

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Send

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

3–14 February 2014

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 in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at:
<http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

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	17
Section 2. Respect	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	39
Section 4. Resettlement	45
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	55
Section 6. Appendices	61
Appendix I: Inspection team	61
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	63
Appendix III: Prison population profile	71
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	75

Introduction

Send prison in Surrey holds just over 280 convicted women prisoners, well over half of whom are serving very long or indeterminate sentences, often for quite serious offences. We last inspected in 2011 when we reported that Send was a settled institution with impressive features to aspects of its regime. This inspection has found that improvement has continued and Send is now a very successful prison. It is one of the few prisons to achieve our highest grading for outcomes across all four of our healthy prison tests.

We found Send to be a very safe institution and women were properly received and inducted when they arrived. In our survey most women told us that they felt safe and violent incidents were very rare. Problems when they occurred were usually restricted to verbal conflict, but the prison was not complacent and intervened to deal with such issues. Levels of self-harm continued to reduce and care for those who were vulnerable was good. There had been no self-inflicted deaths since our last inspection. Women with very complex needs were well managed but greater scrutiny was needed of the few occasions when women who threatened self-harm had been subject to force or placed in protective strip clothing. Safety was further underpinned by adult safeguarding arrangements that had been developed in conjunction with the local authority and other partners.

Security was applied with proportion and there was little evidence of significant illicit drug use, which was even more commendable given the number of women being released on temporary licence each day. It was also notable that women with alcohol issues now received appropriate support. Incentives and earned privileges (IEP) arrangements supported the safety of the prison but some requirements, notably that the hoods be cut off women's coats, were ridiculous. There was only limited need for formal disciplinary processes and there was little use of force. Commendably there was no segregation unit and the few women who occasionally required separation were supervised successfully on the wings.

Living conditions and the environment were generally very good and relationships between staff and prisoners were particularly strong. The promotion of equality and diversity was, however, unsophisticated and required attention, although most outcomes were reasonable. Gaining a better understanding of the concerns of some minority groups who, when surveyed, were less positive across a range of issues, was something the prison needed to do. Health services were good and mental health provision impressive. More women than usual said the food was good and all could dine in association. Some women were also able to prepare their own meals, which was another impressive feature of the prison.

Prisoners had a good amount of time out of cell, and reasonable access to the prison's well kept, clean grounds. Learning and skills provision was well managed with timetabling that sought to balance education and work and meet individual need. There was sufficient education, vocational training and work for all the women held with more courses planned. Some provision, however, was still not used efficiently. Achievement was high on most programmes but required improvement in functional skills such as English and maths. The library and gym were accessible, and provided good learning opportunities.

Resettlement services were much better than we often see, and offender management arrangements were good. While the backlog in assessments was well managed, this had increased since our previous inspection and needed ongoing attention. Women benefited from good opportunities for release on temporary licence, and assessment arrangements for this were suitably robust. Resettlement planning began on arrival and was followed up to the point of release with a good range of appropriate resettlement services offered. Support to maintain contact with families and friends was good, but family visits were over-subscribed and a specialist family support worker would have facilitated more bespoke and proactive support. Support for women who had been victims of

domestic violence or involved in sex work was embedded in some of the resettlement work offered, but nevertheless needed to be improved with more specific and identifiable interventions offered.

Perhaps the key feature of Send and the work that best defined the institution were the excellent range of interventions offered to address offending behaviour. These included the only therapeutic community for women prisoners currently available, and the psychologically informed physical environment (PIPE) unit, a facility seeking to address the needs of those with personality disorder. Other interventions addressed substance misuse, restorative justice as well as a range of other issues relevant to the risk of offending and harm.

In our report we highlight a number of relatively minor concerns that will assist the prison, but overall this is an excellent report that describes the work of a very effective prison. Women, some of whom are dealing with long sentences and considerable personal challenges and risks, are kept safely and in a prison that affords them respect. They use their time usefully and their risks are addressed meaningfully. This is not only a good prison; it is a useful and effective prison. The governor and staff should be congratulated on their success.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A closed adult female training prison.

Prison status

Public

Region

Greater London

Number held

272 on 5 February 2014

Certified normal accommodation

282

Operational capacity

282

Date of last full inspection

6–10 December 2010

Brief history

Originally an isolation hospital, Send became a prison in 1962 when it opened as a junior detention centre. In 1987 it was reclassified as a category C adult male training prison and by 1999 the prison had been completely rebuilt and had changed its role; it now operates as a closed female training prison. Send houses a 20-bed addictive treatment unit, an 80-bed resettlement unit and the only female prison therapeutic community with a capacity of 40. It also has a 20-bed psychologically informed physical environment (PIPE) community with approval to expand to 40 beds.

Short description of residential units

All cells are single occupancy apart from those on D wing, which has 10 double rooms.

A wing: 40 cells over two floors, providing the PIPE unit

B wing: 38 cells over two floors and identified as the induction wing

C wing: 40 cells over two floors

D wing: 10 cells, each shared by two women on the 12-step Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) programme

E and F wings: the resettlement unit, accommodating 40 prisoners on each wing

J wing: 64 cells over two floors, with the upper tier of 32 beds dedicated to the therapeutic community.

Name of governor/director

Dave Charity (acting governor)

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service provider

Virgin Care

Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust

RAPt and KCA

Lloyds Pharmacy

Learning and skills providers

A4E

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Sarah Bayliss

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** *Most women reported feeling safe during escorts to the prison. The reception process took too long but first night and induction procedures were good. Most prisoners felt safe and the number of incidents was low. Most problems related to minor verbal conflicts, but there were some good arrangements to manage poor behaviour. Levels of self-harm were lower than previously and support for prisoners considered at risk was good. Formal safeguarding arrangements had been developed. Security arrangements were mainly appropriate and the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was well managed. The use of force and cellular confinement was low. It was positive that there was no segregation unit. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Send were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, one had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3** In our survey, most women reported feeling safe during escorts to the prison. The reception area was clean but rather unwelcoming. Holding rooms were comfortable and Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) and Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) offered information and support. Women spent more than two hours in reception and there were delays in reuniting them with their property. First night arrangements were good and most women said they felt safe, although foreign national prisoners were less positive. Induction procedures were generally good.
- S4** Most women felt safe. This was supported by our survey where responses to questions about safety were similar to comparator prisons. However, some minority groups were less positive. Relationship problems, verbal threats, and speculation about offences were among the main sources of conflict; there were few serious violent incidents. Some proactive systems to anticipate possible conflict had been developed. There were good links between the safer custody team and security staff. Investigations into allegations of bullying and intimidation were quality assured, but the small number that led to the opening of a behaviour monitoring booklet were not all completed to the required standard. The prison was aware of this and was soon to introduce a new process.
- S5** There had been no self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection. Levels of self-harm had decreased over the period 2011–2013 and the few serious self-harm incidents that occurred were investigated. Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were completed to a good standard, and generally involved multidisciplinary reviews and consistent case management. Quality assessments of documents were very good and drove up standards. Most women on ACCTs felt well supported. Prisoners had good access to Listeners at all times, and Listeners felt staff supported them well. The anti-ligature and constant watch cells were used proportionately.
- S6** Some formal safeguarding procedures had been established in conjunction with Surrey County Council's adult social care department, other Surrey prisons and the Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation NHS Trust. Existing meetings helped identify adults at risk.

- S7 Security procedures were largely proportionate. Links between the security and other departments and agencies working in the prison were good and there had been few serious incidents. Security objectives were appropriate and few drugs tests were positive. The prison needed to improve its monitoring of the gender of staff conducting hospital escorts.
- S8 The IEP scheme had been updated. Few women were on the basic regime or remained at that level for long. Promotions and demotions were supported by evidenced-based reviews.
- S9 The number of adjudications was low, procedures were fair and sufficient enquiry and good monitoring took place. Some incidents could have been dealt with through the IEP scheme. The use of force was low. Most incidences we reviewed demonstrated efforts by staff to de-escalate the situation. Not all planned uses had been recorded but all incidences were reviewed to establish what lessons could be learned. However, on the few occasions where force involved distressed women, rigorous reviews needed to establish that the circumstances were exceptional and that the action was taken as a last resort. It was positive that the prison managed the population without the need for a segregation unit. Governance of cellular confinement for the few women who required it was good.
- S10 Following the re-tendering of substance misuse services, substance misuse strategy meetings had been relaunched. A substance misuse strategy that outlined how joint care planning could be improved still needed to be developed. Relatively few women were on a methadone programme and the arrangements in place were generally appropriate, although the administration time needed to be changed. Psychosocial support was good. The Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) programme continued to provide a valuable service and now included women with alcohol problems. A good range of interventions were offered and peer support was developing.

Respect

S11 *Living conditions and outside areas were mainly very good. Staff-prisoner relationships were excellent and the personal officer scheme was working well. The strategic management of equality and diversity needed to be improved, although prison staff's generally caring approach resolved most issues. Diversity was not promoted well enough and consultation with some key groups was underdeveloped. Complaints were well managed and legal services were particularly good. Health services were good and some proactive mental health support was provided. The food was good and communal dining arrangements excellent. There could be delays before prisoners received their first shop order. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S12 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Send were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 30 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 21 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

S13 The environment was well maintained and women appreciated the freedom to move around the site. Most women had single cells with integral toilet and shower facilities. Wings and outside areas were clean. The accommodation on D wing was adequate but rather shabby. It was unacceptable that some women's coats were taken away from them to comply with the London IEP facilities list; they were not given suitable weatherproof replacements. Property was stored appropriately, but prisoners could not easily gain access to it.

² This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S14 Staff-prisoner relationships were good and underpinned much of the positive work being done. Most staff demonstrated a caring approach and the interactions we saw were good. Prisoners generally could speak to a member of staff easily. The personal officer scheme had improved and case file notes confirmed they usually adopted a caring and thoughtful approach.
- S15 The strategic management of equality and diversity was underdeveloped and the promotion of diversity throughout the prison was ineffective. The prison was generally able to identify prisoners with protected characteristics well, but consultation with minority groups needed improvement. Monitoring data showed no substantial inequitable outcomes for black and minority ethnic prisoners, but in our survey they were less positive than white respondents about safety and respect. Support for foreign national prisoners was better than at the last inspection, but they were more negative in our survey about their treatment than British nationals. Provision for older prisoners and those with disabilities was generally good but care planning was inconsistent. There were plans to introduce an older prisoner forum. Support for gay and transgender prisoners was very good. Faith provision was excellent and a well integrated and wide range of services was provided.
- S16 Responses to complaints we examined were generally polite, fair and dealt with the concern raised. Quality assurance and monitoring arrangements were good. There were a number of minor complaints about domestic issues that residential officers on wings could have dealt with informally.
- S17 Prisoners had good access to effective advice from nominated legal rights officers and services were well advertised. As at the last inspection, privacy arrangements for official visits were inadequate.
- S18 Health care clinical governance arrangements were robust and a new provider was now well established. Prisoners were generally more positive than at the previous inspection about health care, but some were unhappy about some of the nurses' attitudes. The health care manager was well respected and managed a team of staff, who delivered an appropriate range of services. Access to clinics was good and women could be seen by a GP within four days. Pharmacy and dental services were good. Mental health care was good and was managed in a multidisciplinary manner. Transfers to secure hospital were rare but well managed and swift when required.
- S19 Prisoners liked the food and those on A and J wings appreciated opportunities to prepare their own meals. All women could eat their meals communally. Prison shop arrangements were adequate, but there could be a long delay before women could receive their first order after their arrival at the prison.

Purposeful activity

- S20** *Prisoners had very good time out of cell and access to pleasant outside areas. The leadership and management of learning and skills were good. The prison had sufficient activity places for the population and adopted a flexible approach to timetabling and allocations. A good range of activities was offered and teaching was generally good with learning tailored to the individual. Achievement rates were mainly good, although those in functional skills needed to be improved. The library and gym provided some very good opportunities. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S21 At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Send were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made seven recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and one had not been achieved.

S22 Time out of cell, which was rarely cancelled, was good. Prisoners could move about the site fairly freely during the working day and access to the pleasant outside areas was generally good.

S23 Learning and skills were well managed and an inclusive strategic plan to further develop and improve the provision was in place. Effective and collaborative partnership working was well developed. Self-assessment was thorough. The provision's strengths and weaknesses were clearly understood and the partners involved knew what they had to do to improve it. The allocations process was fair and effective but initial skills assessments were poorly timed and failed to inform sequencing of courses. Efficient timetabling clearly identified individual prisoners' planned education, training or work commitments, but the health care and resettlement departments did not take sufficient account of these plans.

S24 There were sufficient purposeful activity places for the population. Attendance at education was satisfactory, but some of the places available were not filled and the range of education courses was limited. A good variety of vocational training courses was offered and additional courses were planned.

S25 Teaching and learning were generally good: sessions were well planned; learners were involved in learning; most contributed well during sessions; and the majority were keen to succeed. The quality of learners' work in education was generally appropriate. Prisoners were aware of the training and work options available to them. Access to computers for the large number of distance learners was not sufficient.

S26 Prisoners' attainment of qualifications on the majority of courses was good, but required improvement on functional skills courses. Most prisoners developed good knowledge, skills and expertise. Women on psychologically informed physical environment (PIPE) and therapeutic community (TC) programmes attained personal and social skills.

S27 The library facilities were very good; they had improved and been expanded since the last inspection. They were very popular and well-stocked. Visiting and lending rates were extremely high, while the book loss rate was very low.

S28 Physical education was well managed and all prisoners had good access. Provision was available for prisoners over 40. A good range of structured training activities were offered. Vocational instructor courses were provided and achievements were good. Links with health care and RAPt programmes and the education department were good.

Resettlement

S29 *Strategic management of resettlement was good and the provision was broad and appropriate. Offender supervisors and sentence planning considerations were central to many decisions about the management of prisoners. Offender management arrangements were very good and assessments robust. Although there was a backlog of assessments, this was well managed. A large number of women were being released on temporary licence. Reintegration work was good and support through most of the prison's resettlement work was well developed. There were too few family days and some reasonable support was offered for children and families but there was scope to further develop provision. Some excellent offending behaviour interventions were offered, but help for those involved in domestic violence and sex work needed to be improved. The TC provided women with very complex needs with a good environment in which to receive therapy and support. Together with the PIPE, it supported national work with prisoners with personality disorders. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S30 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Send were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 18 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 11 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

S31 Strategic management of resettlement had improved considerably and was now good. There was evidence that action plans were being carefully managed. The flow of information between the offender management unit (OMU) and the rest of the prison was generally good. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was used well to support resettlement and family contact.

S32 The OMU was very well integrated. Offender supervisors saw most prisoners very regularly, and recorded this contact in detail. There was a backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) documents, but it was well managed, and the OASys work we examined was good. Public protection arrangements were proportionate. Re-categorisation processes were not based on sufficient evidence. The needs of indeterminate sentence prisoners were broadly met.

S33 Prisoners' immediate resettlement needs were met during induction, but there was some unproductive duplication in the assessment of their long-term needs. All prisoners had a useful discharge board before release. The St Giles Trust prisoner advice service provided women with good resettlement support. A mentoring service was available six months before a prisoner's release; transport was provided on the day of release as were onward referrals.

S34 More women than at comparator prisons knew where to find accommodation advice and nearly all were released with an address. Overall provision was good but the management and support provided to peer workers needed to be better. An appropriate selection of courses was available in the education department.

S35 A range of appropriate health and substance misuse support was offered before release. Contingencies were in place if palliative care support was ever needed.

S36 Finance benefit and debt advice and support were available and more women than at comparator prisons knew where to find it. All women could open a bank account.

- S37 Many staff were aware of the family circumstances of prisoners in their care and did their best to support them. A specialist counsellor provided women with post-adoption counselling. A large number of women received child care resettlement leave. However, there was no trained family support worker, and coordination of children and families work was poor.
- S38 Only women on the enhanced level could have one visit a week. The bus service operating from the train station was excellent, the visitors' centre was welcoming and the visits room pleasant. Staff supervision was mostly appropriate. Family visits were appreciated, but the provision was not sufficient to meet the demand.
- S39 A variety of interventions was available, notably through the chaplaincy. In addition, the TC provided women with very complex needs with therapy and support. The PIPE unit also offered women an excellent environment. The unit was well managed and residents valued it. A good range of activities was available.
- S40 Provision for women who had been involved in prostitution or victims of abuse, rape or domestic violence was underdeveloped, but women could seek help through a number of OMU staff who had expertise in these areas.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S41 Concern: An overarching policy to provide clear guidance on how equality and diversity should be managed in the prison had not been published. Supplementary documents covering older prisoners, foreign nationals, marriage and civil partnerships and decency had been published, but they were not based on a needs analysis and many of the processes it described had not been implemented. Diversity was not promoted well enough. A more strategic approach to diversity would have assisted in improving promotion and outcomes.

Recommendation: An overarching policy based on a needs analysis should be published to provide clear guidance on how equality and diversity should be managed and promoted in the prison.

