

Report on an announced inspection of

# **HMP Winchester**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**17–21 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](mailto: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](mailto:hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk)

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

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

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	45
Section 4. Resettlement	51
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	61
Section 6. Appendices	71
Appendix I: Inspection team	71
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	73
Appendix III: Prison population profile	81
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	85



# Introduction

HMP Winchester is a complex establishment – in effect it is two prisons in one. The main category B site is a typical Victorian prison of radial design holding 556 men, while the newer West Hill site is a category C training prison holding 129 men.

At our last inspection in October 2012 we found that outcomes had deteriorated sharply and we were seriously concerned about the prison. We gave notice of our intention to return more quickly than usual and, unusually, announced the date of this inspection so the prison would have a clear deadline for making improvements. Although there had been progress, we were disappointed by what we found; too little had been done too late.

As before, at the time of this inspection the prison was seriously overcrowded and was now operating at 35% above its certified normal capacity. As a result of the closure of other local prisons in the west of England, the prison was serving a much larger catchment area. Some men's progress had been set back because they had been moved to other prisons on overcrowding drafts in the middle of training courses or other work to address their behaviour. Following the closure of Reading Young Offenders Institution, the prison had recently started to hold young adults and was struggling to manage them safely and securely. These population changes, major budget reviews and other national policy initiatives had been challenging to manage.

Despite these challenges, some progress had been made. Most importantly, relationships between staff and prisoners had improved considerably and the prison was much cleaner. Prisoners had more time out of their cells. There had been a major effort to reduce the availability of illegal drugs in the prison and improve support for prisoners with substance abuse problems, although there was still a problem with drugs that could not be detected with current testing methods. Health care services had also recently begun to improve and adult safeguarding arrangements were better than we normally see. Support for those at risk of self-harm was reasonable, although some flaws remained. There had been much better progress on the West Hill site than on the main site.

However, these improvements cannot disguise a serious lack of progress elsewhere. The main prison remained insufficiently safe and more prisoners told us they felt unsafe at the time of this inspection than at the last inspection or than at similar prisons. A third of prisoners told us they had been victimised by other prisoners and one in 10 told us they had been physically assaulted. Measures to reduce violence were weak; some incidents were not properly investigated and measures to address the behaviour of bullies and support victims were ineffective. The use of force, special cell, segregation and adjudications was high, and the segregation unit continued to provide an unacceptably poor environment and regime. The new incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had been inconsistently implemented and some prisoners had been left on 'entry' level for too long because it appeared their reviews had been forgotten.

A common feature of all these safety issues was a failure to collect and/or use data effectively to understand what was happening and to take the necessary corrective action. This was particularly true in the prison's tardy reaction to the arrival of young adults in its population. Young adults were over-represented in violent incidents and disciplinary processes, and the prison had taken too long to identify and address this. Greater thought needed to be given to behaviour management, the relationship between staff and prisoners, and the activities on offer, so that these processes were appropriate to their age and maturity.

Although better than before, too many prisoners were locked up during the day on the main site and when they were unlocked, too many were left milling about and bored on both sites. It was not surprising there were fights. This was frustrating because the number of activity places had increased and there were at least sufficient part-time places for the whole population. However, too many of the available places stood empty. Ofsted judged that the management of learning and skills, the quality of provision and prisoners' achievements all required improvement.

Resettlement outcomes remained insufficient on both sites. Despite the fact that Winchester was to become a resettlement prison, little thought had been given to preparation for its new role. The assessment of short-term and remand prisoners needs had deteriorated since the last inspection and was now inadequate. Delays in completing risk assessments meant there was a risk that some prisoners with serious offences would be released before this was done. Some staff who had taken up new offender management roles were overwhelmed by the task. Support for practical resettlement needs was generally adequate but too few prisoners knew where to go for help.

HMP Winchester had made progress since our very critical inspection in 2012 but the progress was slow and limited. The prison needs a clear focus on the basics – keeping the men it holds safe and secure, treating all of them decently and preparing them to return to the community at less risk of reoffending, with good quality activities and resettlement support. We will look forward to receiving their action plan in response to this report's recommendations and will expect to see much greater progress when we return.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2014

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

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

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

Public

**Region/Department**

South Central

**Number held**

685

**Certified normal accommodation**

499

**Operational capacity**

Main prison: 556

West Hill: 129

**Date of last full inspection**

15–19 October 2012

**Brief history**

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

**Short description of residential units**

A wing: remand and convicted mixed wing, induction and first night wing

B wing: remand and convicted mixed wing

C wing: induction, first night unit for prisoners undergoing detoxification only, detoxification and integrated drug treatment system remand and convicted wing

D wing: remand and convicted vulnerable prisoner wing

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

**Name of governor**

David Rogers

**Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

**Health service provider**

Commissioner: NHS England Thames Valley

Provider: Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust

**Learning and skills providers**

Milton Keynes College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

John Tainton

# 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:

<b>Safety</b>	prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
<b>Respect</b>	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
<b>Purposeful activity</b>	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
<b>Resettlement</b>	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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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** *Some prisoners were held in court cells for too long waiting for escorts to the prison. Reception processes were reasonable but there was a lack of first night support. There were high levels of violence, and overall management of this area was poor. People at risk of self-harm were reasonably well cared for but there were weaknesses in responses to emergencies. Security was well managed. Substantial inroads had been made into reducing drug use. Adjudications were carried out for legitimate reasons but exploration of evidence was not always adequate. Use of force was high but it was legitimate in the examined cases. Use of special cells was not subject to sufficient governance. Segregation was not usually used for long periods but the regime and environment were unacceptably poor. Substance use services had improved and were generally good. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners on the Winchester category B site were not sufficiently good and at West Hill were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 23 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and 13 had not been achieved.*
- S3** Some prisoners spent excessive amounts of time in court cells before transfer to the prison as a result of delayed arrival of escort vehicles. Poor planning of transfer journeys to and from the Isle of Wight resulted in prisoners being held at the prison overnight unnecessarily. Many prisoners were handcuffed between the vehicle and reception, regardless of risk and individual frailty.
- S4** Reception was busy, with about 90 movements a day. Risk assessment processes were generally good. Some prisoners spent too long in reception in bare holding rooms. With the exception of first night interviews, there was no further first night support available to newly arrived prisoners. Induction was delivered in an uninspiring way that did not sufficiently engage prisoners.
- S5** Levels of violence were high and the overall management of violence reduction was poor. Many violent incidents were not investigated, and there was no systematic monitoring of bullies or victim support. Our survey results on safety issues on the main site were worse than the local prison comparators, and more prisoners reported victimisation by staff. Despite widespread consensus that the young adult population was responsible for increased violence, there was no specific management plan for this group, although a review had been commissioned. Those on the West Hill site reported generally positively on feelings of safety.
- S6** There had been about 150 instances of self-harm on the main site in the previous six months, which was similar to the level at other local prisons. Prisoners at risk of self-harm and subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management told us that they were well cared for. There was generally good attendance at reviews and appropriate care plans, but night-time observations were too predictable. During our night visit, not all staff carried anti-ligature knives or even knew they had access to one. Some staff did not know how to deal with emergencies. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) generally felt supported but

- some complained that staff were slow to take them to prisoners in need. The two care suites were reasonably clean but poorly furnished. A weekly case review meeting was well attended and provided a useful forum for sharing information.
- S7 The prison had engaged well with community safeguarding services, although we met some prisoners who had not received sufficient basic social care. There was effective community engagement in relation to the provision of social care on release.
- S8 Security intelligence was processed promptly and acted on. With the exception of routine handcuffing of escorted prisoners and the use of closed visits for transgressions unrelated to visits, security arrangements were proportionate. The mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate had decreased following the introduction of a special security operation. However, prisoners told us that the use of drugs not detectable by MDT was widespread, and in our survey too many prisoners on the main site said that it was easy to get drugs in the prison.
- S9 Reviews of prisoners on the entry level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme did not take place on time and many prisoners remained on this level for much too long as a result. IEP reviews of those on basic were usually timely but some staff wrongly assumed that prisoners should remain on this level for 28 days. Although we saw prisoners on the basic level receiving an appropriate level of association and exercise, some wing notices stated that they were not to receive any association.
- S10 The number of adjudications had increased. Records showed that they had been carried out for legitimate reasons but most did not demonstrate sufficient exploration of the evidence, and data analysis was inadequate. Levels of use of force were high and it was used disproportionately against young adults. Most records were complete, detailed and reflected efforts to de-escalate situations. Planned interventions were not always filmed but those we saw demonstrated proportionate actions. Too many prisoners were placed in special accommodation without justification, and governance arrangements for this extreme measure were poor.
- S11 The segregation unit was bleak and dingy. Cells had unscreened toilets, and some contained insufficient furniture, were in poor state of repair, contained graffiti and were dirty. Use of the unit was higher than at comparable prisons but most stays were for short periods. Opportunities to engage in constructive activity were limited and the daily regime generally included only access to a shower, telephone call and 30 minutes' solitary exercise in a grim, caged yard. We found some prisoners segregated on normal location without appropriate governance arrangements. There was no reintegration planning for the few who were segregated for long periods. Staff engagement with prisoners on the unit was limited.
- S12 Substance use services had improved. Day-to-day care and treatment for prisoners on opiate substitution was very good. Peer support and group-based interventions, including for alcohol needs, were good on the main site but access to meetings was hampered by officers failing to unlock prisoners requesting to attend. Psychosocial services were understaffed and this had an impact on the frequency of one-to-one sessions. Some prisoners assessed as needing stabilisation or detoxification were not always placed on the stabilisation unit.

## Respect

- S13** Residential units were generally clean but cells were not sufficiently furnished and cell call bell responses were too slow. Staff–prisoner relationships were mixed. Personal officer arrangements had yet to take effect. The strategic management of diversity was weak and there were serious gaps in provision. Faith provision was good. Complaint responses were generally polite. Legal services were adequate. Health services were improving but significant shortcomings remained. Prisoners were critical of the food provided but shop provision was good. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill.**
- S14** At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners on the Winchester category B site and at West Hill were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 32 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, 10 had been partially achieved and 12 had not been achieved.
- S15** The cleanliness of the living environment had improved but not all cells on the main site had adequate toilet screening, enough furniture or lockable cabinets, and some exercise yards were badly littered. Prisoners reported long cell bell response times, and response time data were not routinely analysed. Laundry facilities were limited and many prisoners on the main site washed clothes in their cells. Prison clothing was of reasonable quality but insufficient quantity. Application forms were not freely available on all wings and the tracking system was ineffective. There were sufficient telephones on each wing and access was good. There were effective processes to ensure the timely delivery of mail.
- S16** In our survey on the main site, all indicators relating to staff–prisoner relationships were worse than at comparator prisons. We noted a considerable improvement in relationships since the previous inspection but prisoners told us that many staff were rude or did not engage with them. Prisoners had personal officers but the new system had not bedded in and most reported limited contact. Prisoners on the West Hill site were more positive about personal officers and general staff–prisoner relationships.
- S17** The strategic management of equality and diversity was weak. There had been little monitoring or analysis of equality for some time and little action had been taken in relation to emerging disparities in recent monitoring. Prisoners with protected characteristics were not systematically identified and assessed. Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were not freely available and prisoners had little confidence in the process. The few DIRFs submitted had been appropriately investigated and followed up.
- S18** There was limited systematic formal support for prisoners with diversity-related needs, such as dedicated prisoner forums or multidisciplinary care planning. There were few links with outside groups that could have provided support. There was no carer scheme and some staff were insufficiently proactive in identifying or addressing needs. There were insufficient adapted showers. Black and minority ethnic prisoners and those with disabilities reported more poorly than others in our survey across a number of important areas, including safety. Apart from remedial gym, little attention had been given to the distinct needs of older prisoners. There was no support or information for Gypsy/Romany/Traveller prisoners, or for gay and bisexual prisoners. There had been insufficient attempts to identify and meet the needs of young adults across the prison.

- S19 Faith provision was good. Facilities for worship were appropriate and pastoral care was provided as needed. Chaplains were visible in the prison and were involved in all aspects of prison life. The chaplaincy ran a range of classes and specialised courses.
- S20 Complaint forms and boxes were accessible on all wings. Most complaint responses were polite, helpful and timely, and there was good analysis and monitoring of complaints data. However, identified disparities, such as the over-representation of black and minority ethnic complainants, were not further investigated.
- S21 There was good use of the video-link facility. Legal visits and booking facilities were reasonable. There was limited legal services information available, even during induction. The bail information service was good.
- S22 Health services had improved. Significant problems remained but there was evidence that effective action was being taken to address them. Governance structures had improved and were good but chronic staff shortages severely impacted on service delivery and development, particularly in chronic disease management and nurse-led clinics. Interactions between health services staff and prisoners were good, and more prisoners surveyed on the main site than at the time of the previous inspection were satisfied with the overall quality of health services. Waiting times for most primary care services were reasonable but the non-attendance rate for some clinics was too high.
- S23 Most health care rooms needed refurbishment. The inpatient waiting rooms were unacceptably dirty, with graffiti and broken or inadequate seating. Prisoners on the inpatient unit were positive about the care they received and a regular multidisciplinary meeting was effective. However, the environment was poor and the unit lacked a therapeutic regime. Pharmacy services were reasonable but there was a lack of in-possession risk assessments, and systems to reorder medication were weak. Dental services were good. Primary mental health services were too limited but secondary mental health services were good.
- S24 Many prisoners expressed dissatisfaction with the food provided. Portion sizes and food temperature were adequate but the poor kitchen facility restricted the range of food that could be prepared. There was a wide range of items on the shop list and catalogues catered reasonably well for minority needs and hobbies.

## Purposeful activity

- S25** *Time out of cell had improved but too many prisoners were under-occupied. The quality of leadership and management of learning and skills was inconsistent. There was limited vocational training. The quality of teaching and learning in education classes was good but weaker in vocational training. With the exception of a few education classes, attendance at activities was poor. Library provision was reasonable. PE provision was adequate. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good on either site.***
- S26 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners on the Winchester category B site were poor and at West Hill were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

- S27 Time out of cell had improved but was still not sufficient. Our roll checks showed that over a third of prisoners were locked up on the main site during the core day. All prisoners were unlocked at West Hill. The core day was not advertised on the wings, not understood by all officers and not implemented consistently. We saw many prisoners with little to do.
- S28 All prisoners, including vulnerable prisoners, had access to at least part-time activity. However, the operational management of non-Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision was weak. There was insufficient analysis and use of data in workshops and vocational courses, which meant that the participation and achievement rates of different groups of prisoners were not identified or addressed. Some prisoners at West Hill had their progress disrupted as a result of overcrowding drafts which required them to transfer mid-way through courses.
- S29 There were sufficient places to keep the prison's population in part-time purposeful activity but not all places were filled. The allocation process was equitable and timely. The variety of activities was limited.
- S30 The quality of teaching and learning in education was good but required improvement in vocational training. There were significant shortcomings in health and safety, and professional standards in vocational training. English and mathematics learning was insufficiently embedded in work and vocational training settings. Individualised learning plans in education were better than we normally see.
- S31 Success rates in English for speakers of other languages, English and mathematics were low but in information and communications technology and business were high, and outcomes of English courses had recently improved. Prisoners developed adequate vocational and some useful employability skills. Attendance at vocational training and workshops and education classes was too low. Punctuality was poor during the inspection.
- S32 Access to the library had improved and was reasonable. The book stock was adequate for the prison population.
- S33 Access to PE had improved and was now adequate. Gym provision was reasonable but there were insufficient facilities for team sports. Few accredited qualifications were available.

## Resettlement

- S34** *The strategic management of resettlement was developing but lacked sufficient focus on offender management. There was insufficient attention to the needs of short-term prisoners. There were some shortcomings in public protection work. Assessment of resettlement needs on arrival and discharge had deteriorated. Resettlement pathway support work was generally reasonable and provision for children and families was good. **Outcomes for prisoners against this healthy prison test were not sufficiently good on either site.***
- S35 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners on the Winchester category B site and at West Hill were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*

- S36 The reducing reoffending strategy was not yet based on a needs analysis and did not adequately promote the role of offender management. Little thought had been given to the fact that Winchester was due to become a resettlement prison or to the needs of short-term prisoners. The offender management model was underdeveloped and progress had been hindered by staff shortages. Prison offender supervisors had received an adequate range of training but some staff in the offender management unit (OMU) were overwhelmed by their new roles. Although our survey findings on resettlement were generally better at West Hill than on the main site, they were worse than at the time of the previous inspection.
- S37 Some reasonable release on temporary licence (ROTL) placements were available for prisoners at West Hill. Risk assessment processes for ROTL were generally adequate but there were some deficiencies.
- S38 The backlog of prison offender assessment system (OASys) assessments had reduced considerably in the previous few months but most assessments were completed late as a result of avoidable delays in allocation. We came across one case where a high risk of harm prisoner who was due for release in a few weeks still had no current OASys assessment or plan. OASys assessments completed by OMU staff were generally of adequate quality.
- S39 The level of contact by offender supervisors with those on their caseload was variable but had improved overall, and was better at West Hill than on the main site. However, initial contact did not happen quickly enough. The ratification of home detention curfew (HDC) decisions was inappropriately carried out by the chair of the HDC board, removing any element of oversight and scrutiny. Timeliness for HDC was not monitored and we found many that were completed late.
- S40 Too many prisoners did not have a multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level assigned, and not enough was done by the OMU to liaise with community-based offender managers to rectify this. Restrictions on contact were appropriately applied, regularly reviewed and removed at the earliest opportunity.
- S41 Categorisation was up to date but prisoners were not informed in person about the outcome of reviews. A large number of prisoners were on a transfer hold but this was for legitimate reasons and reviewed.
- S42 Half of the prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection had been recalled or returned from open conditions. Most others were quickly transferred to more appropriate prisons. Those on remand who potentially faced an indeterminate sentence were not given support or information but a support forum had been introduced for such prisoners once sentenced.
- S43 In our survey, fewer prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons said that they knew who to turn to for help with resettlement needs. The quality and scope of the individual resettlement needs assessments on arrival and pre-release had deteriorated on both sites. Remand and short-term prisoners did not have a custody plan but referrals to agencies were made when a need was identified.

