (2.115)

Achieved

All prison staff should be trained in mental health awareness. (2.116)

Achieved

New arrivals should be offered the choice of a smoker's or non-smoker's reception pack. (2.126)

Achieved

Prisoners from minority groups should be consulted about items in the prison shop that meet their needs. (2.127)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

Prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them.

At the last inspection, in 2012, time unlocked was inadequate for most prisoners and particularly poor for those unemployed. Far too many prisoners were locked up during the core day. Regime slippage was frequent and roll check difficulties disrupted the regime. There were insufficient activity places but even these were significantly underused. The range of education provision was generally adequate. There were insufficient vocational training opportunities for more able prisoners. Achievements were generally good. Prisoner access to the library was poor, and to PE was only reasonable for employed prisoners, but health promotion was good. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

[The number of work, education and vocational training places should be increased, and attendance at activity should be monitored and non-attendance robustly challenged and disruptions urgently resolved. (HP51)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Roll check arrangements should be improved, and prisoners should be unlocked and attend activities as published. (3.5)

Achieved

The provision of activities should be based on an up-to-date analysis of prisoner needs and local employment information. (3.13)

Achieved

Allocation of prisoners to activities should be effective and take account of their sentence plans, and waiting lists should be prioritised to address prisoners' needs. (3.14)

Achieved

Higher-level qualifications should be introduced in the vocational and production workshops to enable prisoners to progress. (3.21)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 3.22)

The prison should improve the uptake of accredited training for prisoners in work. (3.22)

Achieved

There should be extension activities to meet the needs of more able learners. (3.28)

Achieved

The planning of learning and progress reviews for vocational training courses should be improved. (3.29)

Achieved

The prison should improve the extraction facilities in the building craft and joinery workshops and reduce the impact of workshop woodcutting machinery noise. (3.30)

No longer relevant

Outcomes on courses in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) should be improved. (3.37)

Achieved

All learners should receive adequate help to develop their language skills. (3.38)

Achieved

Library opening should be extended to weekdays. (3.42)

Achieved

The library should carry out an annual needs analysis and survey to ensure that the service is suitable for the population. (3.43)

Achieved

All prisoners should have access to at least two PE sessions a week. (3.52)

Achieved

The PE shower and changing room floor should be repaired. (3.53)

Achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2012, strategic management of resettlement was weak and not informed by an effective needs analysis. The needs of the many remand and short-term prisoners were addressed but the minority of sentenced prisoners who stayed too long did not have their needs met. Not all high risk prisoners had a sentence plan. Prisoner-offender supervisor contact was unplanned and reactive. Most prisoners on home detention curfew were released late. Public protection and categorisation processes were sound. Provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners was limited. Resettlement pathway work was better than we often see in similar prisons. Children and family work was especially good, but there was a lack of offending behaviour courses to meet need and little opportunity for prisoners to progress. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The offending behaviour needs of the population should be analysed and suitable offending behaviour courses introduced. (HP52)

Not achieved

Recommendations

There should be a current reducing reoffending strategy and action plan, including the provision of offending behaviour work and release on temporary licence, based on a comprehensive needs analysis of the population. (4.7)

Partially achieved

There should be formal systems for staff throughout the prison to exchange information about risk of harm and likelihood of reoffending with offender supervisors. (4.14)

Achieved

All prisoners serving over 12 months should have an OASys (offender assessment system) assessment and plan, and those serving under 12 months and remand prisoners should have a formal custody and release plan. (4.15)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be released for home detention curfew at their earliest eligibility date. (4.16)

Partially achieved

The transfer of category B sexual offenders should not be delayed. (4.21)

Partially achieved

Provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be improved and include forums and family days. (4.25)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.31)

All sentenced prisoners should have a comprehensive pre-release plan covering all resettlement needs. (4.29)

Achieved

The number of homeless prisoners helped to find accommodation on release should be monitored. (4.32)

Partially achieved

Prisoners' outcomes and destinations on release should be tracked to assess the effectiveness of prison interventions. (4.37)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to open bank accounts before their release and access a financial capability course. (4.41)

Partially achieved

Prisoners, particularly those on remand, should have more visits each month. (4.48)

Achieved

The visits waiting and reception areas should be improved as a matter of urgency, and visit sessions should start on time. (4.49)