- S42 Concern: Too many prisoners did not have an up-to-date OASys assessment. The regular deployment of offender supervisors to other duties was a contributory factor.

Recommendation: All prisoners should have an up-to-date OASys assessment.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

I.1 *Women said escort staff treated them well and that they felt safe during the journey. Some had not been given enough notice of their transfer which meant they could not contact their families before leaving their previous prison.*

I.2 Most women had journeys of less than two and a half hours. Escort vans were reasonably clean and carried refreshments and emergency supplies. Most women said escort staff treated them well and that they felt safe during the journey. In our survey, 65% of women said they were told they were going to Send, but some had been told on the morning of their transfer and did not have enough time to let friends and family know before leaving. Women were disembarked promptly from vehicles.

I.3 Access to appropriate clothing, for example, to attend court hearings, was good. Of the 14 court hearings in the previous six months, three had been held via video link. Women being transferred from Send were given at least 24 hours' notice.

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.4 *The reception area was clean but unwelcoming. Holding rooms were comfortable and Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) and Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) offered information and support. Many women spent more than two hours in reception and there were delays in reuniting women with their property. Most women said they felt safe on their first night although foreign national prisoners were less positive. Induction procedures were generally good.*

I.5 The reception area was clean but rather unwelcoming. The main holding room was comfortable and contained information posters and leaflets, but the TV had not been working for some time. A second holding room was rarely used, and unless a risk assessment suggested otherwise, the holding rooms were left unlocked. Most women were in reception for more than two hours.

I.6 The two officers who staffed the reception were often redeployed to other duties, which meant some women did not receive their property for up to two days after arrival. Women were rub-down searched on arrival and only strip-searched if there was supporting

intelligence. A female officer was called in from another area to complete the search if no female reception staff were on duty.

- I.7** Reception staff interviewed all women in private. Cell-sharing risk assessments were completed and any immediate concerns or special needs such as disabilities were identified. Those subject to self-harm monitoring were seen in reception by safer custody staff. A nurse gave all women a health care screening.
- I.8** Most women said they had been treated well in reception. Women were offered the opportunity to purchase basic canteen items. There were no showers in reception, but all women could shower once on their wing.
- I.9** Insiders met all new arrivals, gave them useful information about the prison and served hot drinks. Listeners told women about the support they offered. Women who arrived after meals had been served were given sandwiches. Women were given a copy of the prison information booklet, which was available in 14 languages.
- I.10** B wing was the designated first night unit; however, the drug assessment unit (D wing), had been used when B wing was full. First night accommodation was reasonably clean and toiletries were available. All women received essential first night information before being locked up. Checks on new arrivals, which took place at least every four hours during their first 24 hours, were recorded. Most women said they felt safe on their first night, but foreign national prisoners were less positive.
- I.11** The two-day induction programme ran on Wednesdays and Thursdays, and there were additional orientation tours of the prison. Women were not locked in their cells between induction sessions. Induction staff, were frequently redeployed, so individual interviews were sometimes carried out after women had completed their induction. In our survey, 96% of women said they had completed the induction course (more than the comparator) and 58% said it covered everything they needed to know.

Recommendation

- I.12** **Prisoners should be held in reception for as short a time as possible and their property should accompany them to the first night unit.**

Housekeeping point

- I.13** Prisoners arriving after the evening meal has been served in the dining room should be given a hot meal in reception.

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.14 *Most women felt safe and there was little physical violence. Issues raised in the prison's own safety survey needed to be addressed. Some good proactive information-sharing meant possible conflict could be anticipated. A new approach to managing antisocial behaviour was to be introduced to address shortfalls.*

- I.15** Most women felt safe. This was supported by our survey where responses were similar to comparator prisons; however some minority groups were less positive (see section on equality and diversity). In the prison's own safety survey (September 2013), 79% of women said they 'mostly or always' felt safe from other women. Compared to the 2012 survey, women reported an increase in feelings of intimidation while they were in medication and meal queues, during outside association and when they moved unescorted by staff from one part of the prison to another; 61% had witnessed others stealing, an increase from 10% in 2012.
- I.16** There was no evidence that this information or previous survey data had informed the safer custody strategy or the safer custody continuous improvement action plan. Minutes from the December 2013 safer custody meeting noted key survey responses and expressed concern about allegations of stealing. They recorded that work would be carried out to address the issues raised, but did not stipulate what this would be. Women were not consulted about safer custody at consultation meetings and exit surveys were still not analysed.
- I.17** There was little physical violence; in the previous six months there had been one fight and four assaults. Relationship breakdown, verbal intimidation and speculation about offences were the main reasons for victimisation. Some proactive information-sharing took place to anticipate possible conflict (see section on safeguarding). Good staff-prisoner relationships also supported safety (see section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- I.18** The safer custody strategy set out what staff's responsibilities were regarding the management of violence and antisocial behaviour. It described factors that contributed to making prisoners vulnerable to victimisation and staff's role in challenging and supporting women.
- I.19** Violence reduction was led by the Safer Send coordinator, a member of the safer custody team (see section on suicide and self-harm prevention). Staff reported incidents to the team via a referral form, 42 of which had been received between July and December 2013. Investigations were thorough and quality assured.
- I.20** Fifteen perpetrator and two victim tackling antisocial behaviour monitoring booklets had been opened between July and December 2013. Most had not been completed fully, and although some insightful comments were made, many were superficial and superfluous. Managers were aware that improvements were needed and a new approach was to be introduced in March 2013.
- I.21** There were good links with the security department and violence reduction was managed by the safer custody committee at well attended monthly meetings; the committee monitored the number of incidents and referrals received, including type, location, ethnicity and any trends.
- I.22** Interventions to address antisocial behaviour were limited, although an assertiveness course was available through the education department. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and adjudication procedures were used when necessary. Mediation continued to be used but, as previously reported, staff had received no formal training.

Recommendation

- I.23 Results from the prison's safety and exit surveys should be used to inform the safer custody strategy and safer custody continuous improvement action plan.**

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

The prison provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Prisoners are identified at an early stage and given the necessary support. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, are appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

I.24 *Suicide and self-harm prevention procedures were well managed. The number of self-harm incidents had decreased and most women on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm felt supported. The Listener request card was an example of good practice.*

- I.25** The comprehensive safer custody strategy set out staff responsibilities regarding suicide and self-harm prevention. The safer custody manager oversaw the work of the well known and accessible safer custody team, including the suicide prevention coordinator, safer custody peer worker and Safer Send coordinator (see section on bullying and violence reduction).
- I.26** There had been 161 self-harm incidents during 2013, an average of 13 each month. This had declined from 325 incidents in 2012 and 386 in 2011. Serious self-harm incidents were investigated.
- I.27** Ninety-seven ACCT case management documents had been opened for 53 women in the previous six months. Ten were open during the inspection and most women felt well supported.
- I.28** Support plans and daily written entries in ACCT documents were generally good and reviews were often multidisciplinary. Good quality assessments drove up standards and a number of regular meetings proactively reviewed care for those at risk of self-harm (see section on safeguarding).
- I.29** The safer custody committee monitored safer custody concerns at well attended monthly meetings (see section on bullying and violence reduction), and used results to develop the safer custody continuous improvement action plan. The committee identified patterns of self-harm incidents, including the location, age, type, timing and days of the week.
- I.30** There were two Listener suites and women had good access to Listeners; women could slip a pre-printed Listener request card under their door at night and did not have to make a verbal request, which others might have overheard. Listeners attended safer custody meetings and said their work was valued by most staff and prisoners.
- I.31** The anti-ligature cell had been used on four occasions in 2013 and the gated cell on 10 occasions. These cells were located next to each other in the main residential block (A, B and C wings) close to reception. They continued to be used proportionately for women under constant supervision. Other women were now prevented from using the corridor when the cells were occupied. All uses were authorised but, as at the last inspection, women held in these cells did not generally attend other activities. Three women had been placed in

anti-ligature clothing, but the reasons for doing this were not explained well enough (see section on use of force).

- I.32** There had been no deaths in custody since the last inspection. In response to a Prisons and Probation Ombudsman report, all night orderly officers (in charge of the night management of the prison) had received first aid and defibrillator training and defibrillators had been obtained and night staff knew where to find them.

Recommendation

- I.33** **Women subject to constant watches should where possible, be encouraged to take part in activities.**

Good practice

- I.34** *The use of pre-printed Listener request cards meant women did not have to make a verbal request to see a Listener, which could have been overheard by other prisoners.*

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.³

- I.35** *A memorandum of understanding (MoU) between Surrey County Council's adult social care department, prisons in Surrey and the Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation NHS Trust, detailed the definition of adults at risk and referral procedures. Existing meetings helped identify adults at risk.*

- I.36** The prison had established links with Surrey safeguarding adults' board. Representatives from HMP Send and other Surrey prisons had met in November 2012 to consider the safeguarding responsibilities of prisons and the local authority. A subsequent meeting in February 2013 had developed procedures further.
- I.37** A published MoU, dated July 2013 between Surrey County Council's adult social care department, all of Surrey's prisons and the Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation NHS Trust, defined adults at risk and referral procedures. The MoU was being reviewed in conjunction with the public protection policy.
- I.38** Staff could raise concerns about women at risk through established procedures. A fortnightly meeting chaired by mental health staff, discussed all women identified as being at risk because of their mental health or self-harming; staff could raise concerns about any other women. The safer communities meeting, which met every two weeks, discussed the management of women identified as posing a risk to others.

³ 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).

- I.39** Every Friday morning a meeting discussed all women subject to ACCT case management, and those needing extra support over the weekend. Public protection meetings discussed all women pre-release. We saw evidence of care management plans for some women. Minutes of meetings were available to all staff on the intranet.

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.40 *Overall security was sound and proportionate and supported by positive relationships. There was a good flow of information, which enabled the prison to identify appropriate security objectives – mainly focused on reducing the supply of drugs, which was low; there were very few positive drug tests. Few incidents were serious.*

- I.41** The sound staff-prisoner relationships, underpinned by a largely relaxed environment, provided good dynamic security. There had only been four serious ‘reportable’ incidents in the previous three years.
- I.42** There were good links between the security department, the police liaison officer and other departments and agencies working in the prison, but this was not always reflected in attendance at formal meetings. As at the last inspection, minutes of the security meeting indicated some departments, including education and the chaplaincy, were not represented. There was, however, a good flow of information – an average of 169 information reports were submitted each month. The security objectives developed from intelligence assessments were appropriate and agreed at a monthly security meeting. These focused mainly on the supply of illicit drugs.
- I.43** Security procedures were largely proportionate. Few women were on closed visits – an average of one per month – and on average one visitor per month was banned. These measures were generally taken following intelligence about or the possession of drugs. If a drug dog gave a positive indication but there was no additional supporting intelligence, the visitor was placed on a table closer to staff. This was more appropriate than offering a closed visit immediately as was previously the case.
- I.44** Restraints were still being used on women during hospital escorts (see section on health services) and minutes from the security meeting in August 2013 suggested that male officers had been cuffed to prisoners during intimate examinations. We found no evidence to indicate this was a continuing practice and managers were clear that this did not happen. Escort records did not indicate the gender of officers.
- I.45** Risk assessments for work activities were similar to when we last inspected and involved basing prisoners’ grading on known intelligence; assessments were then considered by the activities allocation board. A member of the security department attended the board. We found no evidence that women were inappropriately precluded from activities because of security risk factors.

- I.46** There were few positive drugs tests and the availability of drugs was low. The random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate averaged 1.8% in the previous six months against a target of 3.5% and in our survey, considerably fewer women said it was easy to get illegal drugs than the comparator and than in 2010. With two exceptions, suspicion tests were undertaken on time, but out of 37 tests in the previous six months, only three returned positive results for illicit drugs. Most positive tests were consistent with prescribed medication.
- I.47** Full searches or strip-searches were based on intelligence and only conducted prior to target testing. There were on average six incidences per month, accounting for virtually all the strip-searching that took place. Strip-searches were reported to the monthly security meeting.
- I.48** The MDT programme was adequately staffed but the cramped environment of the testing suite meant that women were searched in their cells rather than in the suite; three of the holding rooms were very small.
- I.49** Drug finds were few and consisted of small amounts of medication. Good information-sharing took place between security and health departments and supply reduction was discussed at security meetings and formed part of the overall drug and alcohol strategy.

Recommendations

- I.50** **The gender of officers escorting women to hospital for intimate examinations should be recorded on the person escort record and monitored by a senior manager.**
- I.51** **The establishment should improve the MDT environment.**

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

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.52** *The IEP scheme had been updated in November 2013 and the reasons for the changes discussed with women. The population was largely well-behaved and few women were on the basic regime. The prospect of a place in the resettlement unit encouraged women to progress through the scheme.*

- I.53** The IEP scheme had been updated in November 2013 in line with national changes. The new scheme had generated some anxiety as women needed to demonstrate regularly that their behaviour warranted the enhanced status. Concerns were also expressed about a new London-wide facilities list which placed restrictions on some items of clothing depending on the IEP regime women were on (see section on residential units). The prison had organised regular discussions with women about the application of the new rules. In our survey, a similar number of women compared with other prisons thought they were treated fairly by

⁴ 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.

the IEP scheme and more (49% compared with 41%) said that the different regime levels encouraged them to change their behaviour.

- I.54** The population was largely well-behaved. During the inspection 67% of women were on the enhanced regime, 32% were on the standard level and only 0.7% were on the basic regime. Few remained on the basic level for long, as reviews were held every week. Promotions and demotions were supported by planned evidence-based reviews, and a senior manager sampled IEP boards to assure quality. Women often appealed against warnings and downgrades as they progressed through their sentence to the resettlement unit, which for most was the biggest incentive.

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.55** *There were few adjudications. Procedures were fair and were reviewed and monitored by senior managers. The use of force was low and often occurred to prevent self-harm; on the few occasions where it was used to move women to observation cells or put them in strip-clothing, reviews needed to be rigorous. The prison managed the population without a segregation unit. On the few occasions where segregation was used, it took place in the women's cell and governance was good.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.56** The prison held a quarterly safety and order meeting, chaired by the governor or deputy governor, which reviewed the governance of adjudications, use of force and, since December 2013, the use of segregation. The number of adjudications was low, on average 13 per month, similar to what we reported at our last inspection.
- I.57** The room used for adjudications was on a main thoroughfare and was not sufficiently private. Women were not routinely escorted to adjudications and only the adjudicating officer and governor were present. Procedures were generally fair; the adjudicating governor made sufficient enquiries into the charges. Punishments were within published tariff guidelines, which had been reviewed in December 2013. Some incidents could have been more appropriately dealt with through the IEP scheme.
- I.58** Monitoring of adjudication procedures was good. The safety and order meeting analysed the number of proven adjudications, the reasons for those dismissed and the ethnicity of prisoners subject to the procedures; no concerns regarding the ethnicity of prisoners were evident, which was supported by the prison's race monitoring. Some annual data on prisoners charged with prison discipline offences were collated. The most common were: having unauthorised property, disobeying orders and using threatening or abusive behaviour. The safety and order meeting had discussed the need to avoid informing women of the charges against them in the evening to reduce the risk of self-harm.
- I.59** Five women had been referred to the independent adjudicator between March and November 2013; one case included a woman who was in possession of a controlled drug.

Housekeeping point

- I.60** A quieter room providing greater privacy and fewer distractions should be used for adjudications.

The use of force

- I.61** The use of force was low. There had been 13 recorded uses of force over the previous 12 months, which was considerably lower than the 36 in the year up to the previous inspection. Most incidents we reviewed demonstrated staff's efforts to de-escalate the incident. On seven occasions force was used to prevent self-harm. Three of these incidents involved the planned use of force when moving women to observation cells. One of these planned uses was not recorded.
- I.62** All instances where force was used were reviewed to establish what lessons could be learned, which was a recent improvement; however, the minutes of the March 2013 safety and order meeting stated that not all incidents were being scrutinised and records had not sufficiently explained the reasons for the use of force.
- I.63** One incident that had been recorded on video involved a distressed woman being searched under force for items she might have used to self-harm. Once these were found she was given a strip-gown. On the very few occasions where force was used against distressed women reviews were not sufficiently thorough to establish that the measures were required as a last resort.

Recommendation

- I.64** **Rigorous reviews should be conducted following the few occasions where force is used in conjunction with the observation cell or strip-clothing to ensure that such measures are taken only as a last resort.**

Segregation

- I.65** The prison managed the population without the need for a segregation unit. Women were rarely segregated – 10 from January to November 2013. Few women were subject to cellular confinement for disciplinary reasons – five in the same period. All segregation took place in the prisoner's cell. Governance was good. Individual segregation folders were kept for each woman. They included the authority to segregate, regular observational entries and a record of visitors. Periods of cellular confinement were mostly for short periods, but behaviour targets that were set were unimaginative and usually required the prisoner to remain adjudication free or be well-behaved. Women had access to essential aspects of the regime including telephone, showers (in-cell) and exercise. The prison generally managed poor behaviour well.