- S44 The range of housing support and advice available was adequate. The percentage of prisoners released homeless appeared to be about 12% but outcome monitoring was not routinely completed. The National Careers Service provided some careers information and guidance before release. There was good access to a preparation for release course. The range of support to help with benefits and reduce debts was too limited.
- S45 Health discharge planning for prisoners with complex physical or mental health needs was effective. Most prisoners received their required medication pre-release but prisoners did not always receive support in registering with a GP or a discharge summary of the health care they had received while in custody. Resettlement opportunities for prisoners with substance misuse needs had improved.
- S46 The visitors centre was welcoming. Searching, including the use of drug dogs, was sensitively conducted. Convicted prisoners on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme could have three visits a month but the others could have only two. The number of family days had increased. In partnership with the local authorities, 'Spurgeons', a third-sector organisation, provided a wide range of interventions with fathers and families in need.
- S47 No accredited offending behaviour programmes were available on either site, but good efforts were made to transfer prisoners to complete identified programmes.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S48 Concern: Levels of violence were high but the strategic management of violence reduction was weak. Not all violent incidents were investigated, and there was no system for monitoring bullies or supporting victims.

**Recommendation: All violent incidents should be fully investigated and systematic action taken to address bullying and support victims. A local violence reduction policy should be introduced. All data relating to violence should be collated and analysed to identify trends, and followed up with rigorous remedial action.**

- S49 Concern: Use of force, segregation and special cell were all high, and the number of adjudications had increased. Data was not sufficiently sophisticated to identify and address such concerns.

**Recommendation: Analysis of data for disciplinary procedures, use of force and segregation should be rigorous and effectively used to reduce the number of adjudications, the use of force and the throughput in the segregation unit.**

- S50 Concern: The segregation unit environment was poor, with no natural light and no communal space, and this had a negative effect on relationships between prisoners and staff on the unit, and on prisoners' mental health.

**Recommendation: The segregation unit should be replaced with a modern, fit-for-purpose facility.**

S51 Concern: There had been inadequate consideration given to the needs and the impact of the introduction of young adults to the prison population.

**Recommendation: The specific needs of the young adult population should be identified and met. In particular, they should be helped with the transition to a mixed-age population and provided with adequate social and/or pastoral support, including through the use of support groups.**

S52 Concern: There was insufficient awareness and management of the needs of prisoners with protected characteristics, and the basic social care needs of some prisoners had not been met.

**Recommendation: Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood.** (Repeated recommendation HP55)

S53 Concern: Too many prisoners were locked up on the main site during the core day with nothing to do, and many prisoners were poorly occupied in both sites. Not all purposeful activity places were filled and attendance at vocational training, workshops and education classes was low. Data was not used effectively to monitor and increase participation.

**Recommendation: There should be more activity places, including full time activity, to purposefully occupy prisoners. Participation, attendance and achievements should be monitored, and attendance at activities, especially vocational training and work should be improved.**

S54 Concern: Almost all OASys assessments were completed late, delaying the identification of appropriate allocations for prisoners to address their offending behaviour needs at other prisons. In some cases, risk was not assessed properly before discharge.

**Recommendation: All eligible prisoners should have an OASys assessment and a review within the required timescales.** (Repeated recommendation HP59)

# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1** *Apart from some long waits at court and inter-prison transfer delays, prisoners were satisfied with their treatment during transfer, and felt safe. Reception opened until late evening.*
- I.2** In our survey, 23% of prisoners said that they had experienced journeys of more than two hours in a van, against the 19% comparator. However, many had spent long periods in court cells before transfer, as a result of delayed arrival of escort vehicles – in one case for seven hours. Too many escort journeys to or from the Isle of Wight started too late for them to be completed in a day, resulting in prisoners lodging overnight at Winchester. In our surveys, most prisoners said that their property had accompanied them to prison. Prisoners we spoke to said that they had felt safe during transfer and the vans we saw were clean and well equipped.
- I.3** Person escort records appropriately informed initial risk assessments. Many prisoners were unnecessarily handcuffed during disembarkation, including a man with mobility problems severe enough to warrant use of a walking frame. He was handcuffed until he entered his cell in the health care unit. Prisoners did not wait on escort vehicles for long periods.
- I.4** Reception stayed open continuously, until late evening, and arrivals after 6pm were common.

### Recommendations

- I.5** **Prisoners should not remain in court cells for long periods waiting for transfer to prison.**
- I.6** **The escort contractor should plan inter-prison transfers to guarantee the arrival at the designated prison on the same day.**
- I.7** **Prisoners should only be handcuffed during disembarkation when justified by an individual risk assessment.** (Repeated recommendation I.5)

## 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.8** *Reception was clean but in a poor state of decoration. Prisoners were processed methodically and caringly but strip-searching was not always on the basis of assessed risk. Some prisoners stayed in reception too long and were not routinely offered showers. Most arrivals were accommodated on a dedicated wing but night staff were unaware of their specific locations. Induction provided useful information but was poorly presented.*
- I.9** The reception area was clean but in a poor state of decoration. Holding rooms, search rooms and induction areas were mostly out of sight of the main office, leading occasionally to ineffective supervision. Holding rooms were drab, with nothing to occupy prisoners. Vulnerable prisoners were held in dedicated room and were shielded from other prisoners.
- I.10** Apart from inter-prison transfers, all arrivals were routinely strip-searched. This was proportionate for most of those arriving directly after sentence but not for all existing prisoners returning after court hearings. In our survey, 29% of prisoners said that they had spent less than two hours in reception, against the 49% comparator. Reception was busy, with approximately 90 movements a day, and we found that some prisoners remained there for up to four hours. The time spent in reception was not recorded by the prison.
- I.11** All prisoners received private first night safety and health care interviews. We saw reception staff being methodical and caring, asking questions and giving prisoners the time to ask questions or reveal any concerns. Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) gave new prisoners an overview of the prison and information about what to expect in the next 24 hours, but vulnerable prisoners going to D wing did not receive this talk.
- I.12** We saw most new arrivals being given drinks, a hot meal and telephone credit (subject to public protection measures) for use on the induction wing. Grocery packs were offered to everyone but prisoners could have a 10-day wait before receiving items from the prison shop (see section on prison shop). Only 15% of respondents to our survey, against the 33% comparator, said that they had been offered a shower on arrival. We did not see a shower being offered to any prisoners.
- I.13** The first night wing (A wing) accommodated most prisoners for their first few days in custody. The cells were equipped with a television, kettle, bed pack and toiletries and most were clean. Some had recently been repainted but others were dull and shabby.
- I.14** On arrival on the first night wing, all new prisoners had access to association with other prisoners and they could usually take a shower. Wing staff did not always know who the new arrivals were; there was no additional support or observations for them unless specific risks had been identified.

- I.15** Induction took place on the morning after arrival but was delivered in an uninspiring way and many prisoners appeared to have lost interest in the presentation that we observed. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments said that the course had covered everything they needed to know (50% versus 58%). There was some written information available in many different languages, and if necessary a professional telephone interpreting service was used (see section on equality).

## Recommendations

- I.16** **Prisoners should only be subject to a strip-search when justified by an individual risk assessment.** (Repeated recommendation I.17)
- I.17** **Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival.** (Repeated recommendation I.20)
- I.18** **Night staff should introduce themselves to new arrivals and check on their well-being during the night.**
- I.19** **Induction should effectively engage and inform prisoners of key information.**

## Housekeeping points

- I.20** The introductory interview with Insiders should be made available to vulnerable prisoners.
- I.21** All prisoners should be offered a shower on arrival.

## 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.22** *Levels of violence were high. The overall management of violence reduction was poor and little had been done to address concerns about high levels of violence among the young adult population. Many reported violent incidents were not investigated. There was no effective system to address bullying behaviour or to support prisoners identified as victims of violence.*

- I.23** There were high recorded levels of violence in comparison with other category B sites (200 in the six months to the end of December 2013). In our survey, a third of prisoners on the main site said that they had been victimised by other prisoners and 11% said that they had been hit, kicked or assaulted, considerably more than the comparator in both cases. Despite this, the strategic management of violence reduction was weak. There was no prison-specific violence reduction policy and an over-reliance on the Prison Service Instruction to provide guidance to staff. Almost 30% of submitted violent incident reports (VIRs) were not investigated or incomplete (see main recommendation S48). In theory, when allegations in VIRs were proven, prisoners should have been demoted to the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. We saw suspected bullies being moved to another wing but they remained at their current IEP status and there were no other interventions to

address their behaviour. There was no effective system to monitor those identified as being involved in bullying or anti-social behaviour, or to provide support for victims. Feedback from our group interviews with prisoners indicated that they did not know who to turn to when they were victimised.

- I.24** In our survey, more prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons reported feeling unsafe. The experience of those at West Hill was much better and generally similar to the comparator for category C prisons. Although wing prisoner violence reduction representatives had been identified, few prisoners were aware of them, and the representatives that we spoke to were unsure of their roles. The range of data provided to the well-attended monthly safer custody meeting had improved but there was little analysis of it and minutes showed almost no subsequent actions being identified. Levels of violence had increased with the introduction of more young adults. A senior manager had recently been tasked with reviewing the impact of their introduction to the prison but no actions had been identified at the time of the inspection (see main recommendation S48).
- I.25** D wing was the designated vulnerable prisoner wing and operated an integrated regime with mainstream prisoners. The latter signed a behaviour-based compact and attended mainstream activities. During the inspection, we found that two prisoners had been segregated on the wing with no official authorisation or any levels of governance in place (see section on segregation).
- I.26** There was no specific policy for the management of vulnerable prisoners, and survey results for prisoners on D wing were considerably worse than on other wings in relation to victimisation by other prisoners and feelings of safety. During exercise periods, we saw D wing prisoners being subjected to verbal abuse that went largely unchallenged.

## Recommendation

- I.27** **There should be a specific policy to manage the vulnerable prisoner population, and abusive behaviour directed at them, especially during exercise, should be challenged.**

## 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.28** *The frequency of self-harm incidents was similar to that at comparator prisons. The quality of self-harm monitoring documents and procedures was generally good. Prisoners at risk of self-harm were discussed at a useful weekly meeting and prisoners subject to support procedures told us that they felt supported. However, some appeared to have been held in the segregation unit inappropriately. The Listener team was effective but care suite arrangements were unsatisfactory.*

- I.29** Levels of self-harm on the main site were generally similar to those at comparator prisons, with about 150 incidents in the previous six months. Self-harm was rare at West Hill. The quality of care provided to those at risk of self-harm was good and most such prisoners told us that they were well treated and felt supported. Attendance at reviews was generally good

and recording procedures were reasonable, with the exception of night entries, which were repetitive and predictable.

- I.30** During the inspection, the number of prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management procedures for those at risk of suicide or self-harm ranged from 18–21. Appropriate allowances were made for those subject to the basic IEP regime, and efforts were made to ensure that they engaged in activities. Some prisoners on ACCTs had been held in the segregation unit and we were not assured that there had been exceptional circumstances to justify this or that enhanced assessments had been conducted (see also section on segregation unit).
- I.31** The weekly multidisciplinary care planning meeting provided a helpful forum to influence the individual care of prisoners at risk of self-harm.
- I.32** Until recently, there had been a shortage of Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners); this was reflected in our survey, in which fewer prisoners than at similar prisons said that they could access a Listener at any time. However, the number of Listeners had recently increased following a successful recruitment and training exercise. Listeners told us that they were well supported by the safer custody team and by the local Samaritans. However, they complained of slow response times from some wing staff in initiating support sessions and answering cell bells when they were ready to return to their own cells. Wing staff regularly failed to adhere to the roster, which resulted in some Listeners being called out much more frequently than others.
- I.33** The cleanliness of the two care suites had improved but they were also used for other purposes, which had led to the removal of equipment and some damage to fittings.
- I.34** During our night visit, not all staff had ready access to anti-ligature knives or were aware that they had them in their sealed pouches. Night staff were not clear about how they would deal with emergencies.

## Recommendations

- I.35 Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures should only be held in segregation in exceptional circumstances which should be regularly reviewed and adequately recorded.**
- I.36 Care suites should be properly furnished and equipped to provide an appropriately supportive environment.** (Repeated recommendation I.38)
- I.37 All night staff should be adequately trained in emergency response procedures, and all should carry anti-ligature knives.**

## Housekeeping points

- I.38** The quality of ACCT observations, interaction and entries by night staff should be improved.
- I.39** Staff should adhere to the on-call Listener roster and respond quickly to the needs of on-call Listeners.

## 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.<sup>2</sup>**

**I.40** *Safeguarding procedures were developing, with some good external links, but we found some prisoners who were receiving inadequate social care.*

**I.41** There had been good progress in the development of safeguarding procedures. Links had been established with external agencies to provide a continuation of social care for prisoners on release. The governor had driven the prison's involvement and had influenced local service provision. However, there were some obvious failures of safeguarding procedures in the prison which led to some prisoners not receiving sufficient social care (see section on protected characteristics and main recommendation S52).

## 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.42** *Security intelligence data and subsequent objectives were managed well. With some exceptions, security was generally proportionate. Inroads had been made into reducing the supply of illegal drugs but the use of drugs not detectable by the current mandatory drug testing panel was widespread. Suspicion testing was not always conducted in a timely manner.*

**I.43** Security procedures were proportionate and did not unnecessarily restrict prisoner access to the regime. Movement around the prison was appropriate to the level of risk for both sites. However, we saw one example of the use of handcuffs which was not proportionate (see section on escorts and transfers), and the use of closed visits, although infrequent, was not always related to visits-related incidents.

**I.44** The monthly security meeting was well attended and considered a range of security intelligence. Data were analysed and informed appropriate intelligence objectives, which were communicated widely and monitored properly. Dynamic security was good and supported by a good level of security information reports (SIRs). Between July and December 2013, 1,997 SIRs had been submitted and processed, and actions, including target searching, were acted on expeditiously.

<sup>2</sup> 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.45** Operation 'spring clean' had been created in May 2013 to reduce the supply of illegal items into the establishment and had been reasonably successful. Extra funding for staffing and new technology had been made available and this had led to a large number of drug and mobile telephone finds, and a large reduction in the random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate.
- I.46** In the six months to December 2013, the MDT positive rate was reasonably low, at 8.0%, although slightly higher than the key performance target of 7.5%. However, prisoners told us that the use of drugs which were not detectable by MDT was widespread, including diverted prescribed medication. In our survey, a third of respondents on the main site, more than at comparator prisons, said that it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison. The number at West Hill was in line with the comparator. Prisoners testing positive under MDT were not always referred to the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) in a timely fashion. The MDT suite was located in an ageing portacabin, with dirty holding rooms and no mat for strip-searching.
- I.47** Suspicion testing positive rates stood at 21%, from a total of 32 tests in the six months to December 2013. Some suspicion tests had been completed outside of the 72-hour window required by the Prison Service Instruction but the extent of this was not specifically monitored.

## Recommendations

- I.48** **Closed visits should only be imposed in direct response to trafficking activity or intelligence.**
- I.49** **Suspicion testing should be conducted in a timely manner, and completions and results monitored.**

## Housekeeping points

- I.50** Prisoners testing positive under any testing regime should be referred to the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) service without delay.
- I.51** The mandatory drug testing suite should be kept clean and appropriately furnished.

## Incentives and earned privileges<sup>3</sup>

### 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 new national incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had recently been introduced. Although there were relatively few prisoners on the basic level, some reviews of prisoners on entry level had not taken place. Reviews of those on the basic level were timely but not all staff understood or correctly implemented the IEP scheme.*

**I.53** Information about the newly implemented national IEP scheme was displayed on wing noticeboards. Half the prisoners were on the standard level, with 22% on enhanced and 24% on entry level. At the time of the inspection, 64 of the 171 prisoners on entry level had remained at that level for more than 14 days – some for almost three months – because of reviews being late or non-existent.

**I.54** IEP reviews for those on the basic level were timely. Some staff wrongly assumed that prisoners should remain on this level for 28 days for violence, whereas they could have their standard level reinstated early if their behaviour improved. Records contained targets for behaviour improvement but most were vague and insufficiently targeted to the individual.

**I.55** 'Ad-hoc', unauthorised notices were displayed, specifying that prisoners on the basic level were not to have any association. However, we found that those on basic received one hour out of cell each day for showers, telephone calls and exercise, and could continue with work and education.

**I.56** In our survey, 42% of prisoners on the main site said that the IEP scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour, which was a considerable improvement from 34% at the time of the previous inspection.

### Recommendation

**I.57** **Staff should understand and consistently implement the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy. In particular, all prisoners on entry level should be reviewed after 14 days and behaviour improvement targets should be specific to the individual.**

### Housekeeping point

**I.58** Unauthorised notices on IEP should be removed.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## 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.59** *The use of disciplinary procedures had increased. Records of hearings were poor. There was insufficient analysis of data about disciplinary procedures, use of force and segregation. Use of force was high and young adults were over-represented. De-escalation was used well and films of planned interventions demonstrated proportionate use of force. Governance of special accommodation was poor. The environment in the segregation unit was bleak and the regime was limited. Throughput of the care and separation unit was high but it was used mostly for short periods. Behavioural targets and reintegration planning for longer-term residents were inadequate.*

### Disciplinary procedures

- I.60** There had been 540 adjudications between July and December 2013, representing an increase of around 25% since the previous inspection. The most common offences were disobeying a lawful order, followed by threatening behaviour. The records that we examined showed that the hearings had been carried out for legitimate reasons but showed insufficient exploration of the charge before a finding of guilt. The quality assurance process was ineffective in addressing deficiencies.
- I.61** The data on adjudications were well collated but, except in relation to young adults, were not analysed thoroughly or acted on at the regular monitoring meeting (see recommendation S49).

### Recommendation

- I.62** **Adjudication hearings should examine charges thoroughly and paperwork should be quality checked by a senior manager.**

### The use of force

- I.63** Between July and December 2013, force had been used on 120 occasions, which was higher than at comparator prisons and at the time of the previous inspection. Young adults had recently been located at the establishment, and data showed that they had been involved in a quarter of incidents, which was disproportionately high. Around half of incidents involved the full use of force but many were quickly de-escalated. Most records we examined were complete, contained sufficient detail (including the efforts made to de-escalate incidents) and were quality assured.
- I.64** Planned interventions were not always filmed but there were quality assurance processes for those that were. Those we watched showed proportionate actions by staff. A baton had been drawn once between July and December 2013. Records suggested that this had been justified but no investigation of the incident had been conducted.
- I.65** The use of force committee met bimonthly but there was inadequate analysis of data to identify trends and patterns (see recommendation S49).

- I.66** Special accommodation records showed that it had been used on six occasions between July and December 2013, which was high. Records authorising special accommodation were often poorly completed, without proper justification, and prisoners were not always removed at the earliest opportunity.

## Recommendations

- I.67** Investigations should be conducted into every incident in which a baton is drawn.
- I.68** Prisoners should be placed in special accommodation only in exceptional circumstances and be removed at the earliest opportunity. Records should thoroughly explain the justification for the measure.

## Housekeeping point

- I.69** All planned interventions should be video-recorded.