Achieved

Appendix III: 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	10	451	68.1
Recall	3	66	10.2
Convicted unsentenced	3	34	5.5
Remand	5	65	10.3
Civil prisoners	0	0	0.0
Detainees	1	23	3.5
Other	0	16	2.4
Total	21	656	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	8	126	19.8
Less than six months	2	55	8.4
six months to less than 12 months	1	51	7.7
12 months to less than 2 years	3	80	12.3
2 years to less than 4 years	1	77	11.5
4 years to less than 10 years	1	59	8.9
10 years and over (not life)	5	124	19.1
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	45	6.6
Life	0	39	5.8
Total	21	656	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 18	-	-
Under 21 years	21	3.1
21 years to 29 years	248	36.6
30 years to 39 years	211	31.2
40 years to 49 years	118	17.4
50 years to 59 years	47	6.9
60 years to 69 years	24	3.5
70 plus years	8	1.2
Please state maximum age here: 81	-	-
Total		100

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	18	569	86.7
Foreign nationals	3	82	12.6
Not stated	0	5	0.7
Total	21	656	100

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	7	121	18.9
Uncategorised sentenced	2	17	2.8
Category A	0	0	0

Category B	1	52	7.8
Category C	0	397	58.6
Category D	0	68	10
Other	11	1	1.8
Total	21	656	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	16	500	76.2
Irish	0	1	0.1
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	1	0.1
Other white	3	57	8.9
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	18	2.7
White and black African	0	1	0.1
White and Asian	1	1	0.3
Other mixed	0	4	0.6
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	11	1.6
Pakistani	0	7	1
Bangladeshi	1	2	0.4
Chinese	0	0	0
Other Asian	0	5	0.7
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	20	3
African	0	16	2.4
Other black	0	8	1.2
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	2	0.3
Other ethnic group	0	1	0.1
Not stated			
Total	21	656	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	1	0.1
Church of England	2	104	15.7
Roman Catholic	4	83	12.9
Other Christian denominations	1	82	12.3
Muslim	3	50	7.8
Sikh	0	6	0.9
Hindu	0	3	0.4
Buddhist	1	14	2.2
Jewish	0	1	0.1
Other	0	14	2
No religion	10	298	45.5
Total	21	656	100

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	Not supplied		
Total			

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	6	0.9	124	18.3
1 month to 3 months	2	0.3	184	27.2
3 months to six months	5	0.7	105	15.5
six months to 1 year	0	0.0	67	9.9
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	32	4.7
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	18	2.7
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	13	1.9	530	78.3

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	1	23	100
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).			
Total			

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	5	0.7	51	7.5
1 month to 3 months	1	0.1	34	5.0
3 months to six months	2	0.3	25	3.7
six months to 1 year	0	0.0	13	1.9
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	3	0.4
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	0	0.0
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	8	1.2	126	18.6

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

Appendix IV: 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.

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who do not read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 23 October 2013, the prisoner population at HMP Lincoln was 702. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 201 prisoners.

We received a total of 176 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 88%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Six respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 13 questionnaires were not returned and six were returned blank.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	49
B	32
C	51
D	43
Segregation unit	1

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Lincoln.

First a full breakdown of responses is provided for each question. In this full breakdown all percentages, including those for filtered questions, refer to the full sample. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences are indicated by shading.⁷ Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation of how the filter has been applied. Percentages for filtered questions refer to the number of respondents filtered to that question. For all other questions, percentages refer to the entire sample. All missing responses have been excluded from analyses.

Percentages shown in the full breakdown may differ slightly from those shown in the comparative analyses. This is because the data have been weighted to enable valid statistical comparison between establishments.

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Lincoln in 2013 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 35 local prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Lincoln in 2013 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Lincoln in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the VP wing (E) and the rest of the establishment.

⁷ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

Section I: About You

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		63 (36%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		56 (32%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		31 (18%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		13 (7%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		2 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		136 (77%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		13 (7%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		13 (7%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		5 (3%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		27 (16%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		22 (13%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		22 (13%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		21 (12%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		29 (17%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		27 (16%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>Life</i>		6 (4%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	<i>Yes</i>		28 (16%)
	<i>No</i>		146 (84%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		168 (97%)
	<i>No</i>		5 (3%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		166 (96%)
	<i>No</i>		7 (4%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	124 (72%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	18 (10%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Arab</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 3 (2%)

Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi 2 (1%)

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

Yes 10 (6%)
No 158 (94%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	47 (27%)	<i>Hindu</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Church of England</i>	54 (31%)	<i>Jewish</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Catholic</i>	32 (18%)	<i>Muslim</i>	14 (8%)
<i>Protestant</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Sikh</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	11 (6%)	<i>Other</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	2 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/ Straight 163 (95%)
Homosexual/Gay 4 (2%)
Bisexual 5 (3%)