Good practice

- I.66** *The management of women prisoners without formal recourse to a segregation unit supports our view that with good governance arrangements in place most women can be managed more appropriately in residential units.*

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.

- I.67** *Women prescribed methadone received good care and a dual diagnosis lead member of staff was now in post. However, treatment times were unsuitable and care plans needed to be more integrated. The Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) programme continued to be a valuable resource and psychosocial support had improved. Women with primary alcohol problems were no longer excluded from accessing ongoing support.*
- I.68** Drug strategy meetings had been re-launched following the re-tendering of substance misuse services and a needs analysis was to be repeated to inform the drug and alcohol strategy's action plans.
- I.69** Only seven women received methadone treatment, mostly on a reducing basis. Methadone was not given out until 11.45am because not enough officers were available; this disrupted activities and was stressful for the women. Prescribing regimes were flexible, based on individual needs, and clinical reviews took place regularly. The mental health team had developed a dual diagnosis service, but joint working between mental health and substance misuse services was inconsistent and there were no integrated care plans. The clinical service provider was due to change shortly.
- I.70** Women could access a good range of psychosocial support. In our survey, 95% said they had received support with their alcohol problem against a comparator of 81%, and 96% had found drug and alcohol support helpful compared to 87% in 2010 and 87% in similar prisons.
- I.71** The substance misuse team's active caseload stood at 105 and in addition to one-to-one work, modular group work options included motivation to change, preventing relapse and alcohol awareness. Alcohol interventions were delivered by a designated worker. Women could attend Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous self-help groups, and a peer support scheme was being developed.
- I.72** RAPt's 16-week women's substance dependency treatment programme was well managed and achieved its completion target of 39 per year. Twelve women were in treatment, including some whose main problems were alcohol-related. There were 'lodgers' in the unit (prisoners who were not involved in any RAPt programme but who were placed there because there were spaces); while not ideal, this was managed sensitively. A new pre-programme group for women on methadone reduction had just started with input from four graduates who worked full-time as peer supporters. Women spoke highly of the support they received but felt that participation in the programme needed to be voluntary and should not be set as a sentence planning target.

Recommendations

- I.73** **Methadone administration should take place at a more suitable time so as not to interrupt activities.**
- I.74** **The substance misuse strategy document should contain detailed development targets, be informed by a new needs analysis and outline how joint working between the substance misuse and mental health teams could be improved.**

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 environment was well kept and women appreciated the freedom to move around the site. Most women had single cells with integral toilet and shower facilities. Wings and outside areas were clean. Property was stored appropriately but not easily accessible. Some women's coats were taken away from them to comply with the London incentives and earned privileges (IEP) facilities list. Prisoners were not given suitable weatherproof replacements.*
- 2.2** The environment was well kept and women appreciated the freedom to move around the site. Accommodation was provided on seven wings (see fact page). Apart from on D wing, all cells were single and had en suite toilets and showers. Women on D wing had 24-hour access to toilets and showers, but cells were cramped, poorly ventilated and shabby. Wings and outside areas were clean.
- 2.3** Women could personalise their cells, which were adequately furnished and contained televisions, lockable cabinets, and kettles. We did not see any offensive displays or graffiti in cells. Cleaning materials were readily available and women had courtesy keys to their cells. Cell call bells were answered promptly and a monthly management check of electronic records of response times was carried out.
- 2.4** Association rooms were fairly comfortable and had TVs, books and board games; two had pool and table tennis tables. Women on E, F and J wings could wash their own clothes in their wing laundries. On other wings orderlies provided a weekly service wash, and some limited access to laundries was available during the evening.
- 2.5** Most women wore their own clothes, and items could only be purchased from catalogues or the prison clothing shop. It was unacceptable that women's coats were taken away from them to comply with the London IEP facilities list. Prisoners were not given suitable weatherproof replacements. Garments with hoods had to be placed in women's stored property, or they could opt for them to be altered at a charge of 50p. Prison issue clothing was in good condition and a broad selection of sizes was available.
- 2.6** Property was stored appropriately but only 16% of women, less than the comparator of 39%, said they could obtain their stored property if they needed to. Prisoners waited a long time to collect items that had been sent or handed in. One woman had waited since 8 December 2013 to be called to collect items handed in on a visit. Women were given suitable bags for their belongings on discharge.
- 2.7** There were no limits on how many letters prisoners could send or receive. Mail was processed promptly, including emails sent via the Email a Prisoner service. Most women reported good access to telephones, but foreign nationals were less positive. All telephones had privacy hoods. Women could exchange visiting orders for £1 in telephone credit.

- 2.8** Bimonthly prisoner consultation meetings, chaired by a residential manager, were well attended by wing representatives, but action points were not always progressed swiftly enough.
- 2.9** Application forms were readily available, and staff tried to deal with requests informally. In our survey, most women said it was easy to submit applications, which they said were dealt with fairly and promptly. Applications were logged on each wing and response dates were recorded. The head of residence completed ad hoc quality checks of applications.

Recommendations

- 2.10** **Suitable weather proof coats should be available for women who require them.**
- 2.11** **Women should be able to get their stored property within a week of application.**
(Repeated recommendation, 2.11)

Housekeeping point

- 2.12** Women should not have to pay for garments with hoods to be altered.

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** *Staff-prisoner relationships were very good and all the interactions we observed were decent and respectful. The personal officer scheme was working well.*

- 2.14** Staff-prisoner relationships were strong and underpinned much of the good work being done across the prison. This not only contributed to the safety of the prison, but also helped to foster an atmosphere of cooperation. Most staff had a caring approach and the interactions we saw were good. Prisoners could generally speak to a staff member easily and the use of first or preferred names was the norm. In our survey, most women said that staff treated them respectfully, and that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help should they need it.
- 2.15** The personal officer scheme had improved and case file notes confirmed a caring and thoughtful approach was usually adopted. All women were allocated a personal officer and interactions we observed were meaningful, although links with the resettlement worker could have been stronger. There was good management oversight of the work and regular feedback to staff if personal officer work needed to be improved.

Recommendation

- 2.16** **Personal officers should play a more proactive role in supporting resettlement work through regular contact with resettlement workers.**

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 characteristic⁵ 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.

2.17 *The strategic management of equality and diversity was underdeveloped and the promotion of diversity throughout the prison was ineffective although outcomes were generally good. The prison identified well most of the prisoners with protected characteristics, but consultation with minority groups needed improvement. Monitoring data showed no substantial inequitable outcomes for black and minority ethnic prisoners, but in our survey they were less positive than white respondents when it came to safety and respect. Support for foreign national prisoners was better than at the last inspection, but they were more negative about their treatment than British nationals in our survey. Provision for older prisoners and those with disabilities was generally good, but care planning was inconsistent. Support for gay and transgender prisoners was very good.*

Strategic management

- 2.18** An overarching policy to provide clear guidance on how equality and diversity should be managed in the prison had not been published. A general explanation of some diversity issues had been included in the prison's race and equality action plan but it was not specific enough, was out of date and failed to pay sufficient attention to all the protected characteristics. Supplementary documents covering older prisoners, foreign nationals, marriage and civil partnerships and decency had been published, but they were not based on a needs analysis and many of the processes described had not been implemented.
- 2.19** Systems to identify new arrivals from minority groups were very good. Prisoners were interviewed during reception and induction processes, and the head of diversity and equality ensured that information about protected characteristics was recorded.
- 2.20** The day-to-day management of equality and diversity was the responsibility of a nominated manager – the head of safety, equality and diversity – who was supported by two part-time equality and diversity officers. The equality and diversity officers were often unavailable to carry out their duties and many prisoners told us they did not know who they were. Their role, which was poorly promoted, was not understood.
- 2.21** Three prisoner equality and diversity representatives had also been appointed. Most prisoners knew who they were; they offered prisoners good support and directed them to services. They attended all equality and diversity meetings.
- 2.22** On the whole, except for religious events, the promotion of diversity was underdeveloped; there were few displays in the prison, and some posters were out of date and misleading.

⁵ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

- 2.23** The bimonthly equality and diversity meeting, usually chaired by the governor, was generally well attended, but minutes showed that discussions and the statistical analysis of protected characteristics were limited to race. Implementation of the race and equality action plan was monitored, but the action plan was not based on a needs analysis.
- 2.24** Race monitoring covered mandatory and local ethnicity concerns but not all protected characteristics. Areas identified as out of range were investigated and discussed but minutes of meetings were not shared with prisoners in residential units.
- 2.25** Although the strategic management of equality and diversity was underdeveloped, good staff-prisoner relationships mitigated in part the poor organisational structures. We found that support for prisoners with protected characteristic was good in many areas.
- 2.26** Only five discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) had been submitted since the beginning of 2014. All of them had been investigated reasonably well and there was evidence that one-to-one discussions took place with those involved. Responses were also quality assured by both the head of safety, equality and diversity and the deputy governor. Some complaints relating to equality and diversity were made through the prison's general complaints system. These were also dealt with appropriately and referred to the head of safety, equality and diversity for investigation. They informed the prison's equality and diversity monitoring systems.

Recommendation

- 2.27** **The prison should carry out statistical analysis of information about all protected characteristics.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.28** Twenty-nine per cent of the population were from a black and minority ethnic community. In our survey, black and minority ethnic respondents were less positive than white respondents across a range of questions on safety and respect. Although we found no evidence to support these views, there had been no black and minority ethnic prisoner consultation meetings to consider these perceptions and no prisoner survey to explore issues.
- 2.29** Our survey indicated that approximately 3% of the population were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background, which was in line with the number identified by the prison. Although the prison had no formal support group for these prisoners, the head of safety, equality and diversity was aware of their circumstances, met frequently with them on an informal basis and was dealing with any specific needs as they arose. When we spoke to these prisoners they said that they felt supported.
- 2.30** There were 40 foreign national prisoners. Most of those we met could understand English, but an up-to-date register of foreign nationals who had difficulties with English had been published. Access to a telephone translation service was good and the prison had an up-to-date list of prisoners and staff willing to act as translators. Very little in languages other than English was displayed on wings.
- 2.31** Support for foreign national prisoners was generally good. Immigration officers saw individual prisoners each month and ran drop-in surgeries where prisoners could obtain information about their cases. The charity PRAXIS also provided foreign national prisoners with independent support and advice on a monthly basis.

- 2.32** Prisoners could make an international call to their families each month whether or not they had received visits and there was no limit to the number of letters they could send. Consultation with foreign national prisoners was reasonably good, but forums were sometimes cancelled and were generally poorly advertised.
- 2.33** Effective systems were in place to identify prisoners with a disability. Reception screening was thorough and prisoners were asked to declare any disabilities. A disability screening form was completed during their induction and prisoners were asked again during health care interviews. In our survey, about one quarter of respondents identified themselves as having a disability, which was in keeping with the prison's own records.
- 2.34** There were some adapted cells on J wing and personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs) were completed for all prisoners who required them. A few had been drawn up by the health care department but had not always been communicated to residential officers. Nevertheless, we thought outcomes for prisoners with disabilities were good and they told us they were well cared for.
- 2.35** The prison had recorded that 18% of the prison population were over 50, 4% of whom were over 60. Provision for this group of prisoners was generally good. Most were located on J wing, which was quieter than some of the other residential units. An older prisoner policy was in place but many of the processes it described were not. For example, care plans were seldom used as described in the policy and an older prisoner representative had not been appointed. There were plans to introduce an older prisoner forum. Although our survey showed that older prisoners had poor perceptions, those we spoke to during the inspection were positive about their treatment.
- 2.36** Support for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners were very good. A decency and sexual policy had been published and staff and prisoners were aware of it. We saw these prisoners receive caring support from officers on a day-to-day basis and relationships between same-sex prisoners were appropriately monitored through the safer custody team.

Recommendation

- 2.37** Care planning for older prisoners and those with disabilities should be improved.

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** *The chaplaincy was well integrated and delivered excellent provision for all faiths. A wide range of useful groups and courses was also provided.*

- 2.39** The chaplaincy was active, visible and well integrated in the prison, delivering good provision for all faiths. The team comprised a full-time managing chaplain and a full-time administration support worker. Sessional and part-time chaplains covered all the main religions. The chaplaincy was supported by around 20 active volunteers from the local community who attended the prison every week.

- 2.40** There was a well equipped chapel for Christian services, a multi-faith room with washing facilities and a small kitchen. Enough seating was available for individual services. Muslim Friday prayers were regularly attended by around 23 women and a full programme of religious festival celebrations involved prayer and social gatherings.
- 2.41** The chaplaincy facilitated an excellent range of courses, groups and support sessions. The Making Connections programme was an excellent initiative, providing pre- and post-release support through mentors from the community. Other courses such as victim awareness, restorative justice (The Sycamore Tree), Living with Loss and Making Sense of Forgiveness were on offer. There was also a full range of faith-related activities, such as Faith Exploration, Bible and Quran studies and spiritual guidance groups.

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.

2.42 *Responses to complaints we examined were polite, fair and dealt with the issue at hand. Quality assurance had improved since the last inspection and monitoring arrangements were good. There were a number of minor complaints about domestic issues that could have been dealt with informally by residential officers on wings.*

- 2.43** Given the size of the prison, the number of formal complaints was not excessive – an average of about 63 formal complaints each month. We found that prisoners knew how to use the system. In our survey, 43% of respondents said that complaints were dealt with fairly, better than at the previous inspection (31%).
- 2.44** Governance arrangements for recording, managing and investigating complaints were very good. The complaints clerk ensured that all complaints were logged and that they were dispatched expeditiously to managers in appropriate areas to be dealt with. Senior managers carried out the analysis of the types of complaint made, and there was evidence that action was being taken to deal with emerging problems.
- 2.45** Interim replies for more complicated cases were issued to prisoners along with a predicted conclusion date. Most (about 90%) received a response within three working days of receipt. With a few exceptions, the quality of responses was very good, respectful and addressed the issues raised. There were however, a substantial number of minor complaints about domestic issues that could have been dealt with informally by officers on residential wings.

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.

2.46 *Prisoners had good access to effective advice from nominated legal rights officers. Services were well advertised. As at the last inspection, privacy arrangements for official visits were inadequate.*

2.47 The contact details of the prison's two legal services officers (LSOs) were displayed on residential wings and their roles were well advertised on posters throughout the prison.

2.48 The LSOs had compiled a database of local solicitors that they regularly updated. They had also identified and listed local specialist solicitors.

2.49 Prisoners could access trained volunteers from the prisoner advice clinic (PAC) on the telephone. PAC volunteers provided information on all aspects of prison law, prisoners' rights and conditions of imprisonment and could direct prisoners to other sources of advice and information.

2.50 The libraries provided prisoners wishing to conduct their own cases or check on aspects of prison law with a good service. It held a wide range of up-to-date legal reference books.

2.51 Legal visits were available on Wednesday afternoons. There was an efficient telephone booking system for appointments, and the prison could accommodate visits as requested. However, as at the last inspection, there were no private booths for legal visits so these took place in the open visits room.

Recommendation

2.52 **Legal visits should take place in suitable privacy.** (Repeated recommendation, 3.34)

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.53 *A good level of health care was available to all prisoners and could be accessed quickly. Prisoners were more satisfied with the care provided than previously and were involved in the development of services, including health promotion. The range of services provided was appropriate for the needs of the prison population. Pharmacy and dental services were good. A very good level of primary and secondary mental health care was delivered.*

Governance arrangements

2.54 Clinical governance arrangements were robust and involved the governor and health care manager. A new provider for primary care services had become well established since our previous inspection, while arrangements for mental health remained strong. We observed evidence of good relations with the commissioners, and the governor and health care manager were actively involved with the partnership board. The health care manager also attended the prison senior management team regularly.

- 2.55** Our survey indicated that prisoners were generally more satisfied with access to and the quality of health care services than they were at our previous inspection. However, we received a mixed response from women we spoke to who referred to the poor attitude of some of the nursing staff, although the care we saw was generally good.
- 2.56** Health care was provided at the health care centre located on the ground floor adjacent to reception. All wings also had a treatment room, but some were only used for the administration of medicines. All facilities were clean and well decorated with clinical areas suited to the care of patients.
- 2.57** A health needs assessment had been completed in 2012 and this was due to be carried out again. The health care manager was well respected and managed a small team of staff that delivered an appropriate range of services. Four vacancies were covered by staff from HMP Downview and a small bank of regular staff. An active recruitment programme was in place. Staff had a good skills mix, which met the women's care needs.
- 2.58** Health care services were provided during each weekday, with a more limited arrangement at weekends. Some nurses provided prisoners with specialist clinics, but no one had been nominated to manage the care of older prisoners. The health care manager monitored the training needs of the staff, who received good support from the provider. All staff were up to date with their mandatory training. Clinical supervision was delivered on a group basis but was not formally recorded.
- 2.59** Women could be seen routinely by a GP within four days. Four GPs from a local practice delivered a clinic each weekday and women were able to see a female GP. A reasonable out of hours service was provided.
- 2.60** Clinical records were maintained electronically using SystemOne, the electronic clinical information system, and those that we sampled were well written and demonstrated prisoners' involvement. Emergency resuscitation equipment was appropriately located across the prison and automated external defibrillators (AED) were available in each wing office. AED training had been completed by 59 discipline officers. The equipment was checked regularly and checks were recorded.
- 2.61** Two of the prisoners acted as health care champions and had made efforts to develop the health promotion strategy. Information was only available in English, however. Health care champions and wing representatives attended a monthly focus group where relevant health care concerns could be raised. There were less than 10 health care complaints each month; they received a sensitive response. The use of the prison complaint system meant complaints were not sufficiently confidential.