## Segregation

- I.70** Between July and December 2013, there had been 144 periods of segregation, which was high. The average length of stay was short, at around six days. Most prisoners were reintegrated back to locations in the prison and few prisoners sought refuge on the unit. During the inspection, we came across two prisoners who had been segregated for their own protection on the vulnerable prisoner wing without appropriate governance (see section on bullying and violence reduction).
- I.71** The segregation unit was a bleak environment. It was clean but, as it was located below ground level, there was no natural light in the small communal area and a limited amount in the cells. The exercise yard was cage-like and lacked seating or activities. Conditions in the seven cells were poor. Four contained no furniture and, in effect, equated to special accommodation (see section on use of force). Although recently decorated, most cells contained graffiti and were dirty, and most had inadequate toilet screening and damaged fabric. The shower was insufficiently private and in a poor state of decoration (see main recommendation S50). As there was limited space on the unit, there was no servery, so food containers were delivered to prisoners at the cell doors.
- I.72** The daily regime for segregated prisoners was poor, and included access to showers, telephone calls, a small stock of books and a 30-minute solitary exercise period. Once a week, a selected prisoner could access the gym but most residents had been assessed as too high risk for this. Prisoners could have a radio but were not permitted a television in their cell. In the previous six months, seven prisoners on ACCTs had been held in segregation (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention).
- I.73** Protocols for unlocking individual prisoners were not always proportionate to the risk. Prisoners were escorted by three staff at all times, which was not conducive to building relationships. In our survey, only 21% of respondents who had spent time in the unit said that the staff there had treated them well, against the 37% comparator and 39% at the time of the previous inspection. Staff were knowledgeable about residents on the unit but the interactions we saw were distant.

- I.74** Most multidisciplinary reviews of prisoners were timely and authorising documentation was adequate, but many targets were perfunctory. There was no formal reintegration planning for longer-term residents.
- I.75** Data collation was generally good but the regular segregation monitoring meeting did not use data to identify and analyse trends.

## Recommendations

- I.76** **All instances of segregation, regardless of location, should be appropriately authorised and subject to management oversight.**
- I.77** **All cells in the segregation unit should contain furniture or be classified as special accommodation.**
- I.78** **Prisoners on the segregation unit should have access to a significantly improved regime.**
- I.79** **Staff should build meaningful relationships to support prisoners while in segregation.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.80** Targets for those subject to good order or discipline should be individualised and relevant to encouraging improvements in behaviour.

## 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.81** *Prisoners assessed as needing stabilisation or detoxification were not always placed on the stabilisation unit. Day-to-day care and treatment for prisoners on opiate substitution had improved and was good, although psychosocial services were understaffed. Group-based interventions and peer support were good but access to fellowship meetings was inconsistent.*

- I.82** At the time of the inspection, a total of 92 prisoners were on opiate substitution treatment across both sites. Of those, 76 (83%) were being maintained and 16 (17%) were on reducing doses, which was a reasonably good ratio.
- I.83** Prisoners on the main site were given appropriate first-night prescribing as necessary. However, in the six months to February 2014, an average of only 20% of prisoners who should have spent their first five days on the stabilisation unit did so. Although those placed in other locations had been properly observed, being spread across multiple locations made their clinical management less safe.

- I.84** The standard of day-to-day care for prisoners on opiate substitution had improved and was excellent. In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection (88% versus 76% and 78%, respectively) said that the support they had received for drug or alcohol problems had been helpful.
- I.85** Psychosocial services, provided by RAPt, offered one-to-one key-working sessions as part of a low-intensity group programme called 'Living Safely' and a medium-intensity programme called 'Stepping Stones'. However, shortages in the RAPt staff team had limited their attendance at formal clinical reviews. Additionally, structured key-working sessions were only available every 6–8 weeks, although prisoners receiving opiate substitution had daily ad-hoc access to a psychosocial worker. The 94 prisoners on the RAPt caseload who were not receiving opiate substitution had long waits between key-working sessions.
- I.86** Group-based interventions, including for alcohol needs, were good. Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous and SMART Recovery (an addiction recovery support group) meetings were held regularly but access was often hampered by some wing officers' failure to unlock those who had put in requests to attend. There were two peer supporters on the main site, assisting with group-work delivery and inductions, but none at West Hill.
- I.87** The drug strategy committee met monthly, with good attendance from across the prison. The strategy document was in date and action plan points were reviewed effectively by the monthly strategic meeting.

## Recommendations

- I.88** **Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission.** (Repeated recommendation I.84)
- I.89** **The psychosocial service should be adequately resourced to ensure delivery of integrated clinical reviews and timely key-working sessions.**
- I.90** **There should be sufficient peer workers to provide substance use support across both sites in line with local operational policies and protocols.** (Repeated recommendation I.83)

## Housekeeping point

- I.91** Prisoners should have full access to fellowship and recovery meetings whenever they are held.

## 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** *Some outside areas were littered with rubbish and discarded clothing. West Hill had generally good accommodation. On the main site, most cells and interior areas were clean but many cells were dark and shabby, and some had insufficient furniture. Prison clothing was of reasonable quality but insufficient quantity. Laundry facilities were poor. There was good access to telephones and showers. Responses to applications were not tracked and many prisoners had no faith in the system. Mail arrangements appeared effective. Many prisoners complained of slow cell call bell responses.*

**2.2** Some of the exercise areas of the prison were badly littered with rubbish and discarded clothing. The interior areas were generally clean and tidy, and much improved from the time of the previous inspection, but the quality of the cells varied greatly. West Hill had good accommodation, with all cells on Hearn wing having good-quality furniture and in-cell showers and toilets. Elsewhere in West Hill, there was an ongoing refurbishment programme. Many cells had recently been repainted and had had new floors fitted, although some windows in the communal areas had been missing for many months.

**2.3** On the main site, many cells, especially those which were shared, had missing or broken furniture, inadequate toilet screening and occasionally no toilet seat. Very few had a lockable cupboard. Many cells had been repainted in the previous year but, although clean, were still dull and shabby. We found offensive material on display in some cells, contrary to the policy.

**2.4** Most prisoners could maintain good levels of personal care. There were several showers out of order (on both sites) but the damp problems identified at the previous inspection had been remedied and works had been scheduled to repair the faulty showers. Prisoners on both sites had good access to showers.

**2.5** The quality of prison clothing and bedding was reasonable, although only two pairs of underwear were provided per week and we met newly arrived prisoners with insufficient clothing to last them until the next exchange opportunity. In our survey, only 33% of prisoners on the main site, against a comparator of 54%, said that they were offered sufficient clean clothes for the week. Good laundry facilities were available at West Hill but only one wing (C wing) on the main site had a laundry. Prisoners on the other wings who chose to do their own laundry had to wash their clothes in a bucket and dry them on makeshift washing lines in their cells, for which they were liable to be punished under the IEP scheme.

**2.6** The cell call bell system was not routinely analysed and we found that bells were not always answered quickly. In our survey, only 15% of prisoners on the main site, against a comparator of 35%, said that call bells were answered within five minutes.

- 2.7** We received many complaints from prisoners about the application system. Some said that it took several weeks to receive a reply, if they received one at all. Responses to applications were not tracked and on some wings prisoners did not have direct access to application forms.
- 2.8** There were sufficient telephones on each wing, and in our survey most prisoners said that they did not have problems accessing them. Mail was delivered promptly to the wings each day. Outgoing mail left the prison within 24 hours during the working week.

## Recommendations

- 2.9** **Cells should have clean, adequately screened toilets, adequate furniture and sufficient natural light.** (Repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 2.10** **Prisoners should be provided with sufficient clothing of adequate quality and the facility to launder their own clothes. They should not be penalised for washing and drying clothes in their cells.** (Revised recommendation 2.12)
- 2.11** **The timeliness and quality of responses to prisoner applications should be monitored and improvements made where required.** (Repeated recommendation 2.14)
- 2.12** **Cell call bells should be answered promptly and response times monitored.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.13** Outside exercise yards should be cleaned daily.
- 2.14** The offensive display policy should be applied consistently.

## 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.**

**2.15** *Prisoners on the main site reported negatively on staff but at West Hill relationships were more positive. Staff often referred to prisoners by their surnames only. There was a personal officer scheme but many prisoners reported rarely, if ever, meeting their personal officer. Prisoners were consulted through a prisoner council meeting.*

- 2.16** In our survey on the main site, all indicators relating to staff–prisoner relationships were worse than at comparator prisons. Only 63%, against a comparator of 74%, said that most staff treated them with respect, and prisoners told us that staff were sometimes rude and dismissive of their requests. Most staff, on both sites, addressed prisoners by surnames only but at West Hill relationships were much more positive. Conversations we witnessed on both sites were generally polite and, overall, we saw improved interactions between staff and prisoners in comparison with the previous inspection.

- 2.17** The personal officer scheme had recently been re-launched but had yet to take effect. Personal officers were identified by a name card displayed above every cell but many prisoners said that they rarely, if ever, met this officer. Prisoners at West Hill were more positive about the helpfulness of staff in general. There was an expectation of a personal officer entry in electronic case notes every two weeks. We undertook a random sample and found that, apart from at West Hill, personal officer entries were uncommon and those that were present usually consisted of an observation on behaviour, with no mention of formal sentence planning or offender management processes.
- 2.18** There was a prisoner council, made up of wing representatives elected by their peers. They met twice monthly but many prisoners were unaware of who their wing representative was.

## Recommendation

- 2.19** **There should be an effective system for ensuring that prisoners know whom to ask for help with problems, for checking on their well-being and for supporting them in achieving progress.** (Repeated recommendation 2.21)

## 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 characteristic<sup>4</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.**

- 2.20** *The management of equality and diversity was poor, and almost no attention had been paid to this area. Monitoring, analysis and action in relation to equality issues were weak. Discrimination incident reporting forms were not freely available and prisoners had little confidence in the process. There was little work done to meet the needs of prisoners with any protected characteristics.*

## Strategic management

- 2.21** The general management of equality and diversity was poor and had been neglected for some time (see main recommendation S52). There had been virtually no equality action team (EAT) meetings held. There was little evidence of attention or action in relation to these issues at senior management team meetings (see section on complaints). Our examination of ethnic monitoring data showed other areas that required investigation, such as an over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners being segregated and an under-representation of this group achieving release on temporary licence.

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

- 2.22** Initial identification and recording of protected characteristics was generally weak. This inconsistent and incomplete recording on arrival led to a lack of support for minority groups, such as those with disabilities. There were no links with outside agencies that could provide such support (see below and main recommendation S52).
- 2.23** Equality representatives had recently been appointed but, in common with the diversity officer, had received no training. Although there had been two equality representative meetings in recent months, minutes showed a lack of action in relation to the issues raised; for example, black and minority ethnic prisoners had little faith in the discrimination incident report form (DIRF) process, which may have accounted for their relatively low use (25 had been submitted in the previous six months). The DIRF forms were not always freely available on all wings but those that had been submitted had all been followed up reasonably well.

## Recommendations

- 2.24** **Monitoring data for all protected characteristics should be comprehensively compiled and analysed, and action should be taken to investigate all anomalies.**
- 2.25** **Links should be established with external community groups and agencies to help provide support to minority groups in the establishment.**
- 2.26** **The diversity officer and prisoner equality representative should be suitably trained and supported to fulfil their roles.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.27** Discrimination incident report forms should be freely available on all wings.

## Protected characteristics

- 2.28** Approximately 16% of the population was from a black and minority ethnic background. In our survey, these prisoners (and those with disabilities) reported more negatively than white prisoners in a number of areas, notably safety and victimisation.
- 2.29** Foreign national prisoners represented approximately 9% of the prison population. There was little formal support for them after arrival, although reasonable use was made of professional translation and interpreting services. In our survey, 5% of prisoners identified themselves as being from a Gypsy/Romany/Traveller background, and there was no support or information for this group.
- 2.30** Twenty per cent of prisoners on the main site and 13% at West Hill considered themselves to have a disability. There was no carer scheme, and no other regular social care provision for these prisoners (see also section on safeguarding). Prisoners who needed them did not have person-specific care plans to identify and meet their needs. Although there were a couple of adapted cells, elsewhere showers lacked grab rails or adaptations to make them suitable for older prisoners and those with disabilities. Washing was particularly difficult for two wheelchair-bound prisoners we spoke to. One chose to wash in a wash basin as the nearby shower was not adapted. The other needed to be taken to the health care unit to shower, but some staff were reluctant to push him. Such prisoners were reliant on other prisoners and ad-hoc officer help for basic needs, such as carrying their meal trays and keeping themselves clean (see main recommendation S52). While some staff were generally receptive to the needs of prisoners with disabilities, there was a lack of proactive support for them.

Most prisoners with physical disabilities had personal emergency evacuation plans on the wings and staff were sufficiently aware of them.

- 2.31** Older prisoners (aged 50 and over) made up approximately 11% of the population. They had access to remedial gym (see section on physical education and healthy living) but their specific needs were not otherwise identified or addressed.
- 2.32** Young adults represented approximately 12% of the prison population. Their recent introduction into the establishment had proved challenging to the staff. However, there had been insufficient attempts across the prison to identify this group's specific needs and to address these challenges constructively (see main recommendation S51).
- 2.33** In our survey, 1% of prisoners on the main site identified themselves as either gay or bisexual. Prison staff did not systematically seek out this information when prisoners arrived at the establishment. In the minutes of the (only) recent EAT meeting, prisoners had asked for more support and a dedicated forum to be established, but neither had been progressed.

## Recommendations

- 2.34 Prisoners with disabilities should have appropriately adapted facilities and a multidisciplinary care plans if needed. A paid carer scheme should also be established.**
- 2.35 Dedicated support forums and prisoner representatives should be introduced for prisoners from every protected characteristic group.**

## 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.**

**2.36** *Faith provision was much improved and the chaplaincy was well integrated into prison life. A wide range of pastoral support and faith-based groups and courses was provided but links with external community faith groups were underdeveloped.*

- 2.37** Faith and worship provision had improved considerably. Worship arrangements and facilities for all faiths were good, and chaplains were visible in the prison and well integrated into the running of the prison.
- 2.38** A wide range of pastoral support and faith-based groups and courses was provided by the chaplaincy but there were no effective links with external community faith groups to help provide reintegration support.

- 2.39** Our survey results on respect for religious beliefs and access to services were worse than the comparator on the main site. However, prisoners in our West Hill survey and in our groups (at both sites) were generally positive. Prisoners were asked to indicate their wish to attend weekend religious services during the preceding week but this was to provide information on attendance. They could still attend even if they were not on the list. There were few restrictions on chapel attendance and these appeared to be based on sound reasoning. There had been two such cases during the previous year, and both prisoners had been offered alternative opportunities to worship and been subject to regular review.

## Recommendation

- 2.40** **Links with external community faith groups should be established to support effective reintegration after release.**

## Complaints

### Expected outcomes:

**Effective complaints procedures are in place for prisoners, which are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely responses. Prisoners feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.**

- 2.41** *Complaints procedures were generally effective and most replies were helpful. Data collection was not always followed up with action to address identified patterns.*

- 2.42** Complaints boxes and supplies of complaint forms, which were regularly replenished, were accessible on all wings. Complaints were processed efficiently and allocated to senior managers, with response times monitored. Prison-held data showed that 94% of complainants were given a timely response. Most responses were polite and contained helpful explanations of decisions, but they were occasionally dismissive. We saw a response to a complaint about the loss of a substantial amount of property which conveyed a lack of concern about the issue.
- 2.43** There was good analysis of complaints data, although there was no monitoring of whether or not the complaint was upheld. In our groups, prisoners told us that complaints were rarely upheld, which diminished their confidence in the system. In our survey, prisoners generally reported in line with the comparator on access to and fairness of complaints. A concerning trend in the proportion of complaints from black and minority ethnic prisoners had been discussed at a senior management team meeting but there was no record of any action taken to investigate it.

## Recommendation

- 2.44** **Any identified trends in complaints should be investigated. Information about upheld complaints should be included in the analysis.**

## 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.**

**2.45** *There was good use of video courts. Initial information on legal services was inadequate but bail information processes were good.*

**2.46** Use of the two-court video-link facility for court hearings, legal visits and probation interviews was good. The new legal services area was much improved, although the waiting room was cramped and sparse.

**2.47** Booking arrangements for legal visits had improved, and the visiting period extended to 8.15am to 5.15pm. The legal visitors we spoke to were generally satisfied with the arrangements, although they sometimes experienced delays on arrival and during processing.

**2.48** The induction programme did not adequately inform newly arrived prisoners about legal services provision, and many prisoners told us that they had only been able to find out about legal services by submitting an application. There was no identified legal services officer, although bail information services were effective.

### Recommendation

**2.49** **The legal services provided should meet the needs of the population, and prisoners should be told about them during the induction process.**

## 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.**

**2.50** *The new health services provider had improved services but chronic staff shortages were having an adverse effect on service delivery and the speed of improvement. Governance arrangements were good. Access to the GP and dentist was reasonable but the number of nurse-led clinics was too limited. Prisoners on the inpatient unit were complimentary about the care they received but the regime and environment were poor. Pharmacy services were reasonable but too many prisoners did not receive their medicines on time. Primary mental health services were too limited but secondary mental health services were good.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.51** NHS England Thames Valley commissioned health services and Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust provided secondary mental health services. Central North West London NHS Foundation Trust (CNWL) had taken over primary health service provision in October 2013 on a one-year contract from the previous provider, Solent NHS Trust. The commissioners told us that CNWL had inherited a barely adequate service.
- 2.52** Governance arrangements had improved and were good. Well-attended clinical governance and partnership board meetings covered all essential areas. There were good working relationships with commissioners. At the time of the inspection, a new health needs assessment was being completed. The retender process for the new contract from October 2014 was under way.
- 2.53** Learning from serious incidents, complaints and audits informed service delivery. There was no health service user forum but health had recently been added to the prisoner council meeting agenda, and senior health services staff were scheduled to attend regularly. Patient satisfaction questionnaires had recently been introduced.
- 2.54** The health care complaints system was confidential, with forms easily accessible, and prisoners understood how to use it. All of the 98 health care complaints received in the three months to January 14 had been resolved locally. Most had related to clinical treatment, medication supply and prescribing decisions. The responses we sampled were courteous and consistently addressed the issues raised.
- 2.55** There were long-standing staff shortages. The small core team was enthusiastic and worked hard to improve services, and an experienced nurse manager had started recently. A large number of agency staff covered vacancies, which created inconsistency and contributed to prisoner dissatisfaction with health services (see below), but recruitment for vacancies was under way. There was 24-hour nursing cover and seven GP clinics were held weekly. A reliance on locum GPs was being addressed.
- 2.56** New arrivals received detailed written information about health services. Most services were wing based, except for clinics held in the dental suite on the inpatient unit. Most clinical rooms were not compliant with infection control requirements owing to damaged or inappropriate fixtures and fittings, and the cleaning arrangements were inadequate. A detailed action plan had been formulated following a recent negative infection control audit but remedial action had been too slow.
- 2.57** Health services staff were clearly identifiable and interacted well with prisoners. Electronic clinical records were good. A comprehensive range of electronic policies, including for communicable diseases and safeguarding, was used. Health services staff received regular supervision and had excellent access to development opportunities.
- 2.58** There was an active health promotion action group and good health promotion displays across the prison. Information sharing between health services and gym staff was sometimes delayed, which meant that some prisoners with health issues waited several weeks to use the gym. There was good access to smoking cessation support. Barrier protection was available from health services staff. There was no identified lead for older prisoners and those with disabilities. There was good availability of mobility and health aids, supported by strong links with local social care services. There was adequate access to immunisations and screening for blood-borne viruses.