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 40 (23%)
No 134 (77%)

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

Yes 5 (3%)
No 168 (97%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes 66 (38%)
No 109 (62%)

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

Yes 96 (55%)
No 80 (45%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

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

Less than 2 hours 109 (62%)
2 hours or longer 52 (30%)
Don't remember 14 (8%)

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

My journey was less than two hours 109 (63%)
Yes 35 (20%)
No 22 (13%)
Don't remember 6 (3%)

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

My journey was less than two hours 109 (63%)
Yes 7 (4%)
No 51 (30%)
Don't remember 5 (3%)

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?		
	Yes		119 (69%)
	No		41 (24%)
	Don't remember		12 (7%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?		
	Yes		143 (82%)
	No		29 (17%)
	Don't remember		2 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?		
	Very well		49 (28%)
	Well		87 (50%)
	Neither		26 (15%)
	Badly		6 (3%)
	Very badly		5 (3%)
	Don't remember		1 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Yes, someone told me		121 (69%)
	Yes, I received written information		18 (10%)
	No, I was not told anything		31 (18%)
	Don't remember		8 (5%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?		
	Yes		151 (86%)
	No		19 (11%)
	Don't remember		5 (3%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?			
	Less than 2 hours		61 (35%)	
	2 hours or longer		104 (60%)	
	Don't remember		9 (5%)	
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?			
	Yes		148 (87%)	
	No		19 (11%)	
	Don't remember		4 (2%)	
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well		43 (25%)	
	Well		88 (51%)	
	Neither		20 (11%)	
	Badly		16 (9%)	
	Very badly		5 (3%)	
	Don't remember		2 (1%)	
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Loss of property	26 (15%)	Physical health	32 (19%)
	Housing problems	31 (18%)	Mental health	35 (20%)
	Contacting employers	6 (4%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	15 (9%)
	Contacting family	62 (36%)	Getting phone numbers	45 (26%)

	<i>Childcare</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Other</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	30 (18%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	41 (24%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	36 (21%)		
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?			
	<i>Yes</i>			47 (28%)
	<i>No</i>			77 (47%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>			41 (25%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Tobacco</i>			139 (80%)
	<i>A shower</i>			32 (18%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>			61 (35%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>			114 (66%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>			60 (34%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>			90 (52%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>			10 (6%)
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>			89 (52%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>			117 (69%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>			41 (24%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>			60 (35%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>			24 (14%)
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>			59 (36%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>			58 (35%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>			50 (30%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>			50 (30%)
	<i>Health services</i>			67 (40%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>			61 (37%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>			65 (39%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?			
	<i>Yes</i>			126 (72%)
	<i>No</i>			44 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>			4 (2%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?			
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>			15 (9%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>			115 (66%)
	<i>More than a week</i>			40 (23%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>			4 (2%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?			
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>			15 (9%)
	<i>Yes</i>			90 (52%)
	<i>No</i>			59 (34%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>			10 (6%)

Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	39 (23%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	37 (22%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	81 (48%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	12 (7%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	16 (10%)	40 (24%)	24 (14%)	38 (23%)	17 (10%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	16 (10%)	49 (32%)	23 (15%)	12 (8%)	13 (8%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	7 (5%)	21 (14%)	23 (16%)	17 (12%)	14 (10%)
						N/A
						33 (20%)
						42 (27%)
						65 (44%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					29 (17%)
	<i>Yes</i>					68 (40%)
	<i>No</i>					74 (43%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	<i>Yes</i>					76 (46%)
	<i>No</i>					16 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					75 (45%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	84 (48%)	86 (49%)	4 (2%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	150 (86%)	20 (11%)	4 (2%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	137 (79%)	26 (15%)	10 (6%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	98 (57%)	67 (39%)	8 (5%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	46 (27%)	111 (65%)	15 (9%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	114 (66%)	54 (31%)	4 (2%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	40 (24%)	80 (47%)	49 (29%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	<i>Very good</i>					3 (2%)
	<i>Good</i>					37 (22%)
	<i>Neither</i>					42 (24%)
	<i>Bad</i>					53 (31%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					37 (22%)
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>					7 (4%)
	<i>Yes</i>					81 (47%)
	<i>No</i>					84 (49%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?					
	<i>Yes</i>					97 (55%)
	<i>No</i>					18 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					60 (34%)

Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	84 (48%)
	No	23 (13%)
	Don't know/ N/A	67 (39%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	83 (49%)
	No	15 (9%)
	Don't know/ N/A	72 (42%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	45 (26%)
	Very easy	31 (18%)
	Easy	32 (18%)
	Neither	12 (7%)
	Difficult	12 (7%)
	Very difficult	9 (5%)
	Don't know	32 (18%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	126 (73%)
	No	41 (24%)
	Don't know	5 (3%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (<i>If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	11 (7%) 81 (50%) 71 (44%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	11 (7%) 55 (36%) 88 (57%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	82 (49%)
	No	39 (23%)
	Don't know	46 (28%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (<i>If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	75 (44%) 26 (15%) 70 (41%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	75 (46%) 27 (16%) 62 (38%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	34 (21%)
	No	125 (79%)
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>	65 (38%)
	Very easy	12 (7%)
	Easy	21 (12%)
	Neither	37 (22%)
	Difficult	21 (12%)
	Very difficult	13 (8%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	25 (14%)
	Yes	70 (40%)
	No	50 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	30 (17%)
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>	25 (15%)
	Yes	54 (32%)
	No	67 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	22 (13%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	11 (6%)
	No	160 (94%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	144 (87%)
	Very well	4 (2%)
	Well	4 (2%)
	Neither	7 (4%)
	Badly	2 (1%)
	Very badly	5 (3%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	130 (76%)
	No	41 (24%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	114 (68%)
	No	54 (32%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	44 (26%)
	No	128 (74%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	12 (7%)
	Never	48 (28%)
	Rarely	39 (23%)
	Some of the time	48 (28%)
	Most of the time	13 (8%)
	All of the time	11 (6%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	100 (58%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	30 (17%)

Don't remember 16 (9%)

Q7.6 How helpful is your personal (named) officer?

Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her 100 (58%)
 Very helpful 19 (11%)
 Helpful 27 (16%)
 Neither 11 (6%)
 Not very helpful 9 (5%)
 Not at all helpful 5 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?

Yes 71 (41%)
 No 101 (59%)

Q8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?

Yes 36 (21%)
 No 133 (79%)

Q8.3 In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Never felt unsafe	101 (61%)	At meal times	13 (8%)
Everywhere	18 (11%)	At health services	11 (7%)
Segregation unit	3 (2%)	Visits area	11 (7%)
Association areas	21 (13%)	In wing showers	16 (10%)
Reception area	6 (4%)	In gym showers	6 (4%)
At the gym	6 (4%)	In corridors/stairwells	9 (5%)
In an exercise yard	12 (7%)	On your landing/wing	20 (12%)
At work	12 (7%)	In your cell	14 (8%)
During movement	12 (7%)	At religious services	4 (2%)
At education	6 (4%)		

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

Yes 54 (31%)
 No 120 (69%)

Q8.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	19 (11%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	15 (9%)
Sexual abuse	6 (3%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated	21 (12%)
Having your canteen/property taken	13 (7%)
Medication	6 (3%)
Debt	3 (2%)
Drugs	4 (2%)
Your race or ethnic origin	7 (4%)
Your religion/religious beliefs	10 (6%)
Your nationality	7 (4%)
You are from a different part of the country than others	9 (5%)
You are from a traveller community	4 (2%)
Your sexual orientation	3 (2%)
Your age	4 (2%)
You have a disability	3 (2%)
You were new here	12 (7%)
Your offence/ crime	6 (3%)

	<i>Gang related issues</i>	6 (3%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	50 (29%)
	No	124 (71%)
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>	14 (8%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Medication</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	4 (2%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	104 (64%)
	Yes	24 (15%)
	No	34 (21%)

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	20 (12%)	8 (5%)	20 (12%)	16 (9%)	56 (33%)	49 (29%)
	The nurse	16 (10%)	18 (11%)	50 (30%)	21 (13%)	38 (23%)	23 (14%)
	The dentist	29 (17%)	5 (3%)	11 (7%)	12 (7%)	49 (30%)	60 (36%)
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	39 (23%)	13 (8%)	33 (20%)	33 (20%)	25 (15%)	26 (15%)
	The nurse	16 (10%)	34 (20%)	41 (24%)	36 (21%)	19 (11%)	22 (13%)
	The dentist	58 (35%)	16 (10%)	20 (12%)	25 (15%)	19 (11%)	30 (18%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>					12 (7%)	
	<i>Very good</i>					14 (8%)	
	<i>Good</i>					42 (25%)	
	<i>Neither</i>					34 (21%)	
	<i>Bad</i>					27 (16%)	
	<i>Very bad</i>					36 (22%)	
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes					84 (49%)	
	No					89 (51%)	

Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	89 (52%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	29 (17%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	32 (19%)
	<i>No</i>	22 (13%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	<i>Yes</i>	64 (38%)
	<i>No</i>	106 (62%)
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>	106 (64%)
	<i>Yes</i>	30 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	30 (18%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	50 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	119 (70%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	36 (21%)
	<i>No</i>	132 (79%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	34 (20%)
	<i>Easy</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	90 (54%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Neither</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	104 (63%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	160 (95%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	156 (92%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	114 (71%)
	<i>Yes</i>	34 (21%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (8%)

Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?)	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	132 (80%)
	Yes	20 (12%)
	No	13 (8%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	116 (74%)
	Yes	35 (22%)
	No	6 (4%)

Section II: 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	23 (14%)	10 (6%)	38 (23%)	21 (13%)	38 (23%)	35 (21%)
	Vocational or skills training	43 (27%)	9 (6%)	35 (22%)	17 (11%)	31 (19%)	24 (15%)
	Education (including basic skills)	30 (18%)	21 (13%)	52 (32%)	15 (9%)	28 (17%)	17 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	68 (42%)	5 (3%)	14 (9%)	19 (12%)	25 (16%)	30 (19%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					62 (39%)	
	Prison job					73 (46%)	
	Vocational or skills training					10 (6%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					39 (25%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					4 (3%)	
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	47 (31%)	33 (22%)	52 (34%)	20 (13%)		
	Vocational or skills training	60 (48%)	20 (16%)	30 (24%)	16 (13%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	47 (32%)	45 (31%)	40 (28%)	13 (9%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	68 (55%)	13 (11%)	27 (22%)	15 (12%)		
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					24 (15%)	
	<i>Never</i>					19 (12%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					32 (19%)	
	<i>About once a week</i>					74 (45%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i>					16 (10%)	
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>					36 (22%)	
	Yes					73 (45%)	
	No					54 (33%)	
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					38 (23%)	
	<i>0</i>					50 (31%)	
	<i>1 to 2</i>					37 (23%)	
	<i>3 to 5</i>					33 (20%)	
	<i>More than 5</i>					5 (3%)	

Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	40 (25%)
	0	39 (24%)
	1 to 2	52 (32%)
	3 to 5	19 (12%)
	More than 5	12 (7%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	4 (2%)
	0	9 (6%)
	1 to 2	50 (31%)
	3 to 5	32 (20%)
	More than 5	68 (42%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	32 (19%)
	2 to less than 4 hours	40 (24%)
	4 to less than 6 hours	32 (19%)
	6 to less than 8 hours	29 (17%)
	8 to less than 10 hours	6 (4%)
	10 hours or more	18 (11%)
	Don't know	11 (7%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	61 (37%)
	No	106 (63%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	85 (51%)
	No	81 (49%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	50 (30%)
	No	118 (70%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	29 (18%)
	Very easy	15 (9%)
	Easy	25 (15%)
	Neither	9 (5%)
	Difficult	29 (18%)
	Very difficult	52 (32%)
	Don't know	6 (4%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	27 (16%)
	Yes	94 (56%)
	No	47 (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.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	74 (44%)
	<i>No contact</i>	36 (22%)
	<i>Letter</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Phone</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Visit</i>	38 (23%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	81 (51%)
	<i>No</i>	78 (49%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Yes</i>	47 (28%)
	<i>No</i>	94 (56%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	121 (72%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Involved</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>Neither</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	11 (7%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	121 (75%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	5 (3%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	121 (72%)
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>No</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	13 (8%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	121 (72%)
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	23 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	15 (9%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	121 (72%)
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	19 (11%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	<i>Yes</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	80 (50%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	73 (46%)

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

Yes	19 (12%)
No	142 (88%)

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	41 (26%)	35 (23%)	79 (51%)
Accommodation	40 (26%)	49 (32%)	64 (42%)
Benefits	37 (24%)	55 (36%)	62 (40%)
Finances	40 (27%)	32 (21%)	78 (52%)
Education	40 (27%)	34 (23%)	73 (50%)
Drugs and alcohol	48 (33%)	40 (28%)	56 (39%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i>	27 (17%)
Yes	44 (27%)
No	90 (56%)

Appendix V: Photographs

Damage to the fittings and fabric of a segregation cell wall.