Recommendations

- 2.62** **There should be a named nurse with additional skills in the care and management of older prisoners.**
- 2.63** **Health care complaints should be managed confidentially.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.64** All clinical supervision should be recorded.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.65** All prisoners received a full and comprehensive health care screening in the health care centre. The process was efficient and carried out concurrently by two or three nurses when there were a large number of prisoners. Health care information was provided but only available in English. Prisoners first saw the wing nurse before being referred and could apply to be seen by the health care department; applications went through a triage process and prisoners were allocated to appropriate clinics. They were seen promptly by a GP if necessary.
- 2.66** Prisoners confined to their cells were seen every day by a nurse and, when required, by the GP and mental health team. There was a good range of screening and vaccination clinics together with visiting specialists. Prisoners could obtain barrier protection on request and were supplied with condoms on their release. Patients attending outside hospital appointments had sufficient escort opportunities and cancellations due to lack of escorts were rare. Some women attending hospital appointments were not given sufficient prior notification and did not have time to shower. All patients were cuffed for their appointments regardless of risk (see section on security).

Recommendation

- 2.67** **Patients should be informed early on the day of their attendance at an outside hospital appointment so that they can prepare themselves appropriately.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.68** Health care information should be available in a range of languages.

Pharmacy

- 2.69** An in-house Lloyds Pharmacy ran the pharmacy service and its regular pharmacist carried out medicine use reviews.
- 2.70** The pharmacy was located in the health care centre. Some in-possession medicines were administered directly from the pharmacy, but others were issued from treatment rooms on the wings. Paper-based administration records were used and then transferred to SystemOne. Around 70% of medicines were administered in possession following a risk assessment. There was an in-possession policy in place, which had been reviewed in November 2012. Administration records were generally good.
- 2.71** Pharmacy staff managed the stock effectively. A limited range of patient group directions (PGDs) (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) was available. The pharmacy had an out of hours policy and could supply medicines from its high street store in Ripley. Medicines were administered from the wings three times a day, and night sedation was usually given in possession, with appropriate checks. However, those who did not have their night-time sedation in possession were given their medication too early. Medicines were administered from the wings via hatches or gates, and officers were present at the administrations we observed. Methadone was administered from the treatment room on the main wings (A and B).

- 2.72** A quarterly medicines and therapeutics committee meeting included representation from the commissioners, pharmacy and medical staff. There was little evidence of prescribing data being used in the meetings, but substances liable to abuse were not prescribed excessively. Thermolabile medicines were stored in suitable fridges, and temperatures were monitored well. Confidential material for destruction had been appropriately separated from other records. Old editions of the British National Formulary (a reference book for prescribing, dispensing and administering medicines) were found.

Recommendations

- 2.73** **The medicines management committee should consider introducing additional PGDs to enable the pharmacist or nurse to supply more potent medication, avoiding unnecessary consultations with the doctor.**
- 2.74** **All women receiving night sedation should have their medication at an appropriate therapeutic time.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.75** Old reference books should be discarded, and only the most recent copy should be kept to ensure that information used is up to date.

Dentistry

- 2.76** Two dental sessions were available each week and adequate cover during holidays was available.
- 2.77** A large dental surgery was located in the health care centre with areas divided for treatment and instrument cleaning. The surgery was clean and well equipped. Some prisoners said they waited a long time to see the dentist, but evidence showed that the waiting list was normally very short, 29 during our inspection; the longest wait was usually up to three weeks. Prisoners requiring urgent dental care were prioritised and seen more promptly. Prisoners we observed having treatment and others that we spoke to were complimentary about the quality of care that was provided; we found that the care prisoners received was professional and maintained their privacy. The surgery had its own supply of oxygen and emergency medications and shared additional resuscitation equipment with the health care centre. Prisoners' records were kept on paper and electronically using SystemOne.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.78** A very good level of mental health care was provided by the in-reach team. The team provided nursing, psychotherapy, counselling, psychological therapies and access to a learning disabilities nurse. Two visiting psychiatrists attended one day a week. The team offered integrated primary and secondary care services and could see newly arrived prisoners in reception when required. The caseload included 75 patients at the time of our inspection and there were sufficient staff to meet the demand, except where counselling was concerned.
- 2.79** Prisoners had access to an open referral system, there was a weekly triage clinic and nurses regularly visited the wings. Cases were managed effectively and multidisciplinary meetings took place every week, but staff from substance misuse psychological services were not

involved. Prisoners and staff spoke very highly of the service and the range of treatments and care provided. Very few patients needed to be transferred to secure mental health units, but transfers were managed swiftly when required. Discipline staff received a programme of mental health awareness training.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

2.80 *Prisoners generally liked the food. Women on A and J wings appreciated opportunities to prepare their own meals.*

2.81 In our survey, more women than the comparator said the food was good. The four-week menu cycle catered for all diets, and fresh fruit was available every day. Links with the chaplaincy were good, and religious events such as Ramadan had been celebrated with special meals.

2.82 Women on A and J wings ate their meals communally on their own wings, while all other prisoners ate their main meals together in the large central dining hall. Except on J wing, breakfast packs were issued the day before and eaten in-cell. Meals were served at appropriate times, but second helpings were not allowed. Microwave ovens were available on all wings and women on A and J wings could occasionally cook for themselves under staff supervision.

2.83 The main kitchen and food service areas were clean, and those serving meals were appropriately dressed. Staff and prisoners working in the kitchen and on the servery on J wing received a health screening and had food-handling training. The serving of meals was well supervised.

2.84 Food comments books contained frequent and mostly positive comments, to which the catering manager responded promptly. Food surveys were completed twice a year, and the results had informed changes to the menu. Results of the survey were put on display in the dining hall. Quarterly food consultation meetings, attended by prisoner representatives and chaired by the kitchen manager, took place. Action points from the meetings were progressed quickly.

Recommendation

2.85 **Breakfast should be served on the morning it is eaten.** (Repeated recommendation, 8.9)

Housekeeping point

2.86 Second helpings of food should be allowed.

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 *Some women waited for up to 10 days for their first canteen order. Many women were dissatisfied with the choice of items available. Processes for ordering and distributing canteen were adequate.*

2.88 Canteen orders were submitted on Wednesday mornings, and delivered under staff supervision on Fridays. The canteen service was run by DHL and did not accommodate interim orders which meant women waited up to 10 days before they received their first order.

2.89 Women were consulted about canteen provision through wing representatives, but minutes were not recorded. In our survey, only 37% of women compared to 49% in comparator prisons said the prison shop sold a wide enough range to meet their needs. In our groups, women complained that the cost of products was too high.

2.90 Women could order items from five catalogues, which included those offering toiletries for black and minority ethnic prisoners. There was a 50p administration fee for catalogue orders. Newspapers could be ordered from a local newsagent, for which there was a 20p per week delivery charge. A thriving craft club allowed women to purchase hobby items.

Recommendations

2.91 **Women should be able to place their first canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival and receive it within a reasonable period after the order has been placed.**

2.92 **There should be no charge for catalogue orders.**

Housekeeping point

2.93 The prison should explore prisoners' negative perceptions of the range of products available.

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.⁶

3.1 *Time out of cell was good. Some prisoners continued to be restricted to evening association on wings in winter.*

3.2 Time out of cell remained very good – around 11.25 hours Mondays to Thursdays and 8.25 hours on Fridays and weekends. Only one woman was locked in her cell at 10.30am one weekday morning when we conducted a roll check; she was serving a period of cellular confinement after adjudication.

3.3 Daily association was rarely cancelled. There continued to be no formal exercise arrangements and women could associate in the prison grounds. However, a number of officers on A, B and C wings said that women were restricted to indoor association once it was dark in winter; we reported this situation in 2010. Nevertheless, women had the opportunity during the day to move around the site when they went to the dining hall and attended activities.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.4 *Leadership and management of learning and skills were good. Arrangements to assure the quality of all teaching and learning across the prison were very good. There were sufficient activity places for the population and a purposeful flexible approach to timetabling and allocations was adopted. A good range of activities was available. The curriculum offered by the education department was narrow. Teaching and learning was good, highly motivational and personalised to provide specific individual support. Every prisoner had an individual programme that took account of and prioritised individual training, recovery and resettlement needs. Achievement rates were generally good, although in English and mathematics functional skills they required improvement. The library was well managed, had a good range of stock and was well used. The gym provided some very good facilities and learning opportunities.*

⁶ 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.

3.5 *Ofsted⁷ 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>Good</i>
<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Good</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.6** The management of learning and skills and work and the Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision was good. Strategic planning was very effective and prioritised learning, training and resettlement activities. The prison worked well with A4E, the education and vocational training provider, and all other partners in the prison that provided training. This ensured the provision responded to the needs of women to best prepare them for release.
- 3.7** The prison induction was effective, allowing women to make informed choices regarding activities and training. Good joint working between careers organisation Tribal (subcontracted by the National Careers Service), the education provider and the prison led to a coordinated approach to training. However, initial skills assessment screenings were poorly timed and failed to inform the sequencing of courses. This meant that the development of the English and mathematics skills of some prisoners who required it was not prioritised.
- 3.8** The prison systematically involved all partners who delivered training in assuring the quality of teaching and learning. All partners, including occasional visiting organisations, signed up to the collaborative partnership Send Education and Training, which established the criteria for shared observations of teaching and learning and quality assurance. Partnership activities were particularly effective in promoting improvements across all aspects of the provision and regular quality improvement group meetings ensured information was shared. The self-assessment was accurate.
- 3.9** All prisoners received a personalised weekly timetable, which prioritised their commitments effectively, providing them and staff with a clear picture of their activities. Activities and training were prioritised on a red, amber, green or white basis depending on the importance of the activity to each prisoner. Red and amber sessions could not be changed and prisoners could not miss these sessions. However, the health care department did not use these schedules when allocating routine health care appointments.
- 3.10** Prisoner ethnicity data were used effectively to identify underperformance and access to release on temporary licence (ROTL). However, data were not collected or analysed to investigate other prisoner characteristics, for example if women were single parents or from single parent families, to better inform or identify barriers to resettlement, education or training.

⁷ 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>.

Recommendations

- 3.11 Initial skills assessments should be completed promptly to inform the planning and scheduling of prisoners' activities more effectively.**
- 3.12 All prison departments should use the prisoner schedules to identify when it is appropriate to add additional activities or appointments.**
- 3.13 Better use should be made of data to monitor the provision and prisoners' progress and to identify specific factors that create barriers to learning.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** There were sufficient activity places for all women, which meant they could be occupied throughout the day. This included 267 work places, 42 ROTL places and 40 places in education and vocational training. Women participated in a balance of work and education, within a well managed part-time schedule.
- 3.15** Classroom capacity and spaces in training activities were under used. There were relatively few prisoners in some workshops and education classes. Managers were aware of this and were reviewing the provision to ensure resources were used more efficiently. Insufficient English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classes were held – only one formal session was run once a week. The very well managed individual prisoner schedules meant that activities could be integrated effectively, providing prisoners with good access to the various treatment and therapy programmes. Training activities were not compromised as women completed drug and treatment programmes through the therapeutic community (TC) and the psychologically informed physical environment (PIPE) programme.
- 3.16** Education programmes and vocational training provided a good mix of programmes – from introductory level to level 3. However, the classroom-based curriculum in education was limited. Women working in all areas including the gym could take a customer service qualification. Peer mentors were used very well to support learning in education and vocational training, but none of the mentors were trained or accredited.
- 3.17** Thirty women were involved in Open University or distance learning courses, however, they had very limited access to computers to conduct research or complete assignments. Allocation to education and work was fair and provided women serving long sentences with opportunities to participate in a useful range of activities and work.
- 3.18** Managers and staff had a clear focus on developing women's skills and confidence to prepare them for release. Workshops included business administration and customer service, beauty therapy and hairdressing, textiles and card-making. Other activities included horticulture, domestic and professional cookery and laundry and cleaning work. Plans were well underway to introduce a new workshop to accommodate further training in industrial cleaning and multi-skill do-it-yourself skills.

Recommendations

- 3.19 The number of ESOL classes should be increased to ensure that non-English speaking prisoners' language skills improve as quickly as possible to enable them to integrate more easily into prison society.**
- 3.20 A formal programme should be introduced to train and accredit peer mentors.**

Quality of provision

- 3.21** Teaching and learning in education sessions were predominantly good. Coaching and individual support in vocational training was also good. Tutors planned and resourced learning sessions well. Training sessions were purposeful and productive and the majority of participants were enthusiastic about their learning. Prisoners enjoyed and benefited from the variety of teaching methods and resources tutors employed. Tutors provided prisoners with constructive feedback and support during sessions, using prisoner profiles very well to personalise training and overcome barriers to learning. Peer mentors were used well to provide additional support (see paragraph 3.16).
- 3.22** Most women had a good understanding of what work and training was available through the prison induction, which was thorough and purposeful. Initial assessments were used well to identify prisoners' levels of literacy, language and numeracy. Tribal advisors provided appropriate information, advice and guidance for every prisoner. They produced a clear summary of each prisoner's skills and experience and an associated action plan that identified relevant, realistic, achievable and time-bound goals for their education and skills development. However, these assessments were too often conducted before individual literacy and numeracy needs had been identified (see paragraph 3.7).
- 3.23** Tutors managed the often disparate levels of experience and attainment within their classes well. All functional skills classes included prisoners who had just started, others who were longer-term learners and those who were working at higher levels.
- 3.24** There was little evidence of tutors discussing or promoting equality and diversity during training sessions. However, women were respectful of each other and their tutors.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.25** Outcomes for learners were good. Prisoners' achievement of qualifications on the vast majority of the introductory and intermediate level programmes was high. On a few courses success rates were 100%. Prisoners' attainment of qualifications was low on two out of the three advanced level courses. Learners' achievement of functional skills qualifications in English and mathematics were low.
- 3.26** Success rates on vocational training courses and in the gym were very good and learners developed very good vocational and interpersonal skills.
- 3.27** Prisoners on functional skills English and mathematics courses, demonstrated how their skills had developed over time through their informed contributions to class discussions and responses to tutors' questions. The quality of their written work and use of language was adequate. Prisoners' creative and technical work seen during an art class and in portfolios was particularly good.
- 3.28** Prisoners understood what they were learning and why and most were keen to succeed. Their learning records showed that they had progressed onto different course levels. Many women acquired useful experience, expertise and qualifications that matched their ambitions and goals. Most felt that their self-confidence, knowledge and skills had improved as a direct result of their learning; they mentioned the impact of the employability and business courses in particular. This was especially so for those who received support through the PIPE and TC programmes (see sections on therapeutic community and psychologically informed physical environment).

- 3.29** No significant gaps in achievement were apparent between different groups of learners. Learners' attendance at education and training was adequate.

Recommendation

- 3.30** **The success rates on English and mathematics courses should be improved by increasing the frequency and intensity of classes.**

Library

- 3.31** The library facilities were excellent and had been improved with the addition of a second library since the previous inspection. Access was good and they were open during the daytime, evenings and weekends. Both libraries were well stocked and well attended, and prisoners appreciated them.
- 3.32** The library provision was managed professionally and was informed by good quality data; enthusiastic and competent staff ran the facilities. Five prison orderlies were closely involved in the daily management and organisation of the libraries and all were participating in, or had completed, accredited customer service qualifications. A wide range of books, periodicals, DVDs, CDs, legal publications and Prison Service Orders were available. The book loss rate was very low.
- 3.33** The library had a dedicated section for study, including a computer and printer. Non-readers received good support in developing literacy skills, for example, through the Toe by Toe mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read and Storybook Mums (in which prisoners record stories for their children). A good, popular range of other activities were also offered, including visits from practising authors, a book club and monthly book reviews.

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.

- 3.34** *PE was well managed and provided appropriate access to a good variety of structured activities and physical training facilities. The range of vocational qualifications offered was excellent. Healthy living, diet and the principles of fitness were included in the gym induction and reinforced through activities.*

- 3.35** The physical education provision was well managed and effectively promoted to all women during induction. The good range of structured and recreational activities enabled women to attend group exercise classes or attend sessions to aid weight loss or recovery from illness or injury. Specific activity sessions were available for women over 40, exercise referrals and those undertaking remedial training. There were also sessions in the evenings for prisoners in full-time work. An extensive programme of vocational training enabled women to gain gym instructor qualifications at levels 1 and 2 personal training at level 3. Women who completed training courses were employed as gym orderlies and provided PE staff with useful support by helping other prisoners in the gym.