- 2.59** Emergency equipment was appropriate and was well located across the prison. Although recorded checks took place daily, we found expired items; new processes were introduced during the inspection to address this.

## Recommendations

- 2.60** All clinical areas should be fully compliant with infection control guidelines.
- 2.61** A designated senior health lead to develop health services for older prisoners and those with disabilities should be identified.

## Housekeeping points

- 2.62** There should be regular health care service user consultation that informs service delivery.
- 2.63** There should be robust processes to ensure timely, appropriate information sharing between health services and gym staff.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.64** Nurses saw all new prisoners promptly for an initial assessment, and appropriate referrals were made. Prisoners received a further secondary assessment within 72 hours. Good community liaison ensured continuity of care.
- 2.65** More prisoners surveyed on the main site than at the time of the previous inspection were satisfied with the overall quality of health services (37% versus 23%) and this figure was now in line with the comparator. However, fewer prisoners surveyed at West Hill than at comparator establishments were satisfied with the services provided (30% versus 43%), although the figure was similar to that found at the time of the previous inspection. Prisoners requested services by application, and these were processed promptly, although prisoners did not receive a written response.
- 2.66** Although there were two nurse practitioners, staffing shortages severely restricted the number of clinics held, which increased the demand for GP appointments. Despite this, the wait for routine GP appointments was reasonable, at five days, and daily emergency appointments were available. Communication with the community out-of-hours GP service was good and the service was monitored.
- 2.67** Waiting times for most clinics was good, except for podiatry, but this was being addressed. The non-attendance rate at GP clinics was low as they ran on the wings, but it was 50% for clinics held in the health care unit because of a shortage of escorts to take prisoners to the unit and also because prisoners were sometimes unaware of their appointment. Individual appointment slips were reintroduced during the inspection to improve communication with prisoners. The inpatient waiting rooms were dirty, with graffiti and broken or inadequate seating. Despite being painted during the inspection, they remained unfit for purpose.
- 2.68** There were no regular chronic disease clinics, which meant that prisoners with these conditions were not systematically monitored or supported. A system to ensure that prisoners with complex needs were supported had been introduced but the quality of reviews and care planning was inconsistent. There was good access to diabetic eye screening, and blood-borne virus and sexual health clinics were prioritised.

- 2.69** Prisoners on the 13-bed inpatient unit spoke highly of the care they received but the environment and the regime on this unit were poor, with little purposeful activity for prisoners located there. The corridor was bright and welcoming but the single and double cells were bleak and needed repainting. Although several residents had serious physical disabilities, there were no adapted cells. The dedicated small gym facility was an excellent resource but was underused. Aids to make the communal showers suitable for residents with disabilities had been ordered but these facilities needed deep-cleaning.
- 2.70** The unit was staffed by consistent, enthusiastic discipline officers and a nurse. The daily multidisciplinary meeting ensured good communication between members of the team but care planning was too limited for many residents. The admission criteria for inpatients were clear but prisoners were regularly admitted for operational rather than clinical reasons, which negatively affected the running of the unit.
- 2.71** Referrals to external hospital appointments occurred promptly. Three prisoners could attend hospital appointments daily and appointments were well managed. Prisoners with ongoing local hospital appointments were appropriately held at the prison. Appointments were rarely cancelled for security reasons.

## Recommendations

- 2.72** Prisoners should have prompt access to confidential nurse assessment clinics, provided by trained staff who can provide appropriate treatment using evidence-based triage algorithms to ensure consistency.
- 2.73** The failure-to-attend rate for all clinics should be monitored and appropriate remedial action taken to reduce it to less than 10%.
- 2.74** Prisoners with life-long conditions should receive regular reviews which generate an evidence-based care plan from appropriately trained and supervised staff.
- 2.75** The inpatient unit should offer adequate care-planned therapeutic and constructive activities to residents, in a satisfactory environment, and only prisoners with a clinical need should be admitted.
- 2.76** There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities. (Repeated recommendation 2.81)

## Housekeeping points

- 2.77** Prisoners should receive a written response to health care applications.
- 2.78** The waiting rooms on the inpatient unit should be refurbished to provide a clean area, with appropriate seating and adequate resources to pass the time.

## Pharmacy

- 2.79** Lloyds pharmacy supplied medicines in a timely manner. A Lloyds pharmacist attended twice weekly to complete audit checks and provide clinics, including smoking cessation and medicine use reviews. At the time of the inspection, a CNWL pharmacist on a 12-week secondment was reviewing policies and procedures. Drug administration errors and drug alerts were managed effectively. Most medicines, including controlled drugs, were stored appropriately, although some treatment rooms were too warm for safe storage of heat-sensitive items, and refrigerator temperatures were not consistently recorded. Out-of-hours stock was available and was well audited.
- 2.80** A prescribing formulary (a list of medications used to inform prescribing) had recently been introduced and the medicines management committee met regularly. However, the lack of attendance by security staff slowed the implementation of new policies because any required changes in practice were not agreed with the prison sufficiently expediently. A prescribing review group considered the appropriateness of the prescribing of tradable medication, but many prisoners complained to us that their individual circumstances were not fully considered. There was not enough prescribing under patient group directions (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) or 'special sick' (immediate health treatment without an appointment), which increased the demand on GPs and delayed prisoners' treatment.
- 2.81** Electronic records were kept of prescriptions and drug administrations, although prescriptions were also printed and faxed to the pharmacy. Prisoners told us about, and we observed, regular problems with the reordering of medicines, which caused avoidable delays in prisoners receiving medication. A new pharmacy technician started during the inspection to address this. Decisions to prescribe medication in-possession were informal and inconsistent, with inadequate recording of the rationale. However, a new, comprehensive policy and risk assessment were in advanced development.
- 2.82** Medicines were administered three times daily on the main site, at 8am, 11.45am and 4.45pm, which meant that some medicines were given too close together and supervised night medication was given too early. At West Hill, medicines were issued once a day, as weekly or monthly in-possession. There was little confidentiality or privacy during drug administration at either site, owing to the design and location of the medication administration hatches. Discipline staff were present at these times but did not directly supervise medication administration in all areas, which increased the risk of medication being traded. Drug administration records were complete and there were clear policies to follow up non-attendance.

## Recommendations

- 2.83 Prisoners should be fully involved in prescribing reviews.**
- 2.84 A wider range of medicines should be available to prisoners without the need to see the doctor, either on 'special sick' or as patient group directions.**
- 2.85 The reordering of medicines should be managed effectively, to ensure continuity of care.**
- 2.86 The draft in-possession policy should be implemented, and risk assessments should be reviewed regularly and be available for the prescriber to see at the time of prescribing.**

**2.87 All medication should be administered at an appropriate time for maximum therapeutic effect and with sufficient officer supervision and privacy.**

### Housekeeping points

**2.88** The ambient temperature in clinical rooms should be monitored daily and remedial action taken as required to ensure that it is suitable for the provision of health services and storage of medicines.

**2.89** The maximum and minimum temperatures for all drug refrigerators should be recorded daily and appropriate corrective action taken as required.

**2.90** Senior prison security staff should regularly attend the medicine management committee to ensure timely implementation of policies.

### Dentistry

**2.91** Solent NHS Trust provided four dental sessions weekly. Waiting times were reasonable, at five to six weeks. Appointments were allocated based on need and urgent appointments were provided as necessary. NHS-equivalent dental treatment was available. The dental consultation and clinical records we observed were good. Comprehensive oral health promotion was provided.

**2.92** The small dental surgery had separate clean and dirty areas but did not meet current best practice standards. There were advanced plans to refurbish the surgery to achieve compliance. All dental equipment was appropriately maintained and dental waste received professional disposal.

### Recommendation

**2.93 The dental surgery should fully comply with dental regulation HTMI-05.**

### Delivery of care (mental health)

**2.94** There were effective working relationships between prison and mental health staff. Regular mental health awareness training was available for prison staff but only 10% of prison officers had received this in the previous three years.

**2.95** In our survey, more prisoners on the main site than at the time of the previous inspection (38% versus 28%) said that they had received help for emotional or mental health problems, which was now similar to the comparator. At West Hill, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons (25% versus 49%), but similar to the number at the time of the previous inspection, said that they had been helped with such problems.

- 2.96** Two mental health nurses provided regular primary mental health clinics for prisoners with mild-to-moderate mental health issues but this was still not enough to meet need. Staffing shortages restricted the provision to primarily an assessment and signposting service. A small number of prisoners (six during the inspection) received ongoing support from primary mental health nurses. Most of the 10–15 referrals received weekly were seen within four weeks and prisoners with urgent needs were seen quickly. The secondary health screen included a learning disability screen and there was a clear pathway for prisoners with learning disabilities. There was no access to counselling, groups or psychologically informed therapies.
- 2.97** Four mental health nurses and a half-time psychiatrist supported 45–55 patients with severe and enduring mental illness. The care-planning approach was continued after release, and there was good community liaison. The 15 patients moved to NHS mental health facilities since July 2013 had been transferred in a timely manner.

## Recommendations

- 2.98** Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training.
- 2.99** Prisoners should have timely access to a full range of care-planned support for mild and moderate mental health problems, including counselling, clinical psychology and group therapies.

## 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.**

**2.100** *Most prisoners were dissatisfied with the food provided. Consultation with prisoners about the food had taken place but had not yet brought about significant improvements. A new kitchen, with much better facilities, was due to open soon.*

- 2.101** In our survey, only 7% of respondents on the main site (against the 22% comparator) and 16% at West Hill (against the 26% comparator) said that the food was good. In our groups, prisoners' views about the prison catering were mixed but dissatisfaction was expressed about food quality and quantity, and menu choice. We found that the evening meal portion sizes were adequate and the food was well cooked and hot.
- 2.102** There was good provision for halal, vegetarian, vegan and medical diets. Following consultation with the Muslim chaplain, Muslim prisoners had been provided with meals in insulated containers during Ramadan. Staff supervised the serveries but they told us that it was difficult to ensure that serveries workers gave every prisoner a portion of the correct size. Some prisoners told us that they were concerned about bullying and the effects of favouritism at the serveries.

- 2.103** The catering manager read and responded to prisoners' written comments about the food. The four-week menu cycle was changed twice a year in the light of comments from prisoners via a food survey and the prisoner council meeting. However, the analysis of food survey responses was simplistic and did not enable a thorough understanding of prisoners' dissatisfaction.
- 2.104** The kitchen was clean and had been found to be compliant with food hygiene regulations, but it was small, inadequately equipped and restricted the variety of dishes that could be prepared. A bigger and better-equipped kitchen was shortly to open.

## Housekeeping points

- 2.105** Supervision of the serveries, and portion control in particular, should be improved.
- 2.106** Food surveys should be thoroughly analysed to increase understanding of prisoners' dissatisfaction with catering.

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.107** *The prison shop list contained a suitable range of items, at reasonable prices, and prisoners could make additional purchases from a selection of catalogues.*

- 2.108** Prisoners could place a weekly order for a wide range of food items, toiletries and stationery. Those arriving on the day after orders were placed had to wait 10 days for the delivery of their first order (see section on early days in custody) but could buy a smoker's or non-smoker's pack in the meantime. They were consulted about the choice of items available and changes to the list were sometimes made in response.
- 2.109** Staff could provide on-screen details of prisoners' cash accounts from P-Nomis (electronic case notes) and the finance department could provide prisoners with a printout of their private cash account for a fee of 10 pence.
- 2.110** Catalogues were available from which prisoners could buy clothing, electrical goods, hobby materials and items for religious observance; a 50 pence charge was levied for these purchases. Newspapers and magazines were also available. Deliveries were made by staff to prisoners' cells and there was an effective system for managing returns and correcting any mistakes.

## Recommendation

- 2.111** **There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders.**

## 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.<sup>5</sup>**

- 3.1** *Time out of cell on the main site was limited but prisoners at West Hill could leave their cell at any time. Supervision of association and exercise was adequate. The core day was not displayed. Too many prisoners were under-occupied.*
- 3.2** Time out of cell had improved. However, there were complex association arrangements on the main site, which were not advertised on the wings, not applied consistently and not fully understood by all staff and prisoners, leading to confusion and delays in unlocking times. These association arrangements led to limited time out of cell, often only five hours on a weekday, although prisoners told us that they had sufficient opportunity to shower and make telephone calls. Association periods were extended at weekends. The experience of prisoners at West Hill was much better, as they were not locked into their cells at all.
- 3.3** During our roll checks, we found that, on average, 37% of prisoners in the main prison were locked up during the working day, which, although still too high, was better than at the time of the previous inspection (44%).
- 3.4** Exercise was programmed every day but was often cancelled or curtailed to around 30 minutes. Supervision of association and exercise was adequate, although staff–prisoner interactions were mixed (see also section on staff–prisoner relationships) and we saw many prisoners milling around with nothing to do. (See main recommendation S53)

### Recommendations

- 3.5 The core day should be adhered to and information regarding timings made freely available to prisoners.**
- 3.6 Prisoners should be given the opportunity for one hour of exercise in the open air every day.** (Repeated recommendation 3.5)

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

## Learning and skills and work activities

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.7** *The management of learning and skills required improvement. The access to activities had increased. Outcomes were good on some education courses such as information communications technology and business and but poor in English for speakers of other languages, English and mathematics courses. Quality improvement processes and the management of workshops and vocational training did not have a sufficient impact on improving provision, particularly in the delivery of consistently good teaching and learning. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in vocational courses required improvement. Analysis and use of data to monitor the provision and plan improvements required improvement. The service provided by the library was satisfactory.*

**3.8** *Ofsted<sup>6</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

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

### Management of learning and skills and work

**3.9** The education and vocational training provision, provided by Milton Keynes College, required improvement. The management of education provision, which made up a third of available activity places, was effective but the management of work and vocational training was weak.

**3.10** Observations of teaching, learning and assessment had been used by the Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provider to ensure high-quality lessons in education courses. Observations of training in workshops and vocational courses were not as regular and frequent; the quality of training was not sufficiently good.

**3.11** Work and vocational programmes were not sufficiently well planned or delivered. Arrangements for the continuity of learning during staff absences were inadequate; during the inspection, the Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA), carpentry and employability skills workshops did not run as planned, owing to staff leave. The development of the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) had been delayed.

<sup>6</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.12** A range of data on work and vocational programmes were collected but were inadequately analysed and used to monitor the participation and achievement of different groups of prisoners (See main recommendation S53). Some prisoners at West Hill had their progress disrupted as a result of overcrowding drafts which required them to transfer midway through their courses.

## Recommendations

- 3.13** **The operational management of the non-Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision should be improved, to ensure effective supervision and support to delivery staff.**
- 3.14** **The session observation scheme across work and vocational training provision should be further developed and consistently applied.**
- 3.15** **Prisoners at West Hill should not be transferred as a result of overcrowding drafts mid-way through courses.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.16** The number of activity places for all prisoners, including vulnerable prisoners, had increased and the mainly part-time places were allocated equitably and reasonably quickly. There were sufficient places to provide part-time activity across the prison but capacity was underused, even though there were waiting lists for many courses. The National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) level 2 programmes delivered by N-rgy had a third of their places unfilled. In our survey, fewer prisoners on the main site than at similar prisons said that they were involved in work or vocational training (See main recommendation S53).
- 3.17** The range of vocational training and educational opportunities was narrow but adequate. The education provision delivered by Milton Keynes College included English, mathematics, information and communications technology (ICT), art, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), business, and vocational cookery courses. Vocational training qualifications were delivered at level 1 in carpentry, horticulture, cooking and barbering. Both the Industrial Coating Application Training Scheme (ICATS) programme and the level 2 courses offered in cleaning services, customer services and team leading offered valuable qualifications.
- 3.18** Prisoners who worked in the gym, in recycling and in chain assembly workshops were trained and competent, although none gained accredited qualifications. These areas provided opportunities for learners to develop employability skills but there was inadequate recording of the skills developed.
- 3.19** Prison work consisted mostly of waste recycling and unchallenging part-time garden maintenance and cleaning, which delivered low-level qualifications. Contract work consisted of chain assembly, electric box assembly and computer recycling.

## Recommendation

- 3.20** **Employability skills, including English and mathematics, should be prioritised and recorded for all activities.**

## Quality of provision

- 3.21** Teaching and learning for prisoners in education classes were good. Lessons were well planned, with clear, detailed individual objectives. In a minority of lessons, the level of work and the activities provided were not sufficiently well planned to meet the needs of all learners.
- 3.22** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in workshops and vocational training was variable. In the better lessons, tutors planned their activities well and made clear links to improving employability skills. Poorer lessons did not present sufficiently interesting activities to ensure that learners participated well.
- 3.23** Assessment was effective; many teachers used a range of methods to check learning. The understanding and promotion of employability skills were insufficiently promoted in some education and vocational training sessions (see recommendation 3.20).
- 3.24** Good use of specific targets in their individual learning plans ensured that prisoners in education classes made good progress. Feedback from each learning session enabled prisoners to understand their progress and how they could improve their work. In the carpentry workshop, insufficient targets were set to ensure that prisoners progressed quickly.
- 3.25** The development of English and mathematics skills in work and vocational training was inadequate, with the exception of barbering, where in practical exercises prisoners accurately mixed chemicals. Tutors did not sufficiently promote and reinforce literacy and numeracy in the workshops. Prisoners' written work often contained spelling and grammar mistakes, and these were not corrected by tutors. Tutors did not encourage independent learning through the use of dictionaries.
- 3.26** In many work and vocational training areas, there was insufficient promotion and reinforcement of health and safety. During the inspection, we saw poor hygiene in barbering and recycling that did not meet industry and commercial standards, and prisoners in the carpentry workshop did not use the appropriate safety equipment.

## Recommendations

- 3.27 The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved to a consistently high level across all of the provision.**
- 3.28 All staff should strongly promote the development of literacy and numeracy skills, as well as good health and safety awareness, in the workshops.**

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.29** Education and vocational achievements on individual courses varied considerably and required improvement. For example, success rates in ICT, business, carpentry, horticulture and some vocational cookery courses were high, but in ESOL, PICTA, English and mathematics courses had been low in 2012/13. Some recent improvement in achievement rates had been demonstrated in English and British Institute of Cleaning Sciences courses.
- 3.30** The standard of prisoners' work and the skills they developed were adequate. In areas such as barbering, prisoners developed good employability skills, and in cookery they demonstrated skills over and above the requirement of the qualification.