Potential ligature points exposed by damage to the segregation cell ceiling.





Main comparator and comparator to last time

Prisoner survey responses HMP Lincoln 2013

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

Key to tables

		HMP Lincoln 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Lincoln 2013	HMP Lincoln 2012
	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		176	5923	176	147
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	3%	6%	3%	2%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	85%	67%	85%	83%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	9%	7%	17%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	26%	21%	26%	21%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	5%	3%	5%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	16%	13%	16%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	98%	97%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	96%	96%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	16%	25%	16%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	5%	6%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	12%	8%	8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	5%	3%	5%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	23%	22%	23%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	5%	3%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	38%	31%	38%	29%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	55%	54%	55%	57%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	30%	19%	30%	28%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	56%	38%	56%	55%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	10%	11%	11%
2.4	Was the van clean?	69%	61%	69%	73%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	82%	76%	82%	82%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	78%	67%	78%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	69%	65%	69%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	10%	4%	10%	12%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	86%	81%	86%	83%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	35%	47%	35%	37%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	77%	87%	87%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lincoln 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Lincoln 2013	HMP Lincoln 2012
	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				
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	75%	63%	75%	70%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	76%	74%	76%	82%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	15%	15%	15%	10%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	18%	23%	18%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	6%	4%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	36%	31%	36%	39%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	5%	4%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	18%	23%	18%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	21%	21%	21%	14%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	19%	17%	19%	15%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	21%	20%	21%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	8%	9%	7%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	26%	29%	26%	27%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	38%	35%	38%	48%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	80%	85%	80%	82%
3.6	A shower?	18%	34%	18%	16%
3.6	A free telephone call?	35%	60%	35%	8%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	76%	66%	59%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	34%	59%	34%	24%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	52%	61%	52%	49%
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?	52%	47%	52%	52%
3.7	Someone from health services?	69%	71%	69%	77%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	24%	37%	24%	34%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	35%	18%	35%	40%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	36%	49%	36%	40%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	47%	35%	42%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	30%	42%	30%	42%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	30%	46%	30%	37%
3.8	Health services?	40%	52%	40%	57%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	37%	47%	37%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	72%	74%	72%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	80%	91%	92%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Lincoln 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Lincoln 2013	HMP Lincoln 2012
	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				
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	57%	58%	57%	58%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	77%	73%	77%	77%
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?	33%	41%	33%	45%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	42%	58%	42%	56%
4.1	Get bail information?	19%	22%	19%	14%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	40%	39%	40%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	46%	37%	46%	45%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	48%	55%	48%	56%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	86%	77%	86%	95%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	79%	80%	79%	85%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	57%	60%	57%	67%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	27%	36%	27%	40%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	66%	64%	66%	65%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	24%	25%	24%	31%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	23%	23%	23%	42%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	47%	47%	42%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	55%	57%	55%	63%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	53%	48%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	49%	53%	49%	57%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	36%	47%	36%	44%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	78%	73%	86%
For those who have made an application:					
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	53%	57%	53%	75%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	38%	45%	38%	67%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	52%	49%	64%
For those who have made a complaint:					
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	27%	32%	27%	51%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	30%	34%	30%	68%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	21%	18%	21%	11%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	20%	22%	20%	29%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	40%	46%	40%	56%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	32%	45%	32%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lincoln 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Lincoln 2013	HMP Lincoln 2012
	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				
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	7%	7%	7%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	36%	37%	36%	45%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	74%	76%	84%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	68%	74%	68%	82%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	26%	30%	26%	38%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	19%	14%	26%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	42%	46%	42%	60%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	65%	65%	65%	62%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	41%	39%	41%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	16%	21%	24%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	31%	24%	31%	31%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	11%	11%	14%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	7%	9%	8%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	1%	4%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	14%	12%	14%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	5%	8%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	5%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	4%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	2%	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	3%	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	5%	7%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	4%	4%	6%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	27%	29%	26%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Lincoln 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Lincoln 2013	HMP Lincoln 2012
	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				
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	11%	8%	6%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	12%	8%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	5%	6%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	4%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%	6%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	5%	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%	2%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	41%	32%	41%	40%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	17%	26%	17%	26%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	41%	49%	41%	62%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	10%	10%	10%	13%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	36%	44%	36%	51%
9.2	The nurse?	49%	55%	49%	74%
9.2	The dentist?	33%	31%	33%	44%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	37%	38%	37%	44%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	50%	49%	48%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	73%	62%	73%	66%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	38%	35%	38%	31%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	50%	42%	50%	54%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	30%	34%	30%	28%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Lincoln 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Lincoln 2013	HMP Lincoln 2012
	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				
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	22%	26%	22%	24%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	32%	29%	32%	34%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	14%	13%	14%	21%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	5%	8%	5%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%	8%	8%	5%
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	72%	62%	72%	80%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	61%	60%	61%	62%
For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:					
10.9	Was the support helpful?	85%	77%	85%	90%
SECTION 11: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	29%	31%	29%	47%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	28%	29%	28%	33%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	45%	43%	45%	45%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	12%	19%	12%	14%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	46%	44%	46%	61%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	6%	10%	6%	8%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	25%	27%	25%	21%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	3%	8%	3%	4%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	69%	69%	69%	77%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	32%	41%	32%	45%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	52%	56%	52%	54%
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?	30%	48%	30%	60%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	68%	67%	68%	58%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	46%	54%	46%	68%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	45%	53%	45%	44%
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?	24%	45%	24%	46%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	55%	33%	55%	59%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	45%	34%	45%	53%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	23%	30%	23%	32%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	19%	40%	19%	38%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	42%	43%	42%	82%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables		HMP Lincoln 2013	Local prisons comparator	HMP Lincoln 2013	HMP Lincoln 2012
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	11%	10%	11%	14%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	37%	34%	37%	34%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	51%	47%	51%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	30%	33%	30%	28%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	24%	38%	24%	31%
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?	67%	61%	67%	64%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	39%	43%	39%	42%
13.2	Contact by letter?	30%	28%	30%	30%
13.2	Contact by phone?	9%	13%	9%	19%
13.2	Contact by visit?	41%	36%	41%	30%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	51%	31%	51%	33%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	33%	39%	33%	32%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	59%	57%	59%	46%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	42%	44%	42%	41%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	29%	32%	29%	34%
13.6	Offender manager?	27%	27%	27%	37%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	5%	12%	5%	12%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	12%	19%	12%	25%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	40%	60%	40%	31%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	19%	26%	19%	30%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	30%	32%	30%	38%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	7%	4%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	12%	14%	12%	12%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	31%	30%	31%	36%
13.12	Accommodation?	44%	39%	44%	55%
13.12	Benefits?	47%	40%	47%	59%
13.12	Finances?	29%	24%	29%	39%
13.12	Education?	32%	30%	32%	49%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	42%	46%	42%	60%
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?	33%	47%	33%	41%