- 3.36** All prisoners completed an appropriate induction to the gym, which focused on living healthily. The health care department completed basic fitness assessments and results were passed to the gym prior to their induction. The prison monitored and recorded the use of the gym well and identified around 35% of the population as regular users. Access to structured classes and recreational sessions after work and at weekends was good. Links with health care and RAPt programmes and the education department were good.
- 3.37** The facilities were good and well maintained. Courses, classes and one-off events were promoted through notice boards and the regular presence of gym staff on the wings. The sports hall was well used for classes, games, circuit training, team games and coaching activities. The cardiovascular area and modular weight training facilities were predominately used during recreational sessions and a well equipped classroom was used for theory sessions. Changing facilities were clean and showers good.
- 3.38** The two physical education instructors were enthusiastic and appropriately qualified; however, there was no contingency to cover staff sickness or time off.

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** *Strategic management of resettlement had improved considerably and was now good. Evidence demonstrated that action plans were carefully managed. Offender management and the focus on resettlement was well understood by staff across the prison who played their part in supporting the aims of risk reduction. This was also supported by the careful use of release on temporary licence (ROTL).*
- 4.2** A good three-year reducing reoffending development plan had been produced in July 2013. It was based on: a thorough review of government policy; recommendations from the review of the women's estate carried out by the National Offender Management Service; needs analysis information from partner organisations working in the prison; and a detailed large-scale survey of prisoners' views. It lacked an objective assessment of needs, such as offender assessment system (OASys) data, but this was mitigated by the fact that OASys data had been included in a national 'segmentation' study, which analysed the prisoner population and led to the commissioning of services according to identified needs. There were further policy documents for offender management, public protection and indeterminate sentence prisoners.
- 4.3** Progress against the reducing reoffending development plan was monitored at bimonthly meetings, which had been re-launched at the start of 2013. Attendance was improving and there was evidence of consistent efforts to monitor and improve resettlement provision.
- 4.4** The role of the offender management unit (OMU) was well understood across the prison. Offender supervisors were confident and were good ambassadors for their work. A series of protocols for different departments formalised the roles, responsibilities and information-sharing requirements so that the prison's collaborative work could deliver each woman's sentence plan. Sentence plans were generally effective, and the overall picture was good, but in some areas there was scope for even closer working, particularly with personal officers (see section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- 4.5** A comprehensive and up-to-date local ROTL policy ensured that risks were carefully managed; it contained guidance on arrangements for specific population groups, such as indeterminate sentence prisoners and foreign nationals. Ninety-six women, including some foreign national prisoners, had benefited from ROTL in the six months prior to our inspection. Half of these releases included overnight stays, allowing women to spend several days with their families in preparation for release. A further 37% were day releases, mostly for work purposes. The remainder were childcare resettlement licences, which helped women who were primary carers to maintain good relationships with their children. None of those released in the previous year had failed to return to the prison.

- 4.6** Resettlement provision was generally broad, and some innovative work took place. For example, during our inspection we saw staff and prisoner peer workers from Keep Out, a voluntary sector crime diversion scheme, running a workshop for young women at risk of offending. We also found that offender supervisors (OSs) delivered a range of tailored interventions to women on a one-to-one basis, where no formal interventions or programmes were available. This maximised the opportunity for prisoners to make good progress during their sentences.

Good practice

- 4.7** *The protocols between the OMU and other departments had helped to establish constructive and supportive collaborative relationships.*

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8** *The OMU was very well integrated, and the enthusiastic OSs saw most prisoners regularly. The offender management model was still being established. There was a backlog of OASys assessments, but it was well managed. Public protection arrangements were appropriately focused on risks and were proportionate. Re-categorisation processes were on the whole not relevant for the prison population. The needs of indeterminate sentence prisoners were broadly met.*

- 4.9** Nearly all prisoners were seen by their OS within 10 days of arrival. Higher risk cases were allocated to probation service OSs, who had manageable caseloads. Prison officer OSs had slightly higher caseloads but fewer high risk cases. Continued contact was generally very good, particularly for higher risk prisoners, and most OSs knew the women in their care well.
- 4.10** Many of the OSs were new in the role, but all were enthusiastic and reported that they had received good training. Probation service OSs received good quality case management supervision, which prison officer OSs did not have; nevertheless they felt confident that they could receive support and expertise from their colleagues and managers. Both groups of OSs attended practice development meetings together to share and develop expertise, and prison officer OSs could attend Surrey and Sussex Probation Trust training. In addition to the mandatory 10% quality assurance of OASys documents, a prison manager checked one case file a week and discussed it with the OS.
- 4.11** Administrative staff were much less positive about the training and supervision they received. The offender management model had only been introduced in 2013, and some training elements still required consolidation.

- 4.12** Eighty-eight prisoners did not have an up-to-date OASys document, more than at our last inspection, and prison officer OSs were now responsible for much of the backlog; the work was appropriately prioritised, but there was too much of it. OSs were regularly redeployed elsewhere in the prison for around 50 hours a month, which hampered efforts to deal with the backlog. We observed that, wherever possible, prison officers OSs made informal contact with their allocated prisoners when they were required to work outside the OMU.
- 4.13** The OASys documents we viewed were good. HMI Probation inspectors reviewed 20 case files and found work was generally good. However, some OASys reviews did not sufficiently reflect the work prisoners had done towards their sentence planning objectives, or clearly identify how their risk of harm would be managed during the custodial phase of the sentence.
- 4.14** OSs made detailed records of their contact with prisoners in contact logs which were only available to OMU staff. Evidence revealed that some offender supervisors also used the prison's generic case note system to record their contact with prisoners, but this was not sufficiently consistent, and meant information was not shared across the prison. There was a lack of clarity about what information could not be shared.
- 4.15** Sentence planning boards rarely involved anyone other than the OS and the prisoner in person; the offender manager participated via video link when appropriate. Most departments provided written reports. In the previous six months, everyone who had been eligible for home detention curfew had been granted it.

Housekeeping point

- 4.16** All OSs should use P-Nomis, the Prison Service IT system, to record details of their interactions with prisoners.

Public protection

- 4.17** The public protection policy was comprehensive. Most of the work was overseen by the hub manager who kept a spreadsheet containing a list of those subject to public protection measures; staff in the security department used the list to ensure that restrictions for post, telephones and visits were enforced. We noted, however, that the version used by visits staff was three weeks out of date.
- 4.18** OSs discussed any restrictions in place with newly arrived prisoners. Twenty-three women were subject to safeguarding children restrictions, but there were no applications to have contact with named children. No prisoners were subject to offence-related telephone or post monitoring during our inspection, but we saw evidence of previous reviews of these restrictions. We concluded that restrictions were proportionate.
- 4.19** A public protection committee meeting was held every two months; it considered an appropriate range of policy and practice issues and reviewed individual cases, particularly those of prisoners approaching release. Attendance was good. A wide range of information was presented and risk management discussions were detailed. Good written contributions were made to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) meetings. Staff understood how to use MAPPA to raise concerns and plan effectively for release.

Housekeeping point

4.20 The public protection list used by visits staff should be up to date.

Categorisation

4.21 Re-categorisation reviews had been conducted on time, but the decisions were not based on evidence and prisoners were not told how to appeal.

4.22 We struggled to see the purpose of this work, because prisoners who had been judged suitable for open conditions had the same regime and resettlement opportunities as anyone else. In particular, eligible prisoners could participate in all forms of temporary release even if they were not yet formally suitable for open conditions. As at our last inspection, many prisoners chose to stay at Send rather than move to open conditions because of geographical considerations and perceptions about the quality of the accommodation.

Recommendation

4.23 **The National Offender Management Service should review whether the routine re-categorisation process delivers any useful outcomes for prisoners and decide whether or not to continue this work.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

4.24 About a quarter of the population was serving an indeterminate sentence, and there was a clear, appropriate and up-to-date policy statement about how they would be managed. A single case administrator was responsible for them; she ensured that both OSs and prisoners could benefit from her specialist knowledge about the needs of this group of prisoners.

4.25 Indeterminate sentence prisoners no longer had extended visits specifically for them, but could apply for family visits in the same way as other prisoners (see section on children, families and contact with the outside world). This meant the prison no longer had any formal opportunities to encourage the families or friends of indeterminate sentence prisoners to become involved in the management of their sentences. Occasional dedicated forums aimed to help these prisoners understand and work with the risk management process, but family members and friends could not attend them.

4.26 Parole processes were up to date. The previous shortage of psychology staff to complete reports required for parole purposes had been resolved. There was no evidence of delays in arranging progressive moves.

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.

- 4.27** *Immediate resettlement needs were met on induction. There was some duplication in the assessment of long-term needs. The Working Out scheme provided women with excellent work experience opportunities. Mentoring was available. Nearly all women were released with an address, but the management of housing peer workers needed improvement. Well structured interviews during induction made useful links to agencies delivering education and work skills development required for employment on release. Links with employers were good and some very good ROTL opportunities were offered. Prisoners received information about access to NHS services on release. Substance misuse services linked in well with the OMU, release planning was good and some women had been placed in residential rehabilitation facilities. Financial advice was available and all prisoners could open bank accounts. Visits were generally good, but there were not enough family days and no family support worker. The therapeutic community (TC) and psychologically informed physical environment (PIPE) enabled women to seek therapeutic support, and many other interventions were available.*
- 4.28** Prisoners were usually seen by their OS within 10 days of arrival for an initial discussion about their home circumstances, risks and resettlement needs. A variety of agencies assessed new arrivals and there was some unhelpful duplication in the assessment of prisoners' long-term needs.
- 4.29** Six months prior to release, and subject to behaviour, prisoners became eligible to apply to live in the resettlement units. Most prisoners on ROTL came from these units and staff supported women to work outside the prison.
- 4.30** All women had a pre-release OASys assessment, were discussed at the public protection meeting and had a discharge board. These processes ensured that their resettlement needs were met and any outstanding risks addressed.
- 4.31** Fifty women participating in the Working Out scheme, including seven who were in paid employment. In the previous six months, 93 different women had benefited from these opportunities.
- 4.32** In addition, women could receive help through the St Giles Trust, including through-the-gate services for women returning to London and a peer-to-peer resettlement call centre offering women telephone and face-to-face resettlement advice. A 'meet at the gate' service was also available for some women.
- 4.33** The Making Connections project, available through the chaplaincy, provided women in the last six months of their sentence with mentoring opportunities, transport to their release address and referrals to local support.

Accommodation

- 4.34** In our survey, fewer prisoners than previously said they had arrived with housing problems, and more women than at comparator prisons knew where to go for accommodation advice. Nearly all women were released with an address.
- 4.35** Accommodation advice and support was available through a range of sources, including OSs, three housing peer workers and the St Giles Trust (see paragraph 4.32). Housing peer workers liaised with a variety of local and national housing providers, including hostels. A prison-based St Giles Trust representative liaised with community service providers in complex cases. All peer workers had attained national vocational qualification level three in advice and guidance, but not all had received specific housing training and they received no formal casework management. Unchanged from 2010, their work was hampered by limited access to telephones and no access to a fax, email or the internet, for which they had to rely on staff.
- 4.36** A representative from charity Women in Prison visited the prison every month to offer prisoners returning to London a variety of support, including housing advice. All women were referred six months pre-release to the chaplaincy's Making Connections mentoring programme (see paragraph 4.323).

Recommendation

- 4.37** **Housing peer workers should be able to use telephones and the internet for their work.** (Repeated recommendation, 9.46)

Housekeeping point

- 4.38** Housing peer workers should receive casework supervision and support.

Education, training and employment

- 4.39** Arrangements for resettlement into education, training and work, led by careers organisation Tribal, were good. Women had appropriate access to a good range of well taught stand-alone activities, including advice and guidance on all aspects of employment, education and training. Tribal advisers carried out well structured interviews with all women during induction and linked up with agencies delivering education and work skills training required for employment on release. Women had access to business courses and could gain good practical interpersonal and work skills. Links with employers were positive and used well to offer some very good ROTL opportunities.
- 4.40** The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) was new but prisoners used it appropriately to search for work and create CVs.

Health care

- 4.41** Pre-release planning ensured there was sufficient time for preparations before a prisoner's release. Prisoners received information about their care and treatment while in prison and about access to NHS services. The care programme approach (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness) was used for prisoners with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care and end of life programmes were available but rarely required.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.42** The substance misuse service had good links with the OMU; it shared care plans and contributed to sentence planning, parole and ROTL meetings and there was also evidence of joint release planning. A designated aftercare lead member of staff in the team worked with community social workers to arrange residential rehabilitation placements post-release. Women were given harm reduction information, and links had been established with a wide range of community drug intervention programme teams.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.43** As well as support from their OSs, prisoners could obtain financial and debt advice through the St Giles Trust. A Jobcentre Plus representative provided benefits advice and arranged benefits appointments pre-release. All prisoners could open bank accounts and participate in a financial capability course through the education department; a budgeting and household management course was run in the PIPE unit. Women could phone the free National Debtline.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.44** In our survey, more prisoners than in the comparator said that staff had supported them to maintain contact with their family and friends, and we saw from case note records that staff often discussed family relationships. Storybook Mums (in which prisoners record stories for their children) was available in the library and a family relationships course took place in the education department. Prisoners who had been bereaved or separated from their children as a result of adoption could receive specialist bereavement counselling through the chaplaincy. The chaplain managed 20 prison visitors and women could be partnered with a pen-friend.
- 4.45** However, there was no family support worker to support prisoners seeking to maintain, improve or re-establish contact with their families, and no general relationship counselling for women or immediate family members. Although the St Giles Trust peer workers helped facilitate phone calls to resolve issues, women who were primary carers could not receive incoming telephone calls.
- 4.46** ROTL was used extensively to help prisoners maintain family ties, particularly before release (see section on strategic management of resettlement, paragraph 4.5). Some inter-prison visits took place by teleconference, and prisoners in the TC, some of whom were very far from home, could have accumulated visits during therapy breaks.

- 4.47** The visitors' centre, run by charity Send Family Link, was welcoming, accessible, spacious and well equipped. There was a visitors' comments book, but it was rarely used. Visitors said they were treated respectfully and received sufficient information before their visit. We found the entry checks and searching arrangements to be proportionate. It was good that the prison provided a free bus service to and from the train station.
- 4.48** The visits room was pleasant and had comfortable furniture, a refreshment bar and a staffed play area for children. However, it was noisy even when it was only half full. Send Family Link, which ran the play and refreshment facilities, helped the prison to organise family visits. Ten took place in 2013, eight involving children and two involving adults only. These events included a lunch in the dining room and organised activities in the visits hall. Prisoners and their families and supporters appreciated the visits, but they were approximately 40% over-subscribed. Prisoners without children typically had only one opportunity for a family visit in the year, and grandmothers could rarely see their grandchildren. A monthly mother and toddler group allowed mothers to care for their young children without the carer present.
- 4.49** Only prisoners on the enhanced regime could receive a weekly visit. Visits could be booked easily by telephone, but not while at the prison. Prisoners still had to wear an identifying sash and they could not visit the play area with their children. Supervision was generally low key, but officers often appeared to overhear prisoners' conversations with their visitors.

Recommendations

- 4.50** **The prison should have a qualified family support worker.**
- 4.51** **All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week.** (Repeated recommendation, 9.85)

Housekeeping points

- 4.52** Arrangements should ensure that staff are able to observe but not overhear domestic visits.
- 4.53** Women prisoners should not have to wear a coloured bib in the visits room. (Repeated recommendation, 9.87)

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.54** A good variety of offending behaviour interventions were available, including the only prison-based democratic TC for women with complex needs in the country (see section on the therapeutic community), a PIPE (see section on the psychologically informed physical environment) and the Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) programme (see sections on substance misuse and additional resettlement services).
- 4.55** In addition, the chaplaincy coordinated the Sycamore Tree restorative justice and victim awareness programme, as well as the Making Sense of Forgiveness and Living with Loss courses. In the previous year, three of each had been delivered, providing prisoners with around 120 places. The waiting time for a place on the popular Sycamore Tree programme was more than a year, but for other courses waiting times were more manageable.
- 4.56** In our survey, more prisoners than in comparator prisons reported that they had been involved in offending behaviour programmes and felt the programme would help them on release.

Therapeutic community

- 4.57** Women felt that information they had received about the TC was good and helped them decide whether or not to apply; they also thought that the assessment period had been useful. We observed that difficulties obtaining medical information from other prisons delayed some applications.
- 4.58** Since the last inspection, the TC had moved into new accommodation on J wing. The environment was reasonable, but could have been much better. There was not enough seating in the communal area, and some of it was very worn. The large community room was long and narrow and when it was almost full, it was difficult for residents to make themselves heard clearly.
- 4.59** The unit was nearly full, but only two of the three spurs on the upper floor of J wing were used and there were a number of 'lodgers' on the landing. Some were TC graduates, others had been selected for their maturity; however, their presence diluted the therapeutic environment.
- 4.60** Prisoners said they received good support and had excellent relationships with staff. There was no evidence that prisoners' individual rights, such as to make formal complaints or seek confidential support from chaplains, were at odds with the workings of the TC, where the prevailing culture was to bring personal issues to the group.
- 4.61** The staff group had changed substantially as a result of a new national policy, and there would soon only be two women officers in a staff group of eight. This was mitigated by the fact that the therapists were women, but the situation was not ideal. Despite this, the community was stable.
- 4.62** The community had agreed to welcome a prisoner whose history included sexual offending; although this had been difficult for both prisoners and staff, it reflected community members' mature approach.
- 4.63** An audit conducted in autumn 2013 by the Community of Communities, a quality improvement and accreditation programme for TCs, had been generally positive.