- 3.31** Prisoners were well behaved and had positive and respectful relationships with their tutors. Many learners complimented the patience and good teaching skills of their tutors and instructors.
- 3.32** Attendance rates were too low, although they had improved in recent months. During the inspection, we saw low attendance at carpentry and cookery sessions. Too many prisoners did not attend education sessions and offered no explanation for their lack of regular attendance. Punctuality was poor in many sessions. (See main recommendation S53)
- 3.33** Poor productivity was observed in a number of work settings, including in waste recycling, computer recycling, electrical assembly and carpentry workshops.

## Recommendation

- 3.34** **Success rates in English for speakers of other languages, Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy, English and mathematics courses should be improved.**

## Library

- 3.35** The library service was provided by Hampshire County Council. On the main site, a full-time library manager and two library assistants were supported by three prison orderlies. At West Hill, the library room was staffed by a full-time orderly. The orderlies received good training and contributed effectively to the running of the service. The book stock was adequate for the population, with a range of fiction and non-fiction, books in languages other than English, and audio books. An appropriate range of legal books and Prison Service Instructions was readily available.
- 3.36** The book stock was regularly replenished but data about the borrowing patterns of different groups of prisoners, and formal communication with other departments, were not used sufficiently to plan the purchase of new titles. In our survey, the proportion of prisoners using the library had increased and was satisfactory. Arrangements to borrow books from other sites were suitable.
- 3.37** Library accommodation on both sites was adequate, but on the main site provided little space for private study and reading.
- 3.38** Library opening hours had been reduced. However, changes to the core day and the increased proportion of part-time work and education meant that prisoners had satisfactory access to the services without interrupting their planned activities. Prisoners unable to visit the library, such as older prisoners, those with disabilities and inpatients in the health care unit, received books from trolley services.
- 3.39** The library appropriately supported activities to promote literacy and reading, such as Toe by Toe (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read).

## Recommendation

- 3.40** **Library services should be developed through formal liaison with other departments and analysis of patterns of library use.**

## 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.**

**3.41** *The small PE department was well organised and worked effectively following a restructuring of access arrangements. Access to PE for all groups of prisoners, including those in work or education, as well as older and vulnerable prisoners, had improved and was satisfactory. Links with the health care department resulted in effective support for prisoners who had planned health programmes. No qualifications were offered in the gym.*

**3.42** The prison had restructured the timing of activities and improved gym access for all prisoners. The proportion of the population on the main site participating in recreational gym sessions had increased but was considerably lower than that at comparator establishments.

**3.43** An appropriate range of sport- and health-related fitness activities was offered to most prisoners, including at lunchtime and in the evenings for those engaged in full-time work, training or education. Regular, specific sessions were provided for older and vulnerable prisoners.

**3.44** PE facilities included a weights room and a sports hall on the main site. At West Hill, there was a sports hall filled with a wide range of equipment and an artificial outside pitch. However, the sports hall at West Hill was not available for team sports and the outside artificial pitch was not used. On the main site, the size of the sports hall and its use for drama events significantly restricted the ability to support team sports and games.

**3.45** There was good promotion of healthy living. A few adult first-aid certificates had been awarded in the previous year but no other accredited PE courses were offered.

**3.46** Instructors motivated prisoners with disabilities and health conditions to complete prescribed courses of activity when guidance was received from the health care department. However, enquiries for advice about the management of medical conditions were often not dealt with by health service staff in a timely manner.

### Recommendations

**3.47** **Prisoners should have consistently good access to a wide range of group recreational sports and games.**

**3.48** **More accredited courses should be made available in the gym.**

### Housekeeping point

**3.49** Communication with the health care department should be sufficient to ensure timely advice and guidance to prisoners, thereby promoting safe, well-supervised exercise.

## Section 4. Resettlement

### Strategic management of resettlement

#### Expected outcomes:

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

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

**Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.**

- 4.1** *The reducing reoffending strategy was limited and not based on a needs analysis. Offender management did not have a sufficiently high profile across the prison and did not have an action plan. The offender management model was underdeveloped and progress had been hindered by ongoing staff vacancies. Some case administrators felt overwhelmed by the range of new tasks that they had had to take on. Release on temporary licence opportunities had developed but were underused, and risk assessments were inadequate.*
- 4.2** The reducing reoffending strategy was not currently based on a needs analysis. A survey of prisoner needs had been undertaken recently and the results were in the process of being analysed. However, there had been no analysis of offender assessment system (OASys) data and there were no plans to analyse the different needs of the diverse population, which included young adults, short-term prisoners and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs).
- 4.3** The strategy did not adequately promote offender management, and the committee meetings focused only on the resettlement pathways. Although there was an action plan covering the resettlement pathways, there was no plan for offender management, making it difficult to see priorities and progress and too little had been done to plan for the transition to a resettlement prison later in 2014.
- 4.4** There had been many changes in the offender management unit (OMU) over the previous year and there were ongoing staff shortages. As a result, the offender management model was underdeveloped (see below). There was a lack of a whole-prison approach to offender management, and some wing staff did not fully understand its role or purpose, which negatively affected the level and quality of information exchange.
- 4.5** Prison offender supervisors had received an adequate range of training since taking up post a few months earlier. The generic role of case administrator had been implemented a few months before the inspection, requiring staff to learn a range of new tasks, and as a result some felt overwhelmed.
- 4.6** More release on temporary licence (ROTL) placements than at the time of the previous inspection had been developed for prisoners on the category C West Hill site but not all of these were utilised at the time of the inspection. Risk assessments for ROTL were generally adequate but there were some deficiencies, with insufficient contributions from key personnel.

- 4.7** In our survey, more prisoners on the main site than at the time of the previous inspection said that they could achieve their sentence plan targets at the establishment (45% versus 18%) but this remained far lower than at other local prisons (59%). However, considerably more prisoners than at comparator prisons said that there were plans for them to achieve their targets elsewhere, which reflected good attention to transferring prisoners in order to complete required work.
- 4.8** Although our survey findings on resettlement were generally better at West Hill than on the main site, they were worse than at the time of the previous inspection (see section on reintegration planning).

## Recommendations

- 4.9** **The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis and focus more on the importance of offender management, with an action plan setting out priorities.**
- 4.10** **Release on temporary licence processes should ensure that contributions from all relevant key personnel are included and considered, and that an appropriate level of governance and authority is applied.**

## Offender management and planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

**4.11** *The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments had reduced considerably but unnecessary delays in allocation made it almost impossible to achieve timely completion. Not all high risk of harm prisoners had an up-to-date assessment and sentence plan. Too few prisoners on the main site knew they had an offender supervisor but this was better on the vulnerable prisoner wing and considerably better at West Hill. Offender supervisor contact with prisoners was variable but was better for those at West Hill, although initial contact between offender supervisors and the prisoners in their care occurred too late. Home detention curfew releases and timeliness were not monitored. Public protection restrictions were appropriate but not enough was done to identify the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level and contribute to risk management planning before release. Those facing an indeterminate sentence had no dedicated support and there were no specific family days for these prisoners.*

- 4.12** In 2013, there had been a backlog of 100 late OASys assessments. Additional resources had been allocated over the previous few months, and at the time of the inspection there were only 10 assessments waiting for allocation and a further 16 which had been started but not yet finished; this represented about 15% of the total number.

- 4.13** Allocation of new OASys assessments was unnecessarily delayed. Most were not allocated within eight weeks of sentence, in accordance with the regulations, and some were allocated much later. For example, one prisoner had been sentenced at the end of October 2013 and his assessment had still not been allocated at the time of the inspection. We also saw evidence of recalled prisoners not being reassessed. In our survey, only 24% of prisoners on the main site said they had a sentence plan, which was much lower than at other local prisons (40%). Only 51% of those at West Hill said that they had a sentence plan, which was worse than the 70% comparator but much better than at the time of the previous inspection (32%). Five out of the seven cases we looked at in detail did not have a current OASys assessment or sentence plan. Many prisoners we spoke to complained about this delay and its impact on their ability to secure a progressive transfer. We found a high risk of harm case due for release in the next couple of months who still did not have an OASys assessment or risk management plan, despite being eligible for multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) (see main recommendation S54).
- 4.14** In many cases, prisoners from West Hill were transferred out on overcrowding drafts, which potentially hindered their progression (see recommendation 3.15)
- 4.15** OASys assessments completed by OMU staff were generally of adequate quality. They were countersigned by probation staff, and peer mentors were used to drive up quality.
- 4.16** Sentence plans were sometimes too limited, omitting some offending behaviour needs and not always including outcome-focused objectives. The risk management plans we saw were adequately detailed and included actions both in and out of prison.
- 4.17** Only those serving over 12 months were allocated an offender supervisor. In our survey, too few prisoners on the main site said that they had an offender supervisor (22% versus 32% at other local prisons) but this was better on the vulnerable prisoner wing (31% versus 20%). The figure at West Hill was much higher, at 77%, which was in line with the comparator but far better than at the time of the previous inspection (23%). Offender supervisor workloads were manageable and better use was now made of the skills of seconded probation staff, who managed high risk of harm cases as well as ISPs.
- 4.18** The level of contact by offender supervisors with those on their caseload was variable but had improved overall. It was better at West Hill than on the main site. However, initial contact did not happen sufficiently early in the sentence. There was some evidence of one-to-one work, such as victim empathy work and psychology support, being carried out.
- 4.19** Case management oversight was more evident than at the time of the previous inspection, and some useful case discussion was recorded. A meeting to discuss the most complex cases also supported offender supervisors.
- 4.20** The number of prisoners released on home detention curfew (HDC) was similar to that at the time of the previous inspection. Processes were adequate and where possible started 10 weeks before release. Success rates and the timeliness of release were not monitored. We found some prisoners released long after their eligibility date and it was difficult to identify the reasons for these delays. The ratification of HDC decisions was inappropriately made by the chair of the HDC board, removing any element of oversight and scrutiny.

## Recommendation

- 4.21 All relevant prisoners should have timely and regular contact with their offender supervisor.**

## Housekeeping points

- 4.22 The number and timeliness of home detention curfew (HDC) releases should be monitored and action taken to make any necessary improvements.
- 4.23 HDC recommendations should not be ratified by the chair of the HDC board.

## Good practice

- 4.24 *OASys assessments were countersigned by probation staff, and peer mentors were used to drive up quality.*

## Public protection

- 4.25 Prisoners were screened on arrival by one of two public protection officers. Relevant offences and court orders were identified and restrictions on contact applied when necessary.
- 4.26 At the time of the inspection, a total of 97 prisoners were potentially eligible for mail and telephone call monitoring across both sites. Monitoring was appropriately undertaken and recorded, despite some recent staff shortages. Monitoring was regularly reviewed and removed at the earliest opportunity. Assessments for child contact were appropriately undertaken and approved. Prisoners were told in person about restrictions placed on them and could appeal.
- 4.27 MAPPA-eligible prisoners were identified on arrival but not all had a level identified six months before release, to aid risk management release planning. Not enough was done by the OMU to liaise with community-based offender managers to rectify this.

## Recommendation

- 4.28 **Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) processes should be improved to ensure timely identification before release, ensuring the involvement of offender managers where appropriate.**

## Categorisation

- 4.29 Two officers in the observation, classification and allocation (OCA) department completed all initial categorisation, and paperwork was complete. Reviews of categorisation were undertaken by the OMU and based on a range of information. Prisoners could submit a written report in support of their recategorisation but were not informed of the outcome in person. This limited their understanding of the targets they needed to achieve before the next review.
- 4.30 Links between the OMU and OCA department were good and adequate priority was given to progressive transfers.

- 4.31** A large number of prisoners were on a transfer hold. The reasons for this were legitimate, including medical appointments or further court appearances. However, the offender supervisor was not always consulted about this. Transfer holds were reviewed each month by OCA staff and removed if no longer relevant.
- 4.32** There were four category D prisoners at West Hill during the inspection. They had all been recategorised recently and were waiting to transfer to an open prison.
- 4.33** We saw evidence of good efforts to transfer prisoners to other prisons to complete offending behaviour work, including the sex offender treatment programme. Some category B prisoners and some sex offenders faced longer waits to transfer owing to a lack of places nationally.

### Housekeeping points

- 4.34** Prisoners should be told in person about the outcome of their recategorisation review.
- 4.35** The offender supervisor should be consulted about the application of a transfer hold.

### Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.36** There were 21 prisoners serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) and 21 life-sentenced prisoners across the prison at the time of the inspection. Ten of the IPP prisoners were considerably over tariff but nine had either failed open conditions or had been recalled because of further offending. Most other ISPs were transferred promptly to more appropriate prisons.
- 4.37** Those on remand who were potentially facing a life sentence were not given support or information to help them prepare for sentencing. An ISP forum had started recently and had met twice but there were no ISP family days, although there were well-advanced plans to introduce these.

### Recommendation

- 4.38** **Prisoners facing an indeterminate sentence should be given information and support and, after sentencing, should be able to access family days.**

## 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.**

**4.39** *Assessment of resettlement needs on arrival and before release was poor and those on remand or serving short sentences did not have a custody plan. The range of housing support and advice available was adequate and there were links with accommodation providers in the community. Prisoners had good access to a pre-release course before release to help develop job search skills. Pre-discharge health care appointments had been introduced but prisoners did not always receive support in registering with a GP or a discharge summary of the health care they had received. There were good resettlement opportunities for prisoners with substance misuse problems. Insufficient advice and support were offered to prisoners to resolve debt and other financial problems. Convicted prisoners who were not on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme could receive only two visits a month. The visitors centre was excellent. A wide range of interventions was provided for fathers and families in need. Provision of offending behaviour programmes was poor but prisoners with an identified need were transferred quickly to undertake programmes elsewhere, although a few waited too long to be assessed.*

**4.40** Prisoners' immediate resettlement needs were no longer assessed on arrival, and remand and short-term prisoners did not have a custody plan. The new arrangements over-relied on the prisoner applying to see a resettlement adviser, which meant that they needed to be aware that they had a problem and be motivated to resolve it. Referrals to agencies were made when a need was identified. In our survey, fewer prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they knew who to turn to for help with resettlement needs.

**4.41** Pre-release planning had also largely ceased and was now simply a check on release details rather than identifying issues or planning to address them. In our survey, fewer prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had been helped to prepare for release (5% versus 14% and 9%, respectively).

### Recommendation

**4.42 Resettlement needs should be comprehensively assessed and planned for on arrival and again before release.**

### Accommodation

**4.43** A full-time, trained housing officer gave an overview of service provision during the induction process but did not see all new arrivals individually to assess need. In our survey, fewer respondents than at comparator establishments knew who to go to in the prison for help with accommodation issues. The range of support and advice available was adequate, including maintaining or closing down tenancies. Referrals through the pre-release process took place too close to discharge to be wholly effective. There were good links with accommodation providers in the community.

- 4.44** The percentage of prisoners released homeless in the previous six months was about 12%, which was similar to that at other local prisons. However, the prison did not monitor the number of potentially homeless prisoners they had helped to secure accommodation on release.

### Recommendation

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

### Education, training and employment

- 4.46** Before release, prisoners had good access to a pre-release course, using the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) to help develop job search skills. The course also helped to support prisoners to develop CVs and interview skills.
- 4.47** The National Careers Service provision was delivered by Tribal and required improvement. The provision had been affected by staff shortages in the previous nine weeks. However, advisers had still been able to meet most new prisoners in order to build a skills development action plan, which was particularly important for the many prisoners serving short sentences. This meant that the advisers often met prisoners before the initial assessment of their literacy and numeracy needs had taken place.
- 4.48** Action plans demonstrated that the provider had a good focus on identifying barriers to employment for each prisoner, and the actions agreed correctly prioritised the development of essential skills such as literacy and numeracy. However, advisers had been able to meet only approximately 50% of the prisoners being released, to conduct their pre-release interview.
- 4.49** The prison had made some good links with employers but these had not been fully exploited to provide opportunities for ROTL and improve employment opportunities. External links with the National Grid provided employment courses, including forklift truck driving, after release. Local charities provided opportunities for prisoners to engage in volunteer work.
- 4.50** Around 27% of prisoners about to be released had employment or arrangements to continue with education or training on discharge.

### Recommendation

- 4.51** **The links made with employers should be fully exploited to provide more opportunities for release on temporary licence and improve employment prospects for prisoners.**

## Health care

- 4.52** Pre-discharge health care appointments had been introduced to ensure that prescribing was continued. Most prisoners received their required medication pre-release but did not always receive health promotion information, support in registering with a GP or a discharge summary of the health care they had received while in custody. Prisoners with complex physical and mental health needs had more effective pre-release planning, including appropriate community liaison.
- 4.53** There was an effective end-of-life pathway. A large room in the inpatient unit was being adapted into a palliative care suite.

## Recommendation

- 4.54** **A health care discharge summary should be sent prisoners' GP or be given to the prisoner before release, and all prisoners should receive information and assistance to access community health services on release.**

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.55** Resettlement opportunities for prisoners with substance misuse needs who were residents of Hampshire and Dorset were good, mainly because of the recent appointment of a full-time community integration and support worker. A wide range of services was delivered, including arranging gate pick-ups, housing, rehabilitation centre funding, community treatment, arranging recovery champion visits to the prison and developing links with regional drug intervention programme and drug, alcohol and assessment teams.
- 4.56** A family lead worker for those with a substance use problem had been in post since November 2013, developing support for prisoners' family members through referrals and signposting to Al-anon and other community-based services.

## Good practice

- 4.57** *The appointment and subsequent achievements of the community integration and support worker had improved resettlement opportunities for prisoners with substance misuse problems released in Hampshire and Dorset.*

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.58** Insufficient advice and support were offered to prisoners to resolve debt and other financial problems. Some debt advice was offered by Citizens Advice one day a week, and a sessional member of staff had eight hours a week designated for helping prisoners deal with loan companies, but demand for these services was high.
- 4.59** Jobcentre Plus provided benefits advice, set up fresh claims before release, provided information and signposted prisoners to external support agencies. Prisoners could open bank accounts before release and 384 had been opened in the previous 12 months. Access to money management training was limited to one module, provided by the education department.

## Recommendation

**4.60** There should be adequate debt advice provision to meet the needs of prisoners.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

**4.61** Convicted prisoners on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme could have three visits a month but the others could have only two. Remand prisoners could have visits every day. Visitors told us that it took a long time to get through on the dedicated visits booking number. When we tested the booking line, it took eight minutes before the telephone was answered.