Diversity analysis

Key question responses (ethnicity and foreign national) HMP Lincoln 2013

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		27	146	28	146
1.3	Are you sentenced?	78%	86%	64%	88%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	41%	12%		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	98%	89%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	97%	82%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			39%	11%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	7%	4%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	44%	1%	32%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	7%	26%	7%	26%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	4%	11%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	52%	35%	64%	32%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	63%	81%	67%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	56%	71%	56%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	87%	63%	91%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	77%	59%	78%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	73%	77%	65%	78%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	69%	69%	59%	71%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63%	74%	61%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	89%	92%	96%	90%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	30%	34%	35%	33%

Key to tables

Diversity analysis

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British 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?	37%	50%	57%	47%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	74%	89%	86%	87%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	22%	28%	43%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	25%	25%	23%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	15%	53%	39%	49%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	37%	59%	29%	61%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	47%	46%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	46%	48%	54%	48%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	68%	74%	81%	72%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	44%	50%	39%	51%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	30%	43%	29%	43%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	29%	33%	27%	34%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	15%	5%	22%	4%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	69%	77%	70%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	54%	70%	73%	68%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	11%	14%	12%	14%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	37%	43%	36%	43%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	46%	40%	46%	40%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	19%	22%	22%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	42%	29%	36%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	8%	12%	7%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	19%	1%	11%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	12%	5%	11%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	12%	3%	14%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	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				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	50%	25%	36%	26%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	12%	6%	4%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	27%	2%	11%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	4%	4%	7%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	8%	2%	14%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	8%	18%	15%	17%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	21%	44%	31%	44%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	27%	53%	19%	55%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	19%	41%	22%	40%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	35%	16%	36%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	44%	46%	56%	44%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	4%	7%	12%	5%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	13%	27%	36%	22%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	2%	4%	2%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	56%	54%	60%	54%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	16%	24%	20%	24%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	18%	20%	24%	18%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	39%	43%	33%	44%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	15%	10%	7%	12%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	62%	49%	48%	52%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	52%	26%	30%	30%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability and age over 50) HMP Lincoln 2013