Recommendation

- 4.64** **A dedicated therapeutic community with a population who were exclusively involved with the programme for women should be maintained to ensure that the different life experiences and specific needs of women are fully understood and met within a fully supportive therapeutic setting.** (Repeated recommendation, 9.114)

Psychologically informed physical environment

- 4.65** The PIPE unit had been established following our last inspection. It was an excellent environment and helped prisoners progress and develop. The unit was well managed by a clinical forensic psychologist supported by six key worker discipline staff, who also spent some of their time working elsewhere in the prison. The unit was designed for women with personality disorders who had attended programmes and treatment in the past elsewhere. All residents were volunteers who had been selected by a panel of prison staff, which met every month and was chaired by the PIPE clinical lead staff member. There were 22 residents at the time of our inspection but the unit had a capacity for 40.

4.66 Women located in the unit valued it, and a good range of group meetings and activities were available. Prisoners in the unit continued to attend work and education activities. All had a key worker whom they met on a one-to-one basis for at least one hour per fortnight. The women attended structured group work in teams of eight and all residents and staff met every Monday for a working breakfast. Additional creative sessions were carried out in the evenings and at weekends to encourage women to socialise and build relationships. Women usually stayed in the unit for a minimum of six months and up to two years prior to their release or further resettlement.

Additional resettlement services

4.67 The National Offender Management Service had discontinued a number of interventions for prisoners who had been victims of abuse, rape or domestic violence or who had been involved in prostitution. Prisoners were asked on induction if they had been victims of these crimes or involved in sex work, but there was no evidence to suggest they were encouraged on a continuing basis to disclose their experiences. Managers were hoping to secure alternative services, but no clear plans were in place. Only 25 staff had received the Sex Workers in Custody and Community training.

4.68 Some OMU staff had expertise in these areas and helped support individual women. In addition, the TC, PIPE and the RAPt programme all provided women with the opportunity to address trauma and relationship issues. The services of the mental health in-reach team were a source of support, as was the one-to-one listening service available in the chaplaincy.

Recommendations

4.69 **More staff needed to attend specific awareness training of the issues relevant to women who had been sex workers in the community.**

4.70 **Prisoners should be encouraged and supported to disclose if they have previously been victimised or traumatised as a result of abuse, rape, domestic violence or involvement in prostitution.**

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 An overarching policy based on a needs analysis should be published to provide clear guidance on how equality and diversity should be managed and promoted in the prison. (S41)
- 5.2 All prisoners should have an up-to-date OASys assessment. (S42)

Recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.3 The National Offender Management Service should review whether the routine re-categorisation process delivers any useful outcomes for prisoners and decide whether or not to continue this work. (4.23)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.4 Prisoners should be held in reception for as short a time as possible and their property should accompany them to the first night unit. (1.12)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.5 Results from the prison's safety and exit surveys should be used to inform the safer custody strategy and safer custody continuous improvement action plan. (1.23)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.6 Women subject to constant watches should where possible, be encouraged to take part in activities. (1.33)

Security

- 5.7 The gender of officers escorting women to hospital for intimate examinations should be recorded on the person escort record and monitored by a senior manager. (1.50)
- 5.8 The establishment should improve the MDT environment. (1.51)

Discipline

- 5.9** Rigorous reviews should be conducted following the few occasions where force is used in conjunction with the observation cell or strip-clothing to ensure that such measures are taken only as a last resort. (1.64)

Substance misuse

- 5.10** Methadone administration should take place at a more suitable time so as not to interrupt activities. (1.73)
- 5.11** The substance misuse strategy document should contain detailed development targets, be informed by a new needs analysis and outline how joint working between the substance misuse and mental health teams could be improved. (1.74)

Residential units

- 5.12** Suitable weather proof coats should be available for women who require them. (2.10)
- 5.13** Women should be able to get their stored property within a week of application. (2.11, repeated recommendation, 2.11)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.14** Personal officers should play a more proactive role in supporting resettlement work through regular contact with resettlement workers. (2.16)

Equality and diversity

- 5.15** The prison should carry out statistical analysis of information about all protected characteristics. (2.27)
- 5.16** Care planning for older prisoners and those with disabilities should be improved. (2.37)

Legal rights

- 5.17** Legal visits should take place in suitable privacy. (2.52, repeated recommendation, 3.34)

Health services

- 5.18** There should be a named nurse with additional skills in the care and management of older prisoners. (2.62)
- 5.19** Health care complaints should be managed confidentially. (2.63)
- 5.20** Patients should be informed early on the day of their attendance at an outside hospital appointment so that they can prepare themselves appropriately. (2.67)
- 5.21** The medicines management committee should consider introducing additional PGDs to enable the pharmacist or nurse to supply more potent medication, avoiding unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.73)

- 5.22** All women receiving night sedation should have their medication at an appropriate therapeutic time. (2.74)

Catering

- 5.23** Breakfast should be served on the morning it is eaten. (2.85, repeated recommendation, 8.9)

Purchases

- 5.24** Women should be able to place their first canteen order within 24 hours of their arrival and receive it within a reasonable period after the order has been placed. (2.91)
- 5.25** There should be no charge for catalogue orders. (2.92)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.26** Initial skills assessments should be completed promptly to inform the planning and scheduling of prisoners' activities more effectively. (3.11)
- 5.27** All prison departments should use the prisoner schedules to identify when it is appropriate to add additional activities or appointments. (3.12)
- 5.28** Better use should be made of data to monitor the provision and prisoners' progress and to identify specific factors that create barriers to learning. (3.13)
- 5.29** The number of ESOL classes should be increased to ensure that non-English speaking prisoners' language skills improve as quickly as possible to enable them to integrate more easily into prison society. (3.19)
- 5.30** A formal programme should be introduced to train and accredit peer mentors. (3.20)
- 5.31** The success rates on English and mathematics courses should be improved by increasing the frequency and intensity of classes. (3.30)

Reintegration planning

- 5.32** Housing peer workers should be able to use telephones and the internet for their work. (4.37, repeated recommendation, 9.46)
- 5.33** The prison should have a qualified family support worker. (4.50)
- 5.34** All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (4.51, repeated recommendation, 9.85)
- 5.35** A dedicated therapeutic community with a population who were exclusively involved with the programme for women should be maintained to ensure that the different life experiences and specific needs of women are fully understood and met within a fully supportive therapeutic setting. (4.64, repeated recommendation, 9.114)
- 5.36** More staff needed to attend specific awareness training of the issues relevant to women who had been sex workers in the community. (4.69)

- 5.37** Prisoners should be encouraged and supported to disclose if they have previously been victimised or traumatised as a result of abuse, rape, domestic violence or involvement in prostitution. (4.70)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.38** Prisoners arriving after the evening meal has been served in the dining room should be given a hot meal in reception. (1.13)

Discipline

- 5.39** A quieter room providing greater privacy and fewer distractions should be used for adjudications. (1.60)

Residential units

- 5.40** Women should not have to pay for garments with hoods to be altered. (2.12)

Health services

- 5.41** All clinical supervision should be recorded. (2.64)
- 5.42** Health care information should be available in a range of languages. (2.68)
- 5.43** Old reference books should be discarded, and only the most recent copy should be kept to ensure that information used is up to date. (2.75)

Catering

- 5.44** Second helpings of food should be allowed. (2.86)

Purchases

- 5.45** The prison should explore prisoners' negative perceptions of the range of products available. (2.93)

Offender management and planning

- 5.46** All OSs should use P-Nomis, the Prison Service IT system, to record details of their interactions with prisoners. (4.16)
- 5.47** The public protection list used by visits staff should be up to date. (4.20)

Reintegration planning

- 5.48** Housing peer workers should receive casework supervision and support. (4.38)
- 5.49** Arrangements should ensure that staff are able to observe but not overhear domestic visits. (4.52)

- 5.50** Women prisoners should not have to wear a coloured bib in the visits room. (4.53, repeated recommendation, 9.87)

Examples of good practice

- 5.51** The use of pre-printed Listener request cards meant women did not have to make a verbal request to see a Listener, which could have been overheard by other prisoners. (1.34)
- 5.52** The management of women prisoners without formal recourse to a segregation unit supports our view that with good governance arrangements in place most women can be managed more appropriately in residential units. (1.66)
- 5.53** The protocols between the OMU and other departments had helped to establish constructive and supportive collaborative relationships. (4.7)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas
 Sean Sullivan
 Rose Bugdale
 Joss Crosbie
 Paul Fenning
 Jeanette Hall
 Gordon Riach
 Rachel Prime
 Helen Ranns
 Lucy Higgins

Deputy Chief inspector
 Team leader
 Inspector
 Inspector
 Inspector
 Inspector
 Inspector
 Research officer
 Research officer
 Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Sigrid Engelen
 Mick Bowen
 Simon Denton
 Kathleen Byrne
 Charles Clarke
 Nick Crombie
 Martin Hughes
 Colin Barnes
 Elizabeth Smith
 Steve Woodgate

Substance misuse inspector
 Health services inspector
 Pharmacist
 Care Quality Commission
 Ofsted inspector
 Ofsted inspector
 Ofsted inspector
 Offender management inspector
 Offender management inspector
 Offender management 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 2010, reception and first night procedures were generally satisfactory and women were positive about induction. Most women felt safe but many reported victimisation by other prisoners and this was not satisfactorily dealt with. There was good support for women at risk of suicide and self-harm. Use of force had increased substantially in recent years and there was insufficient monitoring to ensure it was always necessary. Clinical management for substance users was good and there was relatively little illegal drug use. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

In consultation with prisoners, staff and all relevant stakeholders, the prison should develop a revised violence reduction strategy aimed at reducing the level of threats and intimidation experienced by women at Send and tackling the underlying causes. (HP44)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Women prisoners should be offered a toilet break at least every 2.5 hours. (1.3)

No longer relevant

Unless a risk assessment indicates otherwise, all women should be given at least 24 hours notice of planned transfers and be able to telephone family, friends or legal advisers. (1.4)

Achieved

Women should have their immediate needs and vulnerabilities identified and assessed at a private meeting with an officer before they are locked up on their first night. (1.12)

Achieved

All new arrivals should spend their first night on the first night unit. (1.13)

Not achieved

Senior managers should complete quality assurance checks of the investigations into alleged incidents of bullying to ensure that these are thorough and that appropriate action is taken to challenge bullies and protect and support victims. (3.7)

Achieved

Assessment, care in custody and teamwork care plans (care maps) should identify the prisoner's needs and concerns, indicate how and when these will be addressed and the person responsible and should be updated after each review. (3.17)

Achieved

An appropriate environment should be provided for women under constant supervision, who where appropriate should be encouraged and enabled to take part in activities. (3.18)

Partially achieved

The action plan for emerging findings for the most recent death in custody should ensure that the proposed actions promptly and fully address the concerns raised, including the provision of defibrillators and sufficient first aid-trained staff. (3.19)

Achieved

Closed visits should not be implemented following a single drug dog indication unless there is additional supporting intelligence. (7.7)

Achieved

Individual security risk assessments should be carried out to ensure that women prisoners are not unnecessarily prevented from participation in specific activities. (7.8)

Achieved

Use of force data should routinely be formally analysed for trends and records scrutinised by a senior manager to ensure that force is used only when necessary. (7.17)

Partially achieved.

A dual diagnosis lead should be identified and designated dual diagnosis services should be developed for women with mental health and substance-related problems supported by joint work between mental health and CARAT services. (3.47)

Partially achieved.

Nurses should undertake training to allow naltrexone treatment to start before release. (3.48)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2010, relationships between staff and prisoners and personal officer work were generally good but marred by a small number of staff. Living conditions were mostly good but satisfaction with food had significantly decreased. Reasonable diversity work was taking place but there was little care planning for women with disabilities and black and minority ethnic women had some poorer perceptions of their treatment. Applications were well managed but some responses to complaints were too curt. Health services were beginning to improve from a very poor base. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

A prisoner council, chaired by a senior governor, should be formed to consult women prisoners (HP45)

Achieved

Recommendations

Women should be able to get their stored property within a week of application. (2.11)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Sufficient working phones should be provided in booths on each wing. (2.12)

Achieved

The governor of Send and Downview should ensure that all staff are fully aware of expected professional standards in dealing with women and that any managerial concerns or complaints about staff are effectively investigated and monitored at a senior level. (2.22)

Achieved

Breakfast should be served on the morning it is eaten. (8.9)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.85)

Women prisoners should have the opportunity to cook meals for themselves. (8.10)

Achieved

Women prisoners should be able to make a shop order within 24 hours of arrival. (8.19)

Not achieved

Black and minority ethnic women should have weekly access to a good range of specialised products through either the shop or the specialist catalogues. (8.20)

Achieved

Regular prisoner consultative meetings should be held for all diversity strands, including for black and minority ethnic prisoners. (4.20)

Not achieved

Ethnic monitoring should extend to cover areas of concern to prisoners, including employment and other activities. Any areas out of range should be fully discussed at the race equality and diversity action team meeting and actions taken when necessary. (4.21)

Achieved

Racist incident reports should be thoroughly investigated and subject to critical external and management scrutiny. Written reports should clearly explain the reason behind the findings. (4.22)

Achieved

Professional telephone interpreters should be used for women prisoners who have little understanding of English when issues of accuracy or confidentiality arise and to ensure they are aware of basic prison procedures. (4.36)

Achieved

Foreign national women should receive a free five-minute telephone call every month regardless of whether they have received a visit. (4.37)

Achieved

Women should have access to accredited independent immigration advice and support agencies. (4.38)

Achieved

Equality of treatment should be monitored and analysed by religion and appropriate actions taken to correct any inequalities. (4.29)

Not achieved

Women prisoners with disabilities and older women who need additional support should have their individual needs assessed and relevant care plans drawn up and suitable adaptations provided to meet their needs. (4.47)

Partially achieved

All replies to applications should be recorded in the wing applications log books. (3.26)

Achieved

Senior managers should ensure that women prisoners receive respectful and legible responses to complaints that address the issues raised and the reason for the decision. (3.27)

Achieved

Legal visits should take place in suitable privacy. (3.34)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.52)

Pentecostal and Hindu ministers should regularly attend the prison. (3.39)

Achieved

A full health needs assessment including mental health provision should be undertaken to help ensure the delivery of a safe, decent and comprehensive health service that matches services in the community and meets the particular needs of women prisoners at Send. (5.6)

Achieved

All clinical incidents, near misses and serious untoward incidents should be recorded and learning incorporated into clinical training. (5.14)

Achieved

All health care staff should have a minimum of annual resuscitation skills training. (5.15)

Achieved

There should be a formal secondary health assessment within 72 hours of arrival to ensure health concerns are identified early and dealt with appropriately. (5.23)

Achieved

There should be an appropriate in possession risk scoring tool that is consistently available to prescribers with the clinical record. (5.32)

Achieved

Women should receive night sedation at bed time. (5.33)

Partially achieved

There should be complete dental records, including charting of teeth, as advised by the Dental Good Practice Guidelines (Faculty of General Dental Practice [UK]). (5.43)

Achieved

Women should not be held in restraints for external hospital appointments unless there is a clear individual risk assessment that identifies a real security risk. Where intimate examinations or procedures are to be undertaken and/or the woman needs to undress, the right to privacy and dignity should be properly respected at all times. (5.48)

Not achieved

A clear system should be introduced to ensure prompt and appropriate referrals from reception screenings to the mental health team. (5.55)

Achieved

All staff with direct contact with women should have mental health awareness training. (5.56)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2010, time out of cell was very good and there were enough activity places for all women. Education provision was generally good with some good teaching and achievements, but there were too few progression opportunities for the more able women and those serving longer sentences. Work was generally of good quality but there was insufficient accredited training. The library played an active role in supporting learning. PE facilities and programmes were good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

A wider range of education and training courses should be provided and at higher levels to improve women's progression opportunities. (HP46)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

An agreed core day should be displayed and followed on each wing. (6.30)

Achieved

All women prisoners should be able to have one hour in the open air every day. (6.31)

Partially achieved

Sufficient, appropriately qualified staff should be provided to cover absences for classes and to improve the range of vocational courses. (6.6)

Partially achieved

Arrangements for observations of teaching and learning should be improved in education and introduced across the learning and skills provision. (6.7)

Achieved

The number of vocational training opportunities should be increased. (6.13)

Partially achieved

Prisoners on personal study courses should have better access to computers. (6.16)