**4.62** The children's charity, Spurgeons, managed the visitors centre, which was open seven days a week. It was an attractive facility, with comfortable seating and appealing, well-equipped play areas. Visitors using it spoke highly of its facilities and staff.

**4.63** The visits hall lacked natural light, and the fixed furniture was unwelcoming. Prisoners and visitors told us that visits often started late, with visitors waiting in the visits hall for prisoners to be brought in. The visits session we observed started on time but some visitors waited about 10 minutes after entering the hall. Visitors told us that they had been searched sensitively, including contact with the drugs dogs. Volunteers operated a tea and coffee bar and a crèche on most days.

**4.64** Until shortly before the inspection, prisoners had been required to wear 'bibs' in the visits hall. These had been unpopular and had been replaced by more dignified orange lanyards.

**4.65** Spurgeons provided a wide range of interventions for fathers and families in need, in partnership with local authorities. Data showed that most prisoners who wanted to participate in a programme were offered a place, and they were publicised around the prison. These included parenting support programmes such as 'You and Your Child', 'Family Man' and 'Dads Together', individual interventions tailored to the specific needs of prisoners and their families, outreach work with families, and awareness-raising sessions with local authority social workers. Prisoners with children were identified during induction and given a 'Dad's Pack' with information about these programmes. Prisoners and their families described the programmes as highly valued and helpful.

**4.66** The frequency of family days had increased and two were provided on one weekend per month. These days were well attended and met demand.

## Recommendation

**4.67** All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (Repeated recommendation 4.46)

## Good practice

**4.68** *In conjunction with the local authority, Spurgeons provided a range of well publicised and valued programmes to meet the needs of fathers and their families.*

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.69** No accredited offending behaviour programmes were available on either site. However, most prisoners who had an identified offending behaviour need were transferred fairly quickly to undertake programmes elsewhere, although a few waited too long to be assessed (see section on offender management and planning).
- 4.70** There had been no recent analysis of the offending behaviour needs of the population. In our survey, only 11% of respondents on the main site said that it was easy to be involved in offending behaviour programmes, against the 18% comparator, which reflected the lack of provision at the establishment.
- 4.71** The Sycamore Tree programme and the Inside Out project, two restorative justice programmes which addressed prisoners' attitudes towards their offending behaviour, were run. A domestic violence awareness programme (ADAPT) was only delivered to prisoners at West Hill, and there was limited monitoring and evaluation of outcomes.

## Housekeeping point

- 4.72** The ADAPT course should be facilitated across the whole prison.

## 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** All violent incidents should be fully investigated and systematic action taken to address bullying and support victims. A local violence reduction policy should be introduced. All data relating to violence should be collated and analysed to identify trends, and followed up with rigorous remedial action. (S48)
- 5.2** Analysis of data for disciplinary procedures, use of force and segregation should be rigorous and effectively used to reduce the number of adjudications, the use of force and the throughput in the segregation unit. (S49)
- 5.3** The segregation unit should be replaced with a modern, fit-for-purpose facility. (S50)
- 5.4** The specific needs of the young adult population should be identified and met. In particular, they should be helped with the transition to a mixed-age population and provided with adequate social and/or pastoral support, including through the use of support groups. (S51)
- 5.5** Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (S52, repeated recommendation HP55)
- 5.6** There should be more activity places, including full time activity, to purposefully occupy prisoners. Participation, attendance and achievements should be monitored, and attendance at activities, especially vocational training and work should be improved. (S53)
- 5.7** All eligible prisoners should have an OASys assessment and a review within the required timescales. (S54, repeated recommendation HP59)

### Recommendations

#### to the escort contractor

#### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.8** Prisoners should not remain in court cells for long periods waiting for transfer to prison. (1.5)
- 5.9** The escort contractor should plan inter-prison transfers to guarantee the arrival at the designated prison on the same day. (1.6)

## Recommendations

### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.10** Prisoners should only be handcuffed during disembarkation when justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.7, repeated recommendation 1.5)

### Early days in custody

- 5.11** Prisoners should only be subject to a strip-search when justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.16, repeated recommendation 1.17)
- 5.12** Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival. (1.17, repeated recommendation 1.20)
- 5.13** Night staff should introduce themselves to new arrivals and check on their well-being during the night. (1.18)
- 5.14** Induction should effectively engage and inform prisoners of key information. (1.19)

### Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.15** There should be a specific policy to manage the vulnerable prisoner population, and abusive behaviour directed at them, especially during exercise, should be challenged. (1.27)

### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.16** Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures should only be held in segregation in exceptional circumstances which should be regularly reviewed and adequately recorded. (1.35)
- 5.17** Care suites should be properly furnished and equipped to provide an appropriately supportive environment. (1.36, repeated recommendation 1.38)
- 5.18** All night staff should be adequately trained in emergency response procedures, and all should carry anti-ligature knives. (1.37)

### Security

- 5.19** Closed visits should only be imposed in direct response to trafficking activity or intelligence. (1.48)
- 5.20** Suspicion testing should be conducted in a timely manner, and completions and results monitored. (1.49)

### Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.21** Staff should understand and consistently implement the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy. In particular, all prisoners on entry level should be reviewed after 14 days and behaviour improvement targets should be specific to the individual. (1.57)

## Discipline

- 5.22** Adjudication hearings should examine charges thoroughly and paperwork should be quality checked by a senior manager. (1.62)
- 5.23** Investigations should be conducted into every incident in which a baton is drawn. (1.67)
- 5.24** Prisoners should be placed in special accommodation only in exceptional circumstances and be removed at the earliest opportunity. Records should thoroughly explain the justification for the measure. (1.68)
- 5.25** All instances of segregation, regardless of location, should be appropriately authorised and subject to management oversight. (1.76)
- 5.26** All cells in the segregation unit should contain furniture or be classified as special accommodation. (1.77)
- 5.27** Prisoners on the segregation unit should have access to a significantly improved regime. (1.78)
- 5.28** Staff should build meaningful relationships to support prisoners while in segregation. (1.79)

## Substance misuse

- 5.29** Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission. (1.88, repeated recommendation 1.84)
- 5.30** The psychosocial service should be adequately resourced to ensure delivery of integrated clinical reviews and timely key-working sessions. (1.89)
- 5.31** There should be sufficient peer workers to provide substance use support across both sites in line with local operational policies and protocols. (1.90, repeated recommendation 1.83)

## Residential units

- 5.32** Cells should have clean, adequately screened toilets, adequate furniture and sufficient natural light. (2.9, repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 5.33** Prisoners should be provided with sufficient clothing of adequate quality and the facility to launder their own clothes. They should not be penalised for washing and drying clothes in their cells. (2.10, revised recommendation 2.12)
- 5.34** The timeliness and quality of responses to prisoner applications should be monitored and improvements made where required. (2.11, repeated recommendation 2.14)
- 5.35** Cell call bells should be answered promptly and response times monitored. (2.12)

## Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.36** There should be an effective system for ensuring that prisoners know whom to ask for help with problems, for checking on their well-being and for supporting them in achieving progress. (2.19, repeated recommendation 2.21)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.37** Monitoring data for all protected characteristics should be comprehensively compiled and analysed, and action should be taken to investigate all anomalies. (2.24)
- 5.38** Links should be established with external community groups and agencies to help provide support to minority groups in the establishment. (2.25)
- 5.39** The diversity officer and prisoner equality representative should be suitably trained and supported to fulfil their roles. (2.26)
- 5.40** Prisoners with disabilities should have appropriately adapted facilities and a multidisciplinary care plans if needed. A paid carer scheme should also be established. (2.34)
- 5.41** Dedicated support forums and prisoner representatives should be introduced for prisoners from every protected characteristic group. (2.35)

### Faith and religious activity

- 5.42** Links with external community faith groups should be established to support effective reintegration after release. (2.40)

### Complaints

- 5.43** Any identified trends in complaints should be investigated. Information about upheld complaints should be included in the analysis. (2.44)

### Legal rights

- 5.44** The legal services provided should meet the needs of the population, and prisoners should be told about them during the induction process. (2.49)

### Health services

- 5.45** All clinical areas should be fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.60)
- 5.46** A designated senior health lead to develop health services for older prisoners and those with disabilities should be identified. (2.61)
- 5.47** Prisoners should have prompt access to confidential nurse assessment clinics, provided by trained staff who can provide appropriate treatment using evidence-based triage algorithms to ensure consistency. (2.72)
- 5.48** The failure-to-attend rate for all clinics should be monitored and appropriate remedial action taken to reduce it to less than 10%. (2.73)
- 5.49** Prisoners with life-long conditions should receive regular reviews which generate an evidence-based care plan from appropriately trained and supervised staff. (2.74)
- 5.50** The inpatient unit should offer adequate care-planned therapeutic and constructive activities to residents, in a satisfactory environment, and only prisoners with a clinical need should be admitted. (2.75)

- 5.51** There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities. (2.76, repeated recommendation 2.81)
- 5.52** Prisoners should be fully involved in prescribing reviews. (2.83)
- 5.53** A wider range of medicines should be available to prisoners without the need to see the doctor, either on 'special sick' or as patient group directions. (2.84)
- 5.54** The reordering of medicines should be managed effectively, to ensure continuity of care. (2.85)
- 5.55** The draft in-possession policy should be implemented, and risk assessments should be reviewed regularly and be available for the prescriber to see at the time of prescribing. (2.86)
- 5.56** All medication should be administered at an appropriate time for maximum therapeutic effect and with sufficient officer supervision and privacy. (2.87)
- 5.57** The dental surgery should fully comply with dental regulation HTMI-05. (2.93)
- 5.58** Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training. (2.98)
- 5.59** Prisoners should have timely access to a full range of care-planned support for mild and moderate mental health problems, including counselling, clinical psychology and group therapies. (2.99)

#### Purchases

- 5.60** There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders. (2.111)

#### Time out of cell

- 5.61** The core day should be adhered to and information regarding timings made freely available to prisoners. (3.5)
- 5.62** Prisoners should be given the opportunity for one hour of exercise in the open air every day. (3.6, repeated recommendation 3.5)

#### Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.63** The operational management of the non-Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision should be improved, to ensure effective supervision and support to delivery staff. (3.13)
- 5.64** The session observation scheme across work and vocational training provision should be further developed and consistently applied. (3.14)
- 5.65** Prisoners at West Hill should not be transferred as a result of overcrowding drafts mid-way through courses. (3.15)
- 5.66** Employability skills, including English and mathematics, should be prioritised and recorded for all activities. (3.20)

- 5.67** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved to a consistently high level across all of the provision. (3.27)
- 5.68** All staff should strongly promote the development of literacy and numeracy skills, as well as good health and safety awareness, in the workshops. (3.28)
- 5.69** Success rates in English for speakers of other languages, Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy, English and mathematics courses should be improved. (3.34)
- 5.70** Library services should be developed through formal liaison with other departments and analysis of patterns of library use. (3.40)

#### **Physical education and healthy living**

- 5.71** Prisoners should have consistently good access to a wide range of group recreational sports and games. (3.47)
- 5.72** More accredited courses should be made available in the gym. (3.48)

#### **Strategic management of resettlement**

- 5.73** The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis and focus more on the importance of offender management, with an action plan setting out priorities. (4.9)
- 5.74** Release on temporary licence processes should ensure that contributions from all relevant key personnel are included and considered, and that an appropriate level of governance and authority is applied. (4.10)

#### **Offender management and planning**

- 5.75** All relevant prisoners should have timely and regular contact with their offender supervisor. (4.21)
- 5.76** Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) processes should be improved to ensure timely identification before release, ensuring the involvement of offender managers where appropriate. (4.28)
- 5.77** Prisoners facing an indeterminate sentence should be given information and support and, after sentencing, should be able to access family days. (4.38)

#### **Reintegration planning**

- 5.78** Resettlement needs should be comprehensively assessed and planned for on arrival and again before release. (4.42)
- 5.79** The number of homeless prisoners helped to find accommodation on release should be monitored to demonstrate effectiveness. (4.45, repeated recommendation 4.32)
- 5.80** The links made with employers should be fully exploited to provide more opportunities for release on temporary licence and improve employment prospects for prisoners. (4.51)

- 5.81** A health care discharge summary should be sent prisoners' GP or be given to the prisoner before release, and all prisoners should receive information and assistance to access community health services on release. (4.54)
- 5.82** There should be adequate debt advice provision to meet the needs of prisoners. (4.60)
- 5.83** All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (4.67, repeated recommendation 4.46)

## Housekeeping points

### Early days in custody

- 5.84** The introductory interview with Insiders should be made available to vulnerable prisoners. (1.20)
- 5.85** All prisoners should be offered a shower on arrival. (1.21)

### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.86** The quality of ACCT observations, interaction and entries by night staff should be improved. (1.38)
- 5.87** Staff should adhere to the on-call Listener roster and respond quickly to the needs of on-call Listeners. (1.39)

### Security

- 5.88** Prisoners testing positive under any testing regime should be referred to the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) service without delay. (1.50)
- 5.89** The mandatory drug testing suite should be kept clean and appropriately furnished. (1.51)

### Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.90** Unauthorised notices on IEP should be removed. (1.58)

### Discipline

- 5.91** All planned interventions should be video-recorded. (1.69)
- 5.92** Targets for those subject to good order or discipline should be individualised and relevant to encouraging improvements in behaviour. (1.80)

### Substance misuse

- 5.93** Prisoners should have full access to fellowship and recovery meetings whenever they are held. (1.91)

### **Residential units**

- 5.94** Outside exercise yards should be cleaned daily. (2.13)
- 5.95** The offensive display policy should be applied consistently. (2.14)

### **Equality and diversity**

- 5.96** Discrimination incident report forms should be freely available on all wings. (2.27)

### **Health services**

- 5.97** There should be regular health care service user consultation that informs service delivery. (2.62)
- 5.98** There should be robust processes to ensure timely, appropriate information sharing between health services and gym staff. (2.63)
- 5.99** Prisoners should receive a written response to health care applications. (2.77)
- 5.100** The waiting rooms on the inpatient unit should be refurbished to provide a clean area, with appropriate seating and adequate resources to pass the time. (2.78)
- 5.101** The ambient temperature in clinical rooms should be monitored daily and remedial action taken as required to ensure that it is suitable for the provision of health services and storage of medicines. (2.88)
- 5.102** The maximum and minimum temperatures for all drug refrigerators should be recorded daily and appropriate corrective action taken as required. (2.89)
- 5.103** Senior prison security staff should regularly attend the medicine management committee to ensure timely implementation of policies. (2.90)

### **Catering**

- 5.104** Supervision of the serveries, and portion control in particular, should be improved. (2.105)
- 5.105** Food surveys should be thoroughly analysed to increase understanding of prisoners' dissatisfaction with catering. (2.106)

### **Physical education and healthy living**

- 5.106** Communication with the health care department should be sufficient to ensure timely advice and guidance to prisoners, thereby promoting safe, well-supervised exercise. (3.49)

### **Offender management and planning**

- 5.107** The number and timeliness of home detention curfew (HDC) releases should be monitored and action taken to make any necessary improvements. (4.22)
- 5.108** HDC recommendations should not be ratified by the chair of the HDC board. (4.23)

**5.109** Prisoners should be told in person about the outcome of their recategorisation review. (4.34)

**5.110** The offender supervisor should be consulted about the application of a transfer hold. (4.35)

### **Reintegration planning**

**5.111** The ADAPT course should be facilitated across the whole prison. (4.72)

## **Examples of good practice**

### **Offender management and planning**

**5.112** OASys assessments were countersigned by probation staff, and peer mentors were used to drive up quality. (4.24)

### **Reintegration planning**

**5.113** The appointment and subsequent achievements of the community integration and support worker had improved resettlement opportunities for prisoners with substance misuse problems released in Hampshire and Dorset. (4.57)

**5.114** In conjunction with the local authority, Spurgeons provided a range of well publicised and valued programmes to meet the needs of fathers and their families. (4.68)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief Inspector
Hindpal Singh Bhui	Team leader
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Peter Dunn	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Gary Boughen	Inspector
Francesca Gordon	Inspector
Andrew Lund	Inspector
Lucy Higgins	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Gemma Quayle	Researcher

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Majella Pearce	Health services inspector
Sue Melvin	Pharmacist
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Maria Navaro	Ofsted inspector
Ian Smith	Ofsted inspector



## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

### Safety

#### **Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection, in 2012, reception processes were good but took too long. The nominated first night accommodation was not routinely used and first night support was not reliable. Induction was reasonable. Too many prisoners on the main site, and especially vulnerable prisoners, felt unsafe, but those on the West Hill site felt safer. There were high levels of bullying. There was little done to improve safety by identifying and addressing patterns or trends in violent and bullying behaviour. Suicide and self-harm procedures were adequate for most and good for some complex cases. Security arrangements were generally proportionate. Drug use was relatively high and too few prisoners suspected of taking drugs were tested. There was little use of force and it was well governed. Physical conditions in segregation were poor but use of the unit was comparatively rare and stays were short. Treatment for drug and alcohol users was generally good but the range of interventions was inadequate. Outcomes for prisoners on the main site were not sufficiently good and on the West Hill site were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

#### **Main recommendations**

All incidents of bullying should be acted on and reported. A local policy should be introduced and all data relating to violence should be collated and analysed to identify trends, and action taken to improve safety. (HP54)

**Not achieved**

#### **Recommendations**

Prisoners should only be handcuffed during disembarkation when justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.5)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.7)

A full criminal record should accompany all new prisoners being received at the prison. (1.6)

**Achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.16)

Written information for new prisoners should be available in appropriate languages other than English. (1.18)

**Not achieved**

Thorough first night procedures should be applied to ensure that accommodation is prepared, a shower and a telephone call are available and appropriate support and checks are carried out on new arrivals through the night. (1.19)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival. (1.20)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.17)

The abusive behaviour directed at vulnerable prisoners in general, but especially during exercise, should be challenged. (1.28)

**Not achieved**

There should be a specific policy to manage the vulnerable prisoner population. (1.29)

**Not achieved**

The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) observations, interaction and entries by night staff should be improved. (1.36)

**Not achieved**

All discipline staff should be issued with and trained in the use of anti-ligature knives. (1.37)

**Not achieved**

Care suites should be properly furnished and equipped to provide an appropriately supportive environment. (1.38)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.36)

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

**Achieved**

The unnecessary regime-based locking-up procedures should cease. (1.52)

**Achieved**

An up to date supply reduction strategy should be in place, supported by monitoring data and a drug strategy meeting to direct action. (1.53)

**Achieved**

Drug testing should be adequately resourced to allow for mandatory and suspicion testing to be appropriately spread and completed on time. (1.54)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners segregated for good order or discipline should have completed Rule 45 paperwork and effective behavioural targets. (1.72)