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

Key to tables

		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		40	134	20	155
1.3	Are you sentenced?	85%	85%	85%	85%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	19%	5%	17%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	98%	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	96%	100%	95%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	5%	19%	5%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	8%	5%	11%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	9%	5%	8%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	5%	9%	55%	18%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	2%	5%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	23%	41%	55%	35%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	81%	70%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	74%	67%	80%	68%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	88%	90%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79%	75%	68%	77%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	92%	73%	79%	76%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	64%	70%	58%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	66%	74%	74%	73%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	85%	94%	90%	92%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	30%	33%	33%

Key to tables

Diversity Analysis

		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				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	44%	49%	53%	47%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	85%	86%	84%	87%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	18%	28%	26%	27%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	29%	21%	22%	24%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	46%	47%	28%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	69%	52%	63%	55%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	54%	46%	63%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	44%	68%	46%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	74%	53%	76%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	46%	44%	50%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	51%	37%	58%	38%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	36%	32%	35%	32%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	5%	11%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	74%	95%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	72%	66%	84%	66%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	16%	14%	16%	13%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	43%	42%	63%	40%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	54%	38%	47%	40%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	35%	17%	26%	21%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	46%	27%	47%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	15%	11%	16%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	5%	0%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	10%	5%	5%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	5%	0%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	5%	2%	11%	1%

Diversity Analysis

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				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	8%	0%	0%	2%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	25%	37%	27%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	5%	11%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	3%	7%	0%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	8%	3%	5%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	10%	2%	16%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	8%	0%	5%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	29%	13%	17%	17%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	54%	37%	50%	40%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	79%	40%	90%	44%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	72%	29%	28%	39%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	34%	11%	35%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	29%	51%	37%	48%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	8%	5%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	26%	37%	23%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	2%	0%	3%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	63%	53%	78%	52%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	12%	26%	6%	26%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	18%	20%	18%	19%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	42%	42%	44%	41%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9%	11%	17%	10%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	55%	56%	51%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	33%	28%	30%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Lincoln - VP Analysis

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	E Wing	A, B and C Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		43	132
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	4%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	88%	83%
1.3	Are you on recall?	5%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	15%	30%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	5%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	18%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	96%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	95%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	12%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	10%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	12%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	42%	16%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	33%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	54%	55%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	40%	27%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	81%	82%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	86%	76%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	67%	70%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	86%	86%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	A, B and C Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	33%	36%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	93%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	86%	72%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	83%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	17%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	15%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	37%	37%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	10%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	22%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	22%	18%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	20%	20%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	24%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	22%	27%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	65%	85%
3.6	A shower?	9%	22%
3.6	A free telephone call?	23%	39%
3.6	Something to eat?	58%	68%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	14%	41%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	54%	51%
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?	45%	54%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	A, B and C Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.7	Someone from health services?	60%	72%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	21%	25%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	29%	38%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	25%	39%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	35%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	30%	31%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	28%	31%
3.8	Health services?	28%	45%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	33%	39%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	64%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	86%	94%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	91%	72%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	31%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	42%	42%
4.1	Get bail information?	20%	19%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	42%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	49%	45%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	49%	49%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	86%	86%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	84%	78%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	47%	61%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	35%	24%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	74%	64%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	31%	22%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	A, B and C Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	24%	23%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	81%	47%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	44%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	44%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	48%	33%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	46%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	17%	22%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	32%	16%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44%	39%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	30%	33%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	6%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	83%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	74%	66%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	26%	25%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	12%	15%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	58%	37%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	52%	37%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	22%	21%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	49%	25%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		

Key to tables

		E Wing	A, B and C Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	9%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	9%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	23%	9%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	12%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	9%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	3%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	40%	25%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	8%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	21%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	7%	5%

Key to tables

		E Wing	A, B and C Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	2%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	26%	14%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	66%	33%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	12%	9%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	63%	43%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	35%	38%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	19%	33%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	19%	22%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	14%	38%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	5%	17%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	A, B and C Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	10%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	44%	25%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	37%	25%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	60%	40%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	16%	11%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	57%	43%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	2%	8%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	45%	17%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	2%	3%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	62%	52%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	45%	44%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	30%	21%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	20%	18%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	49%	39%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	7%	12%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	34%	37%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	50%	51%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	34%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	18%	27%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	67%	45%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	3%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	11%	12%