Not 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 2010, the resettlement strategy covered all pathways but not the specific needs of different groups. Offender management arrangements operated effectively and most assessments and sentence plans were up to date. Most lifers felt well supported but there was little psychology provision. Reintegration services were mostly satisfactory and a range of good interventions were provided, including the therapeutic community and the RAPt programme but there was a gap in provision for women with alcohol

problems. Services to help women maintain contact with their families were underdeveloped. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

A revised reducing reoffending strategy should be introduced based on an up-to-date and effective analysis of need and which sets out how the specific resettlement needs of particular groups of women prisoners will be met. (HP47)

Achieved

Recommendations

Objectives in sentence plans should be outcome-focused and sequenced appropriately to the specific needs of the individual woman prisoner. (9.21)

Achieved

All women prisoners should have agreed regular contact with their allocated offender supervisor. (9.22)

Achieved

Risk management plans should accurately describe how the objectives of the sentence plan and other activities address the risk of harm to others and protect actual and potential victims. (9.30)

Achieved

There should be sufficient psychology resources to meet the needs of life-sentenced prisoners. (9.37)

Achieved

Designated accommodation should be provided for women serving long sentences. (9.38)

Not achieved

Housing peer workers should be able to use telephones and the internet for their work. (9.46) **Not Achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.37)

A specialist housing advice provider should continue to offer a service to women after March 2011. (9.47)

Partially achieved

Health services should be fully integrated into discharge arrangements to help ensure women's health needs are taken into account on release. (9.52)

Achieved

All prisoners should be helped to open a bank account before release. (9.55)

Achieved

Provision for women with alcohol problems should be increased through the extension of the CARAT service and the RAPt programme to include women with primary alcohol problems. (9.66)

Achieved

The CARAT service should provide longer group work modules focusing on motivation to change and relapse prevention. (9.67)

Achieved

The children and families pathway action plan should be based on an up to date needs analysis and should aim to develop a range of services to help promote creative, positive contact between prisoners, children and families. (9.83)

Partially achieved

Family days should meet demand and should be open to other family members beyond prisoners' own children. (9.84)

Not achieved

All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (9.85)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.51)

Visits should start at the advertised time. (9.86)

Achieved

Women prisoners should not have to wear a coloured bib in the visits room. (9.87)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point, 4.53)

A full needs analysis based on OASys data should be carried out to ensure that suitable interventions are run to meet prisoners' identified needs. (9.97)

Achieved

An entirely separate therapeutic community for women should be maintained to ensure that the different life experiences and specific needs of women are fully understood and met within a fully supportive therapeutic setting. (9.114)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.64)

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced		268	97.1
Recall		8	2.9
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand			
Civil prisoners			
Detainees			
Total		276	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced			
Less than 6 months			
6 months to less than 12 months		3	1.1
12 months to less than 2 years		8	2.9
2 years to less than 4 years		51	18.5
4 years to less than 10 years		107	38.8
10 years and over (not life)		37	13.4
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)		19	6.9
Life		51	25.4
Total		276	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 21		
Under 21 years		
21 years to 29 years	69	25.0
30 years to 39 years	79	28.6
40 years to 49 years	79	28.6
50 years to 59 years	38	13.8
60 years to 69 years	10	3.6
70 plus years	1	0.4
Please state maximum age here: 76		
Total	276	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British		231	83.7
Foreign nationals		45	16.3
Total		276	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Fem closed		250	90.6
Fem open		26	9.4
Category A			
Category B			
Category C			

Category D			
Other			
Total		276	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British		168	60.9
Irish		4	1.4
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		1	0.4
Other white		24	8.7
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean		8	2.9
White and black African			
White and Asian		2	0.7
Other mixed		2	0.7
Asian or Asian British			
Indian		4	1.4
Pakistani		3	1.1
Bangladeshi		2	0.7
Chinese		2	0.7
Other Asian		5	1.8
Black or black British			
Caribbean		22	8.0
African		16	5.8
Other black		13	4.7
Other ethnic group			
Arab			
Other ethnic group		1	0.4
Not stated			
Total		276	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England		62	22.5
Roman Catholic		52	18.8
Other Christian denominations		50	18.1
Muslim		23	8.3
Sikh		4	1.4
Hindu		1	0.4
Buddhist		9	3.3
Jewish		1	0.4
Other		8	2.9
No religion		65	23.6
Total		276	100

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			41	14.9
1 month to 3 months			30	10.9
3 months to 6 months			45	16.3
6 months to 1 year			45	16.3
1 year to 2 years			57	20.7
2 years to 4 years			40	14.5
4 years or more			18	6.5
Total			276	100

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry			
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).		175	63.4
Total		175	63.4

Unsentenced prisoners only

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

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

Appendix 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.⁸ 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 3 February 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Send was 267. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 153 prisoners.

We received a total of 138 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 90%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Eight respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, five questionnaires were not returned and two were returned blank.

⁸ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes an 80% response rate (70% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	24
B	19
C	23
E	18
F	17
J	32
RAPt(D)	5

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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 significant⁹ differences are indicated by shading. 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 Send in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other female training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in two female training prisons since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMP Send in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Send in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2014 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 2014 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other and those who consider themselves to be heterosexual.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the resettlement unit (wings E and F) and the rest of the establishment.

⁹ 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?		
	Under 21	0	(0%)
	21 - 29.....	36	(26%)
	30 - 39.....	38	(28%)
	40 - 49.....	40	(29%)
	50 - 59.....	18	(13%)
	60 - 69.....	5	(4%)
	70 and over	0	(0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	Yes	133	(98%)
	Yes - on recall.....	3	(2%)
	No - awaiting trial.....	0	(0%)
	No - awaiting sentence	0	(0%)
	No - awaiting deportation.....	0	(0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced	0	(0%)
	Less than 6 months	0	(0%)
	6 months to less than 1 year	1	(1%)
	1 year to less than 2 years	7	(5%)
	2 years to less than 4 years	29	(22%)
	4 years to less than 10 years	48	(36%)
	10 years or more	12	(9%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	12	(9%)
	Life.....	25	(19%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	Yes	17	(13%)
	No.....	118	(87%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	Yes	132	(99%)
	No.....	2	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	Yes	131	(97%)
	No.....	4	(3%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)	80	(60%)
	White - Irish	3	(2%)
	White - other.....	10	(7%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	11	(8%)
	Black or black British - African	7	(5%)
	Black or black British - other	2	(1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	1	(1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	3	(2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	1	(1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	0	(0%)
	Asian or Asian British - other	3	(2%)
	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean.....	5	(4%)
	Mixed race - white and black African	3	(2%)
	Mixed race - white and Asian	1	(1%)
	Mixed race - other.....	0	(0%)
	Arab.....	0	(0%)
	Other ethnic group	4	(3%)

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		4 (3%)
	No.....		133 (97%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	30 (22%)	Hindu
	Church of England	44 (32%)	Jewish
	Catholic	25 (18%)	Muslim
	Protestant.....	2 (1%)	Sikh
	Other Christian denomination	10 (7%)	Other.....
	Buddhist.....	7 (5%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		95 (71%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		15 (11%)
	Bisexual.....		23 (17%)
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		33 (24%)
	No.....		102 (76%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes		1 (1%)
	No.....		134 (99%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		91 (66%)
	No.....		47 (34%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		60 (44%)
	No.....		77 (56%)

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		71 (52%)
	2 hours or longer		53 (39%)
	Don't remember		13 (9%)
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	My journey was less than two hours		71 (52%)
	Yes		47 (35%)
	No.....		12 (9%)
	Don't remember		6 (4%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	My journey was less than two hours		71 (52%)
	Yes		2 (1%)
	No.....		58 (42%)
	Don't remember		6 (4%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?		
	Yes		86 (63%)
	No.....		35 (26%)
	Don't remember		16 (12%)

Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	116 (85%)
	No.....	14 (10%)
	Don't remember	6 (4%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	40 (29%)
	Well.....	62 (45%)
	Neither	27 (20%)
	Badly.....	3 (2%)
	Very badly	1 (1%)
	Don't remember	4 (3%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	90 (65%)
	Yes, I received written information	41 (30%)
	No, I was not told anything	9 (7%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	120 (88%)
	No.....	15 (11%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	66 (48%)
	2 hours or longer	61 (45%)
	Don't remember	10 (7%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	116 (87%)
	No	9 (7%)
	Don't remember	9 (7%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	38 (28%)
	Well.....	65 (47%)
	Neither	23 (17%)
	Badly.....	7 (5%)
	Very badly	2 (1%)
	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	16 (12%)
	Housing problems.....	17 (13%)
	Contacting employers	1 (1%)
	Contacting family	17 (13%)
	Childcare	5 (4%)
	Money worries.....	21 (16%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	18 (14%)
	Physical health	19 (14%)
	Mental health.....	26 (20%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners	4 (3%)
	Getting phone numbers	6 (5%)
	Other.....	4 (3%)
	Did not have any problems	54 (41%)

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	30 (23%)
	No.....	48 (36%)
	Did not have any problems	54 (41%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco.....	99 (73%)
	A shower	33 (24%)
	A free telephone call.....	82 (61%)
	Something to eat.....	81 (60%)
	PIN phone credit.....	45 (33%)
	Toiletries/ basic items	51 (38%)
	Did not receive anything	7 (5%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain	67 (49%)
	Someone from health services.....	99 (73%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	77 (57%)
	Prison shop/ canteen	33 (24%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	19 (14%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply)	
	What was going to happen to you	79 (59%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	73 (55%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	68 (51%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	60 (45%)
	Health services	69 (52%)
	Chaplaincy	68 (51%)
	Not offered any information.....	25 (19%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	110 (83%)
	No.....	16 (12%)
	Don't remember	7 (5%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	5 (4%)
	Within the first week.....	116 (87%)
	More than a week.....	5 (4%)
	Don't remember	8 (6%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	5 (4%)
	Yes	74 (56%)
	No.....	40 (30%)
	Don't remember	13 (10%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment.....	17 (13%)
	Within the first week.....	69 (53%)
	More than a week.....	30 (23%)
	Don't remember	14 (11%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	21 (16%)	44 (34%)	21 (16%)	14 (11%)	5 (4%)	26 (20%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	13 (10%)	41 (33%)	20 (16%)	7 (6%)	4 (3%)	41 (33%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	10 (9%)	7 (6%)	1 (1%)	83 (77%)
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>						31 (23%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>						48 (36%)
	<i>No.....</i>						53 (40%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						72 (54%)
	<i>No.....</i>						13 (10%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>						49 (37%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	101 (76%)	31 (23%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	134 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	130 (96%)	3 (2%)	2 (1%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	99 (73%)	33 (24%)	3 (2%)			
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	59 (51%)	16 (14%)	41 (35%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	101 (78%)	28 (22%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	20 (16%)	76 (59%)	32 (25%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	<i>Very good.....</i>						12 (9%)
	<i>Good.....</i>						63 (47%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>						35 (26%)
	<i>Bad.....</i>						23 (17%)
	<i>Very bad.....</i>						2 (1%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know.....</i>						5 (4%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>						50 (37%)
	<i>No.....</i>						80 (59%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						104 (77%)
	<i>No.....</i>						4 (3%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>						27 (20%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						93 (69%)
	<i>No.....</i>						7 (5%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A.....</i>						34 (25%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						102 (76%)
	<i>No.....</i>						3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A.....</i>						30 (22%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i>	22 (16%)
<i>Very easy</i>	50 (37%)
<i>Easy</i>	37 (28%)
<i>Neither</i>	5 (4%)
<i>Difficult</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Don't know</i>	17 (13%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints**Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?**

<i>Yes</i>	120 (89%)
<i>No</i>	11 (8%)
<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are applications dealt with fairly?</i>	1 (1%)	95 (79%)	25 (21%)
<i>Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	1 (1%)	73 (63%)	41 (36%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

<i>Yes</i>	76 (58%)
<i>No</i>	25 (19%)
<i>Don't know</i>	31 (23%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are complaints dealt with fairly?</i>	46 (36%)	35 (28%)	46 (36%)
<i>Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	46 (37%)	37 (30%)	42 (34%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	19 (15%)
<i>No</i>	105 (85%)

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

<i>Don't know who they are</i>	16 (12%)
<i>Very easy</i>	23 (18%)
<i>Easy</i>	45 (35%)
<i>Neither</i>	31 (24%)
<i>Difficult</i>	10 (8%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (3%)

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>	3 (2%)
<i>Yes</i>	78 (58%)
<i>No</i>	35 (26%)
<i>Don't know</i>	18 (13%)

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>	3 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i>	63 (49%)
	<i>No</i>	45 (35%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (13%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>No</i>	131 (99%)
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>	117 (94%)
	<i>Very well</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Well</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Neither</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Badly</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	0 (0%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	100 (76%)
	<i>No</i>	32 (24%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	102 (76%)
	<i>No</i>	32 (24%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	57 (42%)
	<i>No</i>	79 (58%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Never</i>	33 (24%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	32 (24%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	38 (28%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	5 (4%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	27 (20%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	49 (36%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	34 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	25 (19%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	27 (21%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	31 (24%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	40 (31%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	6 (5%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?		
	Yes	54 (40%)	
	No.....	80 (60%)	
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?		
	Yes	16 (13%)	
	No.....	111 (87%)	
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe	80 (63%)	At meal times..... 29 (23%)
	Everywhere	5 (4%)	At health services..... 3 (2%)
	Segregation unit.....	0 (0%)	Visits area..... 4 (3%)
	Association areas	7 (6%)	In wing showers
	Reception area	2 (2%)	In gym showers
	At the gym	3 (2%)	In corridors/stairwells.....
	In an exercise yard	4 (3%)	On your landing/wing
	At work.....	13 (10%)	In your cell
	During movement.....	13 (10%)	At religious services.....
	At education	1 (1%)	
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?		
	Yes	42 (31%)	
	No.....	92 (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)	28 (21%)	
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	4 (3%)	
	Sexual abuse	1 (1%)	
	Feeling threatened or intimidated.....	29 (22%)	
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	3 (2%)	
	Medication.....	1 (1%)	
	Debt	0 (0%)	
	Drugs.....	0 (0%)	
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	6 (4%)	
	Your religion/religious beliefs	3 (2%)	
	Your nationality	4 (3%)	
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	3 (2%)	
	You are from a traveller community	2 (1%)	
	Your sexual orientation	1 (1%)	
	Your age.....	2 (1%)	
	You have a disability.....	6 (4%)	
	You were new here.....	6 (4%)	
	Your offence/ crime	14 (10%)	
	Gang related issues.....	3 (2%)	
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?		
	Yes	37 (28%)	
	No.....	94 (72%)	
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	13 (10%)	
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	1 (1%)	
	Sexual abuse	0 (0%)	
	Feeling threatened or intimidated.....	21 (16%)	
	Medication.....	3 (2%)	

Debt	0 (0%)
Drugs.....	1 (1%)
Your race or ethnic origin.....	5 (4%)
Your religion/religious beliefs	4 (3%)
Your nationality	3 (2%)
You are from a different part of the country than others.....	3 (2%)
You are from a traveller community	1 (2%)
Your sexual orientation	0 (0%)
Your age.....	2 (2%)
You have a disability.....	5 (4%)
You were new here.....	7 (5%)
Your offence/ crime	10 (8%)
Gang related issues.....	1 (1%)

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

Not been victimised.....	75 (59%)
Yes.....	32 (25%)
No.....	21 (16%)

Section 9: Health services**Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people:**

	Don't know	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
The doctor	8 (6%)	6 (4%)	48 (36%)	25 (19%)	39 (29%)	8 (6%)
The nurse	7 (5%)	14 (11%)	70 (54%)	22 (17%)	14 (11%)	3 (2%)
The dentist	16 (13%)	2 (2%)	11 (9%)	11 (9%)	51 (40%)	37 (29%)

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

	Not been	Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
The doctor	9 (7%)	13 (10%)	56 (42%)	26 (20%)	14 (11%)	14 (11%)
The nurse	6 (5%)	17 (13%)	43 (33%)	30 (23%)	22 (17%)	14 (11%)
The dentist	29 (22%)	4 (3%)	39 (30%)	25 (19%)	16 (12%)	18 (14%)

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

Not been	2 (2%)
Very good.....	13 (10%)
Good.....	39 (29%)
Neither.....	34 (26%)
Bad	26 (20%)
Very bad.....	19 (14%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes.....	97 (73%)
No.....	36 (27%)

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

Not taking medication.....	36 (27%)
Yes, all my meds.....	62 (47%)
Yes, some of my meds	20 (15%)
No.....	15 (11%)

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

Yes.....	59 (44%)
No.....	76 (56%)