**Partially achieved**

A segregation monitoring and review group (SMARG) should meet regularly to analyse and act on segregation-related data. (1.73)

**Not achieved**

There should be sufficient peer workers to provide substance use support across both sites in line with local operational policies and protocols. (1.83)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.91)

Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission. (1.84)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.89)

There should be a full range of psychosocial interventions. These should not be cancelled as a result of a shortage of discipline officers. (1.85)

**Achieved**

## Respect

**Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection, in 2012, external areas were generally clean. The quality of cellular accommodation varied widely but on the main site was mainly old and draughty, with little natural light. The newer accommodation was of better quality. Access to showers was good but to telephones on the main site was problematic for some. Prisoners viewed staff as unhelpful. Equality and diversity provision was neglected and undeveloped. The needs of prisoners with disabilities were not met. Complaints were well managed but prisoners lacked faith in the system. Health provision was deficient and compromised by delays in providing medication. There was insufficient primary mental health provision but secondary provision was good. Food was poor. Outcomes for prisoners on both sites were poor against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (HP55)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, S51)

Prescribed medication should be available and prisoners should be unlocked at the right time to receive it. (HP56)

**Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

Cells should have clean, adequately screened toilets, adequate furniture and sufficient natural light. (2.10)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.9)

Problems with drainage and damp in showers in older units should be rectified. (2.11)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should be provided with sufficient clothing of adequate quality and the facility to launder their own clothes. (2.12)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.10)

Prisoners should have daily access to telephones, and all wings should have at least one telephone to every 20 prisoners and they should all have privacy hoods or enclosures. (2.13)

**Achieved**

The timeliness and quality of responses to prisoner applications should be monitored and improvements made where required. (2.14)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Prisoners should have reliable access to their stored property. (2.15)

**Achieved**

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

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.19)

Consultation with prisoners should be regular, consistent and accountable. (2.22)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners from minority groups should be identified accurately. (2.28)

**Not achieved**

The diversity officer should be suitably trained. (2.29)

**Not achieved**

Dedicated forums and prisoner representatives from minority groups should be introduced. (2.30)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners with disabilities should have multidisciplinary care plans, which are available on the wings to identify any additional support required. (2.39)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners who have been allocated responsibility for carrying out diversity work should be suitably trained and supported. (2.40)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should be able to attend religious services and activities without registering. (2.47)

**Partially achieved**

Muslim Friday prayers should be conducted in a suitable venue. (2.48)

**Achieved**

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

**Achieved**

Health promotion should be developed and literature readily available. (2.66)

**Achieved**

Wing treatment rooms should be kept clean and equipped, with adequate storage. (2.67)

**Partially achieved**

A separate secondary health assessment should be completed within 72 hours of arrival. (2.76)

**Achieved**

Chronic disease management should be developed, to include regular clinics for prisoners with diabetes, coronary heart disease and epilepsy. (2.77)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners located on the inpatient unit should be provided with a suitably therapeutic environment and activity. (2.78)

**Not achieved**

There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities. (2.81)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.75)

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

**Not achieved**

There should be adequate supervision of medication queues by prison staff. (2.92)

**Not achieved**

Pharmacist-led clinics and medicines use reviews should take place. (2.93)

**Achieved**

Arrangements for the storage, administration, disposal and recording of controlled drugs should comply with regulations and infection control requirements. (2.94)

**Achieved**

Clean and dirty areas should be separated to meet best practice guidelines. (2.104)

**Achieved**

Primary mental health services should meet the needs of the prison population. (2.113)

**Partially achieved**

Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training. (2.114)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection, in 2012, time unlocked was inadequate for most and particularly poor for unemployed prisoners. Far too many prisoners on the main site were locked up during the core day. The daily regime was unregulated and frequently curtailed. There were too few activity places for the population but even these were underused, particularly on the main site. The range of education provision was good, with sufficient progression opportunities available. There was insufficient vocational and employment-related work, particularly on the West Hill site. Opportunities to accredit work skills were missed. Many prisoners were underemployed in low-skilled work. Achievements were good but only for those who stayed long enough to complete courses. Library access was poor. Recreational PE was adequate. Outcomes for prisoners on the main site were poor and on the West Hill site were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

## **Main recommendations**

The core day should be reviewed to reduce long periods of lock-up. All prisoners should be able have some evening association. Any changes to the published core day should be kept to a minimum, appropriately authorised and communicated to prisoners. (HP57)

**Partially achieved**

The total number of activity places should be increased and places should be fully utilised to allow more prisoners to be employed. The amount of employment-related work and vocational training should be increased, particularly at the West Hill site. (HP58)

**Partially achieved**

## **Recommendations**

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.6)

Sentence planning should link effectively with the allocation process, and regime interruptions to learning and skills and work activities should be reduced. (3.11)

**Not achieved**

A prison-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work, which includes all activities and fully informs action planning for improvement, should be developed and implemented. (3.12)

**Achieved**

The session observation scheme to improve the quality of teaching and learning and assessment should be developed further. (3.13)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

Appropriate English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) qualifications should be introduced. (3.22)

**Achieved**

The analysis and use of data should be improved, to identify the achievements of different groups of learners and ensure that all their needs are identified and met. (3.23)

**Not achieved**

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

**Not achieved**

The library should increase its opening hours on both sites. (3.30)

**Not achieved**

More careers and employment-related information should be available. (3.31)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

## Resettlement

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

*At the last inspection, in 2012, the strategic management of resettlement was weak and not informed by an effective needs analysis. Offender management was underdeveloped. Too few prisoners had an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, a sentence plan or an offender supervisor. The quality of offender supervision was sometimes poor. The needs of remand and short-term prisoners were generally met. Public protection arrangements were appropriate. There were limited release on temporary license opportunities for prisoners on the West Hill site. Reintegration work was generally good. Accommodation; finance, benefit, debt; and employment, education and training services were comprehensive but the number of homeless prisoners helped to secure accommodation was not monitored. Work with children and families was well developed. There were insufficient offending behaviour courses to meet need. Outcomes for prisoners on both sites were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

All eligible prisoners should have an OASys assessment and a review within the required timescales. (HP59)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, S52)

The offending behaviour needs of the population should be analysed and suitable offending behaviour courses introduced. (HP60)

**Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

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

**Partially achieved**

All prisoners serving over 12 months should have an offender supervisor who provides them with regular and meaningful contact which is appropriately overseen by a line manager. (4.14)

**Achieved**

There should be high-quality assessments and plans for managing the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm for all relevant prisoners, and sentence planning boards should be multidisciplinary. (4.15)

**Partially achieved**

Reviews of child contact restrictions should be completed at the earliest opportunity. (4.20)

**Achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.44)

A more structured pre-release programme should be provided, particularly on the West Hill site, to improve prisoners' preparation for employment and reintegration into the community. (4.34)

**Partially achieved**

Links with employers in the local community should be further developed, to provide meaningful employment and training opportunities for prisoners on release. (4.35)

**Partially achieved**

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

**Partially achieved**

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

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.66)

The number of family days should be increased. (4.47)

**Achieved**

## Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	13	327	50.90
Recall	3	42	6.74
Convicted unsentenced	3	100	15.41
Remand	9	169	26.65
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	2	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>640</b>	

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	13	276	43.26
Less than six months	3	65	10.19
six months to less than 12 months	1	32	4.94
12 months to less than 2 years	2	43	6.74
2 years to less than 4 years	5	84	13.32
4 years to less than 10 years	2	70	10.78
10 years and over (not life)	0	30	4.49
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	21	3.14
Life	2	19	3.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>640</b>	

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	18	
Under 21 years	84	12.39
21 years to 29 years	213	31.42
30 years to 39 years	204	30.34
40 years to 49 years	104	15.37
50 years to 59 years	46	6.49
60 years to 69 years	16	2.39
70 plus years	11	1.60
Please state maximum age here:	82	
<b>Total</b>	<b>*678</b>	

\*This figure includes 10 received into reception on Saturday who had not yet received their full induction and who are not included in the other figures, apart from ethnicity – hence the 678 total.

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	28	578	90.72
Foreign nationals	0	62	9.28
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>640</b>	

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	6	5	1.65
Uncategorised sentenced	46	269	47.15
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	42	6.29

Category C	0	268	40.12
Category D	0	13	1.95
Other	19	0	2.84
<b>Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>597</b>	

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
White			
British	61	462	76.80
Irish	0	7	1.05
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	2	8	1.50
Other white	2	26	4.19
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	5	13	2.67
White and black African	2	5	1.05
White and Asian	0	0	0
Other mixed	1	8	1.35
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	3	0.45
Pakistani	0	2	0.30
Bangladeshi	0	3	0.45
Chinese	0	3	0.45
Other Asian	1	7	1.20
Black or black British			
Caribbean	5	23	4.19
African	3	8	1.65
Other black	2	11	1.95
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	1	0.15
Other ethnic group	0	0	0
Not stated	0	4	0.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>594</b>	

<b>Religion</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist	0	1	0.15
Church of England	2	137	20.81
Roman Catholic	4	88	13.77
Other Christian denominations	6	75	12.12
Muslim	6	37	6.44
Sikh	0	1	0.15
Hindu	0	3	0.45
Buddhist	0	7	1.05
Jewish	0	1	0.15
Other	1	44	6.74
No religion	9	246	38.17
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>640</b>	

<b>Other demographics</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Veteran (ex-armed services)	0	12	1.80
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	

**Sentenced prisoners only**

<b>Length of stay</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>		<b>21 and over</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 month	6	0.90	171	25.60
1 month to 3 months	7	1.05	107	16.02
3 months to six months	5	0.75	83	12.42
six months to 1 year	0	0	75	11.23
1 year to 2 years	1	0.15	31	4.64
2 years to 4 years	0	0	3	0.45
4 years or more	0	0	1	0.15
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>		<b>471</b>	

**Sentenced prisoners only**

	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	5	92	14.52
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>92</b>	

**Unsentenced prisoners only**

<b>Length of stay</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>		<b>21 and over</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 month	6	0.90	48	7.18
1 month to 3 months	1	0.15	84	12.57
3 months to six months	0	0	35	5.24
six months to 1 year	2	0.30	2	0.30
1 year to 2 years	0	0	0	0
2 years to 4 years	0	0	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>		<b>169</b>	

<b>Main offence</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Violence against the person	2	98	14.98
Sexual offences	1	15	2.39
Burglary	7	91	14.67
Robbery	4	55	8.83
Theft and handling	3	43	6.89
Fraud and forgery	0	3	0.45
Drugs offences	2	48	7.48
Other offences	1	59	8.98
Civil offences	0	0	0
Offence not recorded /holding warrant	8	228	35.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>640</b>	



## Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

### Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey of a representative proportion of the prisoner population was carried out for this inspection. The results of this survey formed part of the evidence base for the inspection.

### Sampling

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

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 21 January 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Winchester was 551 on Winchester main site and 125 on the West Hill site. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 197 prisoners on Winchester main site. All prisoners were given a questionnaire on the West Hill site.

On Winchester main site we received a total of 165 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 84%. This included one questionnaire was completed via interview. Nine respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 20 questionnaires were not returned and three were returned blank.

<b>Wing/Unit</b>	<b>Number of completed survey returns</b>
A	24
B	55
C	45
D	37
Healthcare	4

On Winchester West Hill site we received a total of 101 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 81%. This included three questionnaire was completed via interview. Eleven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, four questionnaires were not returned and nine were returned blank.

<b>Wing/Unit</b>	<b>Number of completed survey returns</b>
Hearn	33
Alfred	30
Temple	17
Wykham	21

### **Presentation of survey results and analyses**

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences are indicated by shading. 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 for Winchester Main site:
  - The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 35 local prisons since April 2008.
  - The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Winchester in 2012.

- 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 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 the responses of prisoners on D wing and the rest of the establishment.

The following comparative analyses are presented for Winchester West Hill site:

- The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 39 category C training prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Winchester in 2012.
- 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 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.

## Survey summary: Main site

### Section I: About You

<b>Q1.1</b>	<b>What wing or houseblock are you currently living on?</b> See shortened methodology.		
<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	<i>Under 21</i>		14 (9%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		63 (38%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		51 (31%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		22 (13%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		2 (1%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		74 (45%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		13 (8%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		44 (27%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		31 (19%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		1 (1%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		76 (47%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		22 (14%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		11 (7%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		14 (9%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		7 (4%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>Life</i>		3 (2%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		14 (9%)
	<i>No</i>		150 (91%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		160 (98%)
	<i>No</i>		4 (2%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		160 (98%)
	<i>No</i>		4 (2%)
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	120 (73%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 6 (4%)
	<i>White - other</i>	12 (7%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 3 (2%)

<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - African</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)		

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

Yes	8 (5%)
No	152 (95%)

**Q1.10 What is your religion?**

None	59 (37%)	Hindu	1 (1%)
Church of England	46 (29%)	Jewish	1 (1%)
Catholic	29 (18%)	Muslim	9 (6%)
Protestant	0 (0%)	Sikh	0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination	9 (6%)	Other	3 (2%)
Buddhist	3 (2%)		

**Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?**

<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>	159 (99%)
<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	1 (1%)

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

Yes	33 (20%)
No	131 (80%)

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

Yes	6 (4%)
No	157 (96%)

**Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?**

Yes	50 (31%)
No	112 (69%)

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

Yes	89 (54%)
No	75 (46%)

**Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts****Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?**

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	118 (72%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	38 (23%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	118 (73%)
Yes	23 (14%)
No	19 (12%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)

<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	118 (73%)
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	35 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	105 (64%)
	<i>No</i>	55 (34%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	125 (77%)
	<i>No</i>	36 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i>	41 (25%)
	<i>Well</i>	75 (46%)
	<i>Neither</i>	37 (23%)
	<i>Badly</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	119 (73%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	37 (23%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (4%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	144 (89%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)
<b>Section 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>		
<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	48 (29%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	108 (66%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	115 (71%)
	<i>No</i>	44 (27%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Well</i>	67 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i>	44 (27%)
	<i>Badly</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)

<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	20 (13%)	<i>Physical health</i> 27 (17%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	28 (18%)	<i>Mental health</i> 33 (21%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	9 (6%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 7 (4%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	62 (39%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 46 (29%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other</i> 10 (6%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	36 (23%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> 45 (28%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	43 (27%)	
<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		39 (24%)
	<i>No</i>		78 (48%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>		45 (28%)
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Tobacco</i>		135 (82%)
	<i>A shower</i>		24 (15%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>		43 (26%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>		109 (66%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>		87 (53%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>		97 (59%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>		6 (4%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>Chaplain</i>		67 (42%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>		109 (68%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>		67 (42%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>		32 (20%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>		29 (18%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>		59 (37%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>		73 (46%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>		53 (34%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>		52 (33%)
	<i>Health services</i>		76 (48%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>		66 (42%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>		45 (28%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		120 (74%)
	<i>No</i>		36 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		7 (4%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>		
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>		20 (12%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>		108 (67%)
	<i>More than a week</i>		31 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		3 (2%)

<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Yes</i>	71 (44%)
	<i>No</i>	66 (41%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	47 (29%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	78 (48%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)

#### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to.....</b>					
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	13 (8%)	44 (28%)	26 (16%)	37 (23%)	25 (16%) 13 (8%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	18 (12%)	47 (31%)	29 (19%)	15 (10%)	13 (9%) 29 (19%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	6 (4%)	23 (16%)	30 (20%)	22 (15%)	25 (17%) 41 (28%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>					
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					24 (15%)
	<i>Yes</i>					68 (42%)
	<i>No</i>					71 (44%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>					
	<i>Yes</i>					47 (29%)
	<i>No</i>					18 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					99 (60%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>					
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	54 (33%)	106 (65%)	3 (2%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	138 (84%)	24 (15%)	3 (2%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	112 (68%)	45 (27%)	7 (4%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	114 (70%)	44 (27%)	5 (3%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	24 (15%)	125 (78%)	12 (7%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	72 (44%)	89 (54%)	3 (2%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	23 (14%)	92 (57%)	47 (29%)		
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>					
	<i>Very good</i>					0 (0%)
	<i>Good</i>					12 (7%)
	<i>Neither</i>					31 (19%)
	<i>Bad</i>					53 (33%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					66 (41%)
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>					
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>					9 (5%)
	<i>Yes</i>					70 (42%)
	<i>No</i>					86 (52%)

<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	80 (48%)
	No	22 (13%)
	Don't know	63 (38%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes	74 (45%)
	No	22 (13%)
	Don't know/ N/A	67 (41%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	85 (52%)
	No	16 (10%)
	Don't know/ N/A	63 (38%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	I don't want to attend	36 (22%)
	Very easy	22 (13%)
	Easy	45 (27%)
	Neither	9 (5%)
	Difficult	13 (8%)
	Very difficult	9 (5%)
	Don't know	31 (19%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes	121 (74%)
	No	36 (22%)
	Don't know	6 (4%)
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>	
		Not made one    Yes    No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	16 (10%)    75 (49%)    62 (41%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	16 (12%)    54 (39%)    68 (49%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	72 (47%)
	No	36 (24%)
	Don't know	45 (29%)
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>	
		Not made one    Yes    No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	74 (48%)    28 (18%)    53 (34%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	74 (49%)    28 (19%)    48 (32%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>	
	Yes	36 (23%)
	No	122 (77%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>	
	Don't know who they are	65 (41%)
	Very easy	10 (6%)
	Easy	16 (10%)

Neither	36 (23%)
Difficult	24 (15%)
Very difficult	9 (6%)

### Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	12 (7%)
	Yes	70 (43%)
	No	51 (31%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	31 (19%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	12 (8%)
	Yes	67 (42%)
	No	58 (36%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	22 (14%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&amp;R)?</b>	
	Yes	12 (7%)
	No	151 (93%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	133 (85%)
	Very well	2 (1%)
	Well	3 (2%)
	Neither	8 (5%)
	Badly	3 (2%)
	Very badly	8 (5%)

### Section 7: Relationships with staff

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes	101 (63%)
	No	59 (37%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	Yes	110 (68%)
	No	51 (32%)
<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes	29 (18%)
	No	135 (82%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	8 (5%)
	Never	49 (30%)
	Rarely	56 (34%)
	Some of the time	36 (22%)
	Most of the time	8 (5%)
	All of the time	8 (5%)

<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	125 (77%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	26 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (4%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	125 (78%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	4 (2%)