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>	76 (57%)
	Yes.....	43 (32%)
	No.....	14 (11%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	37 (27%)
	No.....	98 (73%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes.....	38 (28%)
	No.....	97 (72%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	8 (6%)
	Easy.....	13 (10%)
	Neither.....	6 (4%)
	Difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	10 (7%)
	Don't know.....	92 (68%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	2 (1%)
	Easy.....	6 (4%)
	Neither.....	2 (1%)
	Difficult.....	9 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	19 (14%)
	Don't know.....	97 (72%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	2 (1%)
	No.....	134 (99%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	4 (3%)
	No.....	130 (97%)
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>	97 (72%)
	Yes.....	33 (25%)
	No.....	4 (3%)
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>	97 (71%)
	Yes.....	37 (27%)
	No.....	2 (1%)

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>	83 (63%)
	<i>Yes</i>	46 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (2%)

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	4 (3%)	33 (26%)	65 (50%)	11 (9%)	12 (9%)	4 (3%)
	Vocational or skills training	25 (20%)	17 (14%)	39 (31%)	17 (14%)	20 (16%)	7 (6%)
	Education (including basic skills)	17 (13%)	21 (16%)	55 (43%)	13 (10%)	12 (9%)	10 (8%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	17 (14%)	17 (14%)	54 (44%)	8 (6%)	17 (14%)	11 (9%)

Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Prison job</i>	115 (88%)
	<i>Vocational or skills training</i>	37 (28%)
	<i>Education (including basic skills)</i>	48 (37%)
	<i>Offending behaviour programmes</i>	43 (33%)

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	3 (3%)	60 (51%)	45 (38%)	9 (8%)
	Vocational or skills training	15 (16%)	63 (66%)	10 (10%)	8 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)	12 (11%)	72 (69%)	15 (14%)	6 (6%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	10 (10%)	73 (71%)	13 (13%)	7 (7%)

Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Never</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>	34 (26%)
	<i>About once a week</i>	46 (35%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>	40 (30%)

Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	
	<i>Don't use it</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>Yes</i>	67 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	57 (43%)

Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	34 (26%)
	<i>0</i>	27 (21%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	41 (31%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	12 (9%)

Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	19 (14%)
	<i>0</i>	33 (24%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	40 (30%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	30 (22%)

Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>0</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	91 (68%)
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>	1 (1%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	13 (10%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	23 (17%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	39 (29%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	34 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (8%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	69 (55%)
	<i>No</i>	56 (45%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	43 (33%)
	<i>No</i>	88 (67%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	29 (21%)
	<i>No</i>	106 (79%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	20 (15%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	8 (6%)
	<i>Easy</i>	38 (28%)
	<i>Neither</i>	16 (12%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	23 (17%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	26 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	112 (85%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (15%)
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>	20 (15%)
	<i>No contact</i>	26 (20%)
	<i>Letter</i>	46 (35%)
	<i>Phone</i>	42 (32%)
	<i>Visit</i>	48 (36%)

Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	117 (89%)
	No.....	15 (11%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	0 (0%)
	Yes	103 (78%)
	No.....	29 (22%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	29 (22%)
	Very involved.....	31 (23%)
	Involved	42 (31%)
	Neither	9 (7%)
	Not very involved	13 (10%)
	Not at all involved.....	10 (7%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	29 (22%)
	Nobody.....	32 (24%)
	Offender supervisor	53 (40%)
	Offender manager	35 (27%)
	Named/ personal officer	26 (20%)
	Staff from other departments	28 (21%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	29 (22%)
	Yes	89 (67%)
	No.....	9 (7%)
	Don't know	6 (5%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	29 (22%)
	Yes	15 (11%)
	No.....	69 (52%)
	Don't know	19 (14%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	29 (22%)
	Yes	28 (21%)
	No.....	44 (33%)
	Don't know	32 (24%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	9 (7%)
	No.....	42 (32%)
	Don't know	80 (61%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes	33 (26%)
	No.....	96 (74%)

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	16 (14%)	53 (47%)	44 (39%)
Accommodation	22 (18%)	66 (55%)	31 (26%)
Benefits	19 (16%)	60 (52%)	37 (32%)
Finances	27 (25%)	43 (40%)	38 (35%)
Education	25 (23%)	47 (43%)	37 (34%)
Drugs and alcohol	38 (33%)	54 (47%)	23 (20%)

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>	0 (0%)
Yes.....	95 (77%)
No.....	28 (23%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Send 2014

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 Send 2014	womens training prisons comparator	HMP Send 2014	HMP Send 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		138	283	138	130
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	6%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%		100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	2%	6%	2%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	1%	5%	1%	4%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	9%	2%	9%	10%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13%	25%	13%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	97%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	95%	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.)	31%	37%	31%	29%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	7%	3%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	7%	6%	7%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	29%	28%	29%	27%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	25%	19%	25%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1%	0%	1%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	66%	68%	66%	61%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	44%	52%	44%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	39%	49%	39%	56%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	72%	84%	72%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	3%	9%	3%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	63%	56%	63%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	85%	75%	85%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	78%	74%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	65%	66%	65%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	30%	25%	30%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	93%	88%	89%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Send 2014	women's training prisons comparator	HMP Send 2014	HMP Send 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	48%	62%	48%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	86%	87%	78%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	75%	76%	75%	70%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	59%	64%	59%	71%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	13%	12%	18%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	13%	18%	13%	29%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	2%	1%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	13%	18%	13%	31%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	5%	4%	6%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	16%	21%	16%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	14%	23%	14%	31%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	14%	16%	14%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	20%	20%	20%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	3%	3%	3%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	5%	15%	5%	26%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	38%	47%	38%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	74%	66%	74%	92%
3.6	A shower?	25%	36%	25%	46%
3.6	A free telephone call?	61%	71%	61%	35%
3.6	Something to eat?	60%	56%	60%	72%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	33%	42%	33%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	38%	47%	38%	
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?	49%	74%	49%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	73%	74%	73%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	57%	43%	57%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	24%	35%	24%	5%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	59%	54%	59%	46%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	55%	43%	55%	58%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	51%	48%	51%	40%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	45%	43%	45%	36%
3.8	Health services?	52%	54%	52%	49%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Send 2014	women's training prisons comparator	HMP Send 2014	HMP Send 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.8	The chaplaincy?	51%	61%	51%	46%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	75%	83%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	96%	91%	96%	94%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	58%	58%	58%	62%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	87%	79%	87%	
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?	50%	47%	50%	50%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	43%	52%	43%	52%
4.1	Get bail information?	7%	13%	7%	14%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	37%	46%	37%	48%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	54%	58%	54%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	76%	84%	76%	76%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	94%	99%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	96%	85%	96%	93%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	74%	67%	74%	67%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	51%	43%	51%	55%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	78%	64%	78%	69%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	16%	39%	16%	31%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	56%	45%	56%	25%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	37%	49%	37%	28%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	77%	71%	77%	86%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	66%	69%	63%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	76%	72%	76%	67%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	65%	66%	65%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	88%	89%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	79%	69%	79%	69%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	64%	60%	64%	59%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	64%	58%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	43%	42%	43%	31%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	47%	43%	47%	43%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	19%	15%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	53%	45%	53%	43%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Send 2014	women's training prisons comparator	HMP Send 2014	HMP Send 2010
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	58%	59%	58%	63%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	41%	49%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	1%	4%	1%	2%
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?	57%	45%	57%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	79%	76%	72%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	76%	79%	76%	81%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	42%	34%	42%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	18%	18%	18%	20%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	80%	83%	80%	95%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	69%	70%	69%	70%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	36%	40%	38%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	14%	13%	14%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	31%	32%	31%	36%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	20%	21%	21%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	6%	3%	12%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%	1%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	22%	22%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	5%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	2%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	5%	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	1%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	5%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	2%	2%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	0%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	3%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	1%	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	6%	5%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	5%	10%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	3%	2%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Send 2014	womens training prisons comparator	HMP Send 2014	HMP Send 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	31%	28%	27%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	11%	10%	16%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	16%	16%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	2%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	0%	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	1%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	3%	0%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	5%	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	5%	8%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	60%	54%	60%	56%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	40%	46%	40%	15%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	65%	65%	65%	46%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	10%	14%	10%	4%
	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?	56%	51%	56%	41%
9.2	The nurse?	48%	56%	48%	37%
9.2	The dentist?	42%	35%	42%	36%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	40%	46%	40%	13%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	73%	69%	73%	75%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	85%	85%	85%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	44%	42%	44%	44%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	76%	60%	76%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Send 2014	women's training prisons comparator	HMP Send 2014	HMP Send 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	27%	24%	27%	40%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	28%	18%	28%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	16%	25%	16%	30%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	6%	8%	6%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	2%	5%	2%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	6%	3%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	89%	78%	89%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	95%	81%	95%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	96%	87%	96%	87%
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	76%	78%	76%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	45%	49%	45%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	60%	60%	60%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	57%	34%	57%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	88%	85%	88%	89%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	28%	20%	28%	29%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	37%	43%	37%	53%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	33%	17%	33%	40%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	97%	98%	97%	99%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	53%	54%	53%	49%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	84%	81%	84%	89%
	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?	78%	65%	78%	72%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	89%	90%	89%	95%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	77%	74%	77%	75%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	90%	79%	90%	91%
	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?	78%	59%	78%	74%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	65%	63%	65%	65%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	50%	60%	50%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	22%	29%	22%	28%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	32%	51%	32%	56%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	54%	68%	80%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Send 2014	Womens training prisons comparator	HMP Send 2014	HMP Send 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	25%	34%	25%	28%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	55%	46%	55%	47%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	33%	42%	33%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	25%	22%	16%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	34%	29%	34%	
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?	85%	84%	85%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	23%	35%	23%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	41%	38%	41%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	37%	29%	37%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	43%	28%	43%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	89%	90%	89%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	78%	81%	78%	89%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	70%	64%	70%	61%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	32%	39%	32%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	52%	40%	52%	
13.6	Offender manager?	35%	26%	35%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	25%	14%	25%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	27%	17%	27%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	86%	66%	86%	86%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	15%	22%	15%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	27%	24%	27%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	6%	7%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	26%	23%	26%	24%
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?	55%	47%	55%	
13.12	Accommodation?	68%	57%	68%	
13.12	Benefits?	62%	59%	62%	
13.12	Finances?	53%	40%	53%	
13.12	Education?	56%	51%	56%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	70%	61%	70%	
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?	77%	63%	77%	67%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and foreign national) HMP Send 2014

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		41	93	17	118
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	22%	7%		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	100%	93%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	92%	100%	93%	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.)			59%	27%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	19%	0%	0%	7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	27%	24%	12%	26%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	81%	58%	100%	60%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	78%	64%	76%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	71%	63%	64%	65%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	89%	82%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	81%	70%	76%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	57%	61%	58%	59%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	69%	75%	88%	71%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	86%	66%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	96%	100%	96%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	53%	50%	49%

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				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	69%	78%	72%	77%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	100%	100%	100%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	53%	50%	65%	49%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	54%	57%	50%	56%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	33%	38%	26%	40%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	59%	85%	52%	80%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	74%	66%	87%	68%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	80%	74%	100%	71%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	92%	81%	92%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	61%	53%	59%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	49%	63%	47%	61%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	49%	28%	54%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	59%	83%	58%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	60%	82%	61%	79%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	10%	23%	24%	18%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	75%	84%	70%	83%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	49%	37%	58%	37%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	8%	35%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	38%	29%	36%	30%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	19%	24%	18%	22%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11%	2%	12%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	2%	12%	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)	8%	3%	0%	5%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	39%	25%	19%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	20%	15%	19%	14%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	14%	0%	13%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	2%	7%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	9%	0%	13%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	9%	2%	0%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	42%	50%	39%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	64%	66%	72%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	59%	78%	58%	75%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	34%	48%	30%	46%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	16%	16%	12%	17%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	86%	91%	79%	89%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	22%	30%	41%	27%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	41%	35%	72%	31%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	36%	33%	7%	37%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	62%	66%	45%	67%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	29%	19%	6%	24%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	16%	39%	36%	32%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	59%	74%	47%	72%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	20%	27%	24%	24%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	27%	36%	21%	34%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	14%	25%	36%	19%



Diversity Analysis

Key question responses (disability and aged 50 and over) HMP Send 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		33	102	23	114
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	15%	13%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	97%	100%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	33%	31%	27%	32%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	2%	5%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	6%	0%	7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			39%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	48%	72%	73%	64%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	77%	73%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	64%	73%	63%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	97%	84%	81%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	77%	78%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	68%	57%	66%	59%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	78%	71%	78%	71%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	85%	87%	82%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	97%	100%	95%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	29%	56%	55%	48%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	69%	78%	77%	76%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	100%	100%	99%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	47%	53%	64%	49%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	55%	56%	57%	55%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39%	37%	43%	36%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	73%	79%	73%	78%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	73%	73%	68%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	78%	73%	76%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	94%	88%	87%	90%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	61%	61%	57%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	63%	69%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	50%	43%	51%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	3%	0%	5%	0%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	80%	76%	82%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	67%	80%	81%	75%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	16%	20%	23%	18%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	76%	83%	91%	79%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	38%	39%	41%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	13%	5%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	48%	25%	39%	30%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	24%	21%	31%	20%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	5%	13%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	2%	9%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	5%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	3%	1%	9%	0%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	16%	1%	13%	3%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	39%	24%	39%	26%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	22%	14%	13%	17%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	2%	9%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	2%	9%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	1%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	6%	0%	9%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	16%	0%	5%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	28%	45%	52%	37%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	50%	68%	71%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	84%	69%	96%	68%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	66%	36%	43%	44%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	11%	13%	16%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	93%	87%	82%	90%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	29%	29%	27%	28%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	35%	37%	34%	37%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	42%	31%	39%	32%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	60%	66%	57%	66%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	13%	26%	9%	24%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	30%	34%	22%	34%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	64%	70%	69%	68%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	27%	24%	34%	22%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	31%	36%	33%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	13%	24%	13%	23%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (sexual orientation) HMP Send 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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		38	95
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	14%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	19%	35%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	8%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	26%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	69%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	76%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	77%	60%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	75%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	47%	64%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	84%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	96%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	62%	45%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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?	80%	75%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	53%	51%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	49%	59%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	29%	40%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	84%	75%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	71%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	80%	73%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	55%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	59%	59%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	63%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	1%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	73%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	84%	74%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	32%	14%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	83%	79%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	45%	38%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	20%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	34%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	26%	20%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By prisoners)	3%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	3%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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%	2%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	33%	25%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	25%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	9%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	40%	42%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	66%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	71%	74%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	45%	43%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	19%	14%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	89%	89%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	30%	29%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	30%	38%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	39%	31%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	60%	66%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	20%	24%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	30%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	71%	68%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	17%	29%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	40%	30%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	19%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Send 2014 Resettlement Unit v. main residential wings comparator

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E and F wings	A, B, C, and J 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	35	98
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?		
1.3 Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3 Are you on recall?	0%	2%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	1%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	15%	8%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	12%	14%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	97%	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.)	31%	29%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	4%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	6%	5%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	12%	33%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	30%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	66%	68%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	40%	44%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	40%	38%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	79%	87%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	75%	74%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	57%	69%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	94%	86%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction		
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	52%	47%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	88%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	73%
When you first arrived:		
3.4 Did you have any problems?	59%	61%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E and F wings	A, B, C, and J 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		
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	21%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	9%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	6%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	18%	16%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	16%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	9%	17%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	12%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	6%	4%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	62%	78%
3.6	A shower?	15%	28%
3.6	A free telephone call?	59%	60%
3.6	Something to eat?	65%	58%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	32%	34%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	44%	35%
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?	47%	48%
3.7	Someone from health services?	71%	74%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	50%	58%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	23%	25%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	71%	54%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	56%	54%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	50%	51%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	41%	45%
3.8	Health services?	59%	48%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	50%	51%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	79%	83%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	96%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	94%	84%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	52%	48%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	36%	45%

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E and F wings	A, B, C, and J 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		
4.1 Get bail information?	10%	6%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	36%	37%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	54%	53%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	94%	69%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	100%	95%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	66%	75%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	47%	54%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	72%	79%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	20%	15%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	46%	60%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	46%	34%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	75%	79%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	77%	66%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	82%	72%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	71%	63%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints		
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	82%	91%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	59%
5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	7%	19%
5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	55%	53%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme		
6.1 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	75%	53%
6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	48%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	3%	0%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff		
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	72%
7.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	85%	72%
7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	44%
7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	15%	19%
7.5 Do you have a personal officer?	84%	78%
SECTION 8: Safety		
8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?	41%	42%
8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	15%
8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	30%	33%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	22%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E and F wings	A, B, C, and J 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		
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	23%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	12%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	23%	32%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	3%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	10%	19%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	7%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E and F wings	A, B, C, and J 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 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	43%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	61%	66%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	6%	12%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	67%	76%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	15%	55%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	24%	27%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	26%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	17%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	3%	6%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	4%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	74%	78%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	44%	45%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	67%	57%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	67%	55%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	78%	94%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	39%	26%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	39%	38%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	22%	36%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	65%	63%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	47%	53%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	22%	23%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	23%	35%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	69%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	47%	18%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	59%	54%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	18%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	9%	27%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	29%	36%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	94%	86%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	8%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	23%	25%