### Section 8: Safety

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>	71 (43%)		
	<i>No</i>	93 (57%)		
<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (21%)		
	<i>No</i>	125 (79%)		
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	93 (58%)	<i>At meal times</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	17 (11%)	<i>At health services</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Visits area</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	27 (17%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	9 (6%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	6 (4%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	21 (13%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	26 (16%)
	<i>At work</i>	4 (3%)	<i>In your cell</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>During movement</i>	14 (9%)	<i>At religious services</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>At education</i>	7 (4%)		
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>	56 (34%)		
	<i>No</i>	107 (66%)		
<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	27 (17%)		
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	18 (11%)		
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	5 (3%)		
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	31 (19%)		
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	15 (9%)		
	<i>Medication</i>	11 (7%)		
	<i>Debt</i>	6 (4%)		
	<i>Drugs</i>	7 (4%)		
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (4%)		
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (2%)		
	<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)		
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	10 (6%)		
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	3 (2%)		
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	5 (3%)		
	<i>Your age</i>	6 (4%)		

<i>You have a disability</i>	8 (5%)
<i>You were new here</i>	21 (13%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	8 (5%)

**Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?**

Yes	56 (34%)
No	109 (66%)

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	22 (13%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	26 (16%)
<i>Medication</i>	14 (8%)
<i>Debt</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Drugs</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	10 (6%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your age</i>	3 (2%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	8 (5%)
<i>You were new here</i>	18 (11%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)

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

<i>Not been victimised</i>	84 (55%)
Yes	17 (11%)
No	51 (34%)

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

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	20 (12%)	7 (4%)	26 (16%)	27 (16%)	50 (30%)	34 (21%)
The nurse	15 (10%)	20 (13%)	61 (39%)	13 (8%)	30 (19%)	17 (11%)
The dentist	39 (25%)	4 (3%)	8 (5%)	11 (7%)	33 (21%)	61 (39%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	29 (18%)	11 (7%)	43 (27%)	27 (17%)	30 (19%)	20 (13%)
The nurse	17 (11%)	24 (15%)	55 (35%)	24 (15%)	21 (14%)	14 (9%)
The dentist	63 (42%)	7 (5%)	20 (13%)	21 (14%)	13 (9%)	26 (17%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	11 (7%)
<i>Very good</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Good</i>	44 (28%)
<i>Neither</i>	28 (18%)
<i>Bad</i>	35 (22%)
<i>Very bad</i>	29 (19%)

<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>	
	Yes	84 (51%)
	No	81 (49%)
<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?</b>	
	<i>Not taking medication</i>	81 (49%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	21 (13%)
	No	35 (21%)
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	Yes	73 (45%)
	No	91 (55%)
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>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.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	91 (58%)
	Yes	25 (16%)
	No	41 (26%)

### Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	62 (38%)
	No	102 (62%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes	32 (20%)
	No	132 (80%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Very easy</i>	29 (18%)
	<i>Easy</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	81 (49%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Easy</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	98 (60%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	10 (6%)
	No	152 (94%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	10 (6%)
	No	152 (94%)

<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	93 (59%)
	Yes	44 (28%)
	No	21 (13%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	132 (81%)
	Yes	19 (12%)
	No	12 (7%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	104 (67%)
	Yes	45 (29%)
	No	6 (4%)

### Section II: Activities

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	29 (18%)	6 (4%)	31 (20%)	24 (15%)	44 (28%)	24 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training	40 (27%)	4 (3%)	28 (19%)	29 (20%)	29 (20%)	16 (11%)
	Education (including basic skills)	26 (17%)	16 (10%)	54 (35%)	37 (24%)	14 (9%)	7 (5%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	54 (36%)	5 (3%)	12 (8%)	26 (17%)	23 (15%)	29 (19%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					65 (42%)	
	Prison job					58 (37%)	
	Vocational or skills training					2 (1%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					31 (20%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					8 (5%)	
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	47 (35%)	27 (20%)	48 (35%)	14 (10%)		
	Vocational or skills training	61 (55%)	16 (14%)	17 (15%)	17 (15%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	51 (40%)	35 (28%)	27 (21%)	13 (10%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	56 (50%)	24 (21%)	18 (16%)	15 (13%)		
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					27 (17%)	
	<i>Never</i>					34 (21%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					49 (30%)	
	<i>About once a week</i>					47 (29%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i>					5 (3%)	
<b>Q11.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Don't use it</i>					51 (32%)	
	Yes					53 (34%)	
	No					54 (34%)	

<b>Q11.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	41 (25%)
	<i>0</i>	40 (25%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	66 (41%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q11.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	36 (22%)
	<i>0</i>	32 (20%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	54 (33%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	30 (19%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	10 (6%)
<b>Q11.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>0</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	41 (25%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	95 (59%)
<b>Q11.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	59 (36%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	34 (21%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (7%)

### Section 12: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	28 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	132 (83%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	80 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	79 (50%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	59 (36%)
	<i>No</i>	104 (64%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	26 (16%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Easy</i>	32 (20%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	30 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	27 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	13 (8%)

## Section 13: Preparation for release

<b>Q13.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	76 (47%)
	Yes	51 (32%)
	No	34 (21%)
<b>Q13.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	110 (69%)
	<i>No contact</i>	29 (18%)
	Letter	7 (4%)
	Phone	7 (4%)
	Visit	13 (8%)
<b>Q13.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	35 (22%)
	No	124 (78%)
<b>Q13.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	76 (47%)
	Yes	20 (12%)
	No	65 (40%)
<b>Q13.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	141 (88%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Involved</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Neither</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	4 (2%)
<b>Q13.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	141 (88%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	0 (0%)
<b>Q13.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	141 (89%)
	Yes	8 (5%)
	No	7 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (2%)
<b>Q13.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	141 (89%)
	Yes	11 (7%)
	No	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (1%)

<b>Q13.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			141 (89%)
	Yes			7 (4%)
	No			6 (4%)
	Don't know			5 (3%)
<b>Q13.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>			
	Yes			15 (9%)
	No			69 (43%)
	Don't know			75 (47%)
<b>Q13.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>			
	Yes			7 (5%)
	No			146 (95%)
<b>Q13.12</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release?: (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	33 (22%)	21 (14%)	95 (64%)
	Accommodation	30 (21%)	30 (21%)	85 (59%)
	Benefits	30 (20%)	46 (31%)	71 (48%)
	Finances	33 (24%)	19 (14%)	88 (63%)
	Education	34 (24%)	22 (15%)	88 (61%)
	Drugs and alcohol	37 (26%)	48 (33%)	59 (41%)
<b>Q13.13</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>			76 (49%)
	Yes			32 (21%)
	No			48 (31%)

## Survey summary: West Hill site

### Section I: About You

In order for us to ensure that everyone is treated equally within this prison, we ask that you fill in the following information about yourself. This will allow us to look at the answers provided by different groups of people in order to detect discrimination and to investigate whether there are equal opportunities for everyone across all areas of prison life. Your responses to these questions will remain both anonymous and confidential.

<b>QI.1</b>	<b>What wing or houseblock are you currently living on?</b> See shortened methodology	
<b>QI.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	<i>Under 21</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	30 (30%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	27 (27%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	28 (28%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	12 (12%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
<b>QI.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	90 (89%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	11 (11%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
<b>QI.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	8 (8%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	16 (16%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	18 (18%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	30 (30%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	15 (15%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	7 (7%)
	<i>Life</i>	4 (4%)
<b>QI.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>No</i>	98 (97%)
<b>QI.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	101 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
<b>QI.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	100 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)

<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>			
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	79 (80%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	4 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	3 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	2 (2%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)		
<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			3 (3%)
	<i>No</i>			93 (97%)
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>			
	<i>None</i>	39 (39%)	<i>Hindu</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	34 (34%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	16 (16%)	<i>Muslim</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Sikh</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (1%)		
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>			
	<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>			100 (100%)
	<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>			0 (0%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			13 (13%)
	<i>No</i>			87 (87%)
<b>Q1.13</b>	<b>Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			7 (7%)
	<i>No</i>			94 (93%)
<b>Q1.14</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			34 (34%)
	<i>No</i>			67 (66%)
<b>Q1.15</b>	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i>			54 (54%)
	<i>No</i>			46 (46%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	77 (76%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	21 (21%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (3%)

<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	77 (77%)
	Yes	10 (10%)
	No	12 (12%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	77 (76%)
	Yes	3 (3%)
	No	20 (20%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes	64 (63%)
	No	31 (31%)
	Don't remember	6 (6%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes	83 (82%)
	No	17 (17%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well	29 (29%)
	Well	46 (46%)
	Neither	19 (19%)
	Badly	3 (3%)
	Very badly	1 (1%)
	Don't remember	2 (2%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me	72 (72%)
	Yes, I received written information	9 (9%)
	No, I was not told anything	17 (17%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes	91 (92%)
	No	7 (7%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

### Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	41 (42%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	53 (55%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes	79 (81%)
	No	15 (15%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)

<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>			
	Very well		19 (19%)	
	Well		41 (42%)	
	Neither		19 (19%)	
	Badly		14 (14%)	
	Very badly		4 (4%)	
	Don't remember		1 (1%)	
<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	Loss of property	8 (8%)	Physical health	13 (13%)
	Housing problems	18 (18%)	Mental health	18 (18%)
	Contacting employers	5 (5%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	2 (2%)
	Contacting family	29 (30%)	Getting phone numbers	26 (27%)
	Childcare	2 (2%)	Other	3 (3%)
	Money worries	18 (18%)	Did not have any problems	35 (36%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	18 (18%)		
<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>			
	Yes		19 (19%)	
	No		44 (45%)	
	Did not have any problems		35 (36%)	
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	Tobacco		65 (66%)	
	A shower		22 (22%)	
	A free telephone call		32 (32%)	
	Something to eat		65 (66%)	
	PIN phone credit		54 (55%)	
	Toiletries/ basic items		55 (56%)	
	Did not receive anything		8 (8%)	
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	Chaplain		38 (40%)	
	Someone from health services		59 (61%)	
	A Listener/Samaritans		45 (47%)	
	Prison shop/ canteen		16 (17%)	
	Did not have access to any of these		21 (22%)	
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	What was going to happen to you		52 (53%)	
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal		43 (44%)	
	How to make routine requests (applications)		44 (45%)	
	Your entitlement to visits		38 (39%)	
	Health services		43 (44%)	
	Chaplaincy		44 (45%)	
	Not offered any information		29 (30%)	

<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	Yes	75 (77%)
	No	20 (20%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	Have not been on an induction course	3 (3%)
	Within the first week	73 (74%)
	More than a week	20 (20%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	Have not been on an induction course	3 (3%)
	Yes	54 (55%)
	No	37 (37%)
	Don't remember	5 (5%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	Did not receive an assessment	1 (1%)
	Within the first week	31 (32%)
	More than a week	56 (57%)
	Don't remember	10 (10%)

#### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to.....</b>					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor/ legal representative?	11 (12%)	21 (22%)	11 (12%)	22 (23%)	12 (13%) 18 (19%)
	Attend legal visits?	7 (8%)	27 (30%)	8 (9%)	9 (10%)	9 (10%) 29 (33%)
	Get bail information?	3 (4%)	8 (10%)	12 (14%)	9 (11%)	9 (11%) 43 (51%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>					
	Not had any letters					16 (16%)
	Yes					37 (38%)
	No					44 (45%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>					
	Yes					39 (41%)
	No					3 (3%)
	Don't know					54 (56%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	68 (70%)	29 (30%)	0 (0%)		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96 (98%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	72 (74%)	23 (24%)	2 (2%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	87 (90%)	10 (10%)	0 (0%)		
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31 (32%)	39 (41%)	26 (27%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	63 (65%)	34 (35%)	0 (0%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	25 (26%)	48 (49%)	25 (26%)		

<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>		
	Very good		1 (1%)
	Good		15 (15%)
	Neither		25 (26%)
	Bad		25 (26%)
	Very bad		32 (33%)
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>		
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know		1 (1%)
	Yes		60 (61%)
	No		37 (38%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>		
	Yes		56 (58%)
	No		9 (9%)
	Don't know		32 (33%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>		
	Yes		45 (46%)
	No		8 (8%)
	Don't know/ N/A		44 (45%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>		
	Yes		49 (51%)
	No		6 (6%)
	Don't know/ N/A		42 (43%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>		
	I don't want to attend		27 (28%)
	Very easy		20 (21%)
	Easy		26 (27%)
	Neither		4 (4%)
	Difficult		3 (3%)
	Very difficult		1 (1%)
	Don't know		15 (16%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>		
	Yes		78 (80%)
	No		15 (15%)
	Don't know		4 (4%)
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>		
		<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	4 (4%)	60 (63%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	4 (5%)	32 (39%)
			<i>No</i>
			31 (33%)
			46 (56%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>		
	Yes		48 (50%)
	No		24 (25%)
	Don't know		24 (25%)

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	47 (48%)	22 (23%)	28 (29%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	47 (51%)	19 (21%)	26 (28%)

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

Yes	16 (18%)
No	74 (82%)

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

Don't know who they are	34 (36%)
Very easy	11 (12%)
Easy	18 (19%)
Neither	13 (14%)
Difficult	12 (13%)
Very difficult	6 (6%)

**Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme****Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)**

Don't know what the IEP scheme is	6 (6%)
Yes	52 (54%)
No	25 (26%)
Don't know	14 (14%)

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

Don't know what the IEP scheme is	6 (6%)
Yes	47 (49%)
No	32 (33%)
Don't know	11 (11%)

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

Yes	4 (4%)
No	93 (96%)

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

I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months	83 (89%)
Very well	3 (3%)
Well	2 (2%)
Neither	3 (3%)
Badly	0 (0%)
Very badly	2 (2%)

**Section 7: Relationships with staff****Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?**

Yes	71 (75%)
No	24 (25%)

**Q7.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?**

Yes	78 (81%)
No	18 (19%)

<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes	27 (28%)
	No	70 (72%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	10 (10%)
	Never	18 (19%)
	Rarely	29 (30%)
	Some of the time	24 (25%)
	Most of the time	13 (13%)
	All of the time	3 (3%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	31 (32%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	14 (14%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	48 (49%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (4%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	31 (32%)
	Very helpful	30 (31%)
	Helpful	24 (24%)
	Neither	8 (8%)
	Not very helpful	1 (1%)
	Not at all helpful	4 (4%)

### Section 8: Safety

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>			
	Yes	28 (29%)		
	No	68 (71%)		
<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>			
	Yes	5 (5%)		
	No	90 (95%)		
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	68 (74%)	<i>At meal times</i>	6 (7%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	7 (8%)	<i>At health services</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Visits area</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	12 (13%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	10 (11%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	2 (2%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	1 (1%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	7 (8%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	8 (9%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	8 (9%)
	<i>At work</i>	2 (2%)	<i>In your cell</i>	6 (7%)
	<i>During movement</i>	5 (5%)	<i>At religious services</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>At education</i>	1 (1%)		
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>			
	Yes	21 (21%)		
	No	77 (79%)		

<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	12 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	7 (7%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	12 (12%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	5 (5%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	4 (4%)
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>	
	Yes	27 (28%)
	No	70 (72%)
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	10 (10%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	3 (3%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	14 (14%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (6%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (2%)
<b>Q8.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	Not been victimised	65 (71%)
	Yes	5 (5%)
	No	21 (23%)

### Section 9: Health services

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:</b>					
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>
						<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	13 (13%)	6 (6%)	18 (18%)	9 (9%)	28 (29%)
	The nurse	9 (10%)	13 (14%)	37 (39%)	6 (6%)	15 (16%)

The dentist	17 (18%)	2 (2%)	13 (14%)	5 (5%)	19 (20%)	38 (40%)
-------------	----------	--------	----------	--------	----------	----------

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	16 (16%)	8 (8%)	24 (24%)	11 (11%)	18 (18%)	21 (21%)
The nurse	10 (10%)	12 (12%)	27 (28%)	12 (12%)	20 (21%)	16 (16%)
The dentist	19 (20%)	9 (10%)	17 (18%)	12 (13%)	11 (12%)	25 (27%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	10 (11%)
<i>Very good</i>	6 (6%)
<i>Good</i>	19 (20%)
<i>Neither</i>	10 (11%)
<i>Bad</i>	27 (29%)
<i>Very bad</i>	22 (23%)

**Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?**

Yes	46 (47%)
No	52 (53%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	52 (53%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	36 (37%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	7 (7%)
<i>No</i>	3 (3%)

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

Yes	30 (31%)
No	68 (69%)

**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>	68 (70%)
Yes	7 (7%)
No	22 (23%)

**Section 10: Drugs and alcohol****Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?**

Yes	21 (21%)
No	77 (79%)

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

Yes	20 (20%)
No	78 (80%)

**Q10.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?**

<i>Very easy</i>	20 (21%)
<i>Easy</i>	15 (16%)
<i>Neither</i>	5 (5%)
<i>Difficult</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Don't know</i>	47 (50%)

<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy	8 (8%)
	Easy	12 (13%)
	Neither	8 (8%)
	Difficult	4 (4%)
	Very difficult	12 (13%)
	Don't know	51 (54%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	7 (7%)
	No	91 (93%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	7 (7%)
	No	89 (93%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem	69 (73%)
	Yes	15 (16%)
	No	10 (11%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	Did not / do not have an alcohol problem	78 (81%)
	Yes	11 (11%)
	No	7 (7%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help	70 (74%)
	Yes	21 (22%)
	No	3 (3%)

### Section 11: Activities

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	2 (2%)	26 (27%)	38 (40%)	8 (8%)	15 (16%)	7 (7%)
	Vocational or skills training	11 (13%)	13 (15%)	32 (36%)	13 (15%)	14 (16%)	5 (6%)
	Education (including basic skills)	4 (5%)	19 (22%)	45 (52%)	8 (9%)	8 (9%)	2 (2%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	10 (11%)	14 (16%)	22 (25%)	7 (8%)	19 (22%)	16 (18%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>						
	Not involved in any of these					3 (3%)	
	Prison job					71 (74%)	
	Vocational or skills training					16 (17%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					25 (26%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					16 (17%)	
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	4 (5%)	39 (46%)	34 (40%)	7 (8%)		
	Vocational or skills training	14 (22%)	26 (40%)	20 (31%)	5 (8%)		

Education (including basic skills)	10 (15%)	29 (43%)	22 (32%)	7 (10%)
Offending behaviour programmes	13 (19%)	31 (46%)	17 (25%)	7 (10%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	17 (18%)
<i>Never</i>	14 (15%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	24 (25%)
<i>About once a week</i>	28 (29%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	13 (14%)

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

<i>Don't use it</i>	28 (29%)
<i>Yes</i>	38 (40%)
<i>No</i>	30 (31%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	25 (26%)
<i>0</i>	13 (14%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	16 (17%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	31 (32%)
<i>More than 5</i>	11 (11%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	15 (16%)
<i>0</i>	9 (9%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	31 (32%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	23 (24%)
<i>More than 5</i>	18 (19%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	15 (16%)
<i>0</i>	1 (1%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	11 (12%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	20 (21%)
<i>More than 5</i>	48 (51%)

**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>	0 (0%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	4 (4%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	8 (9%)
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	16 (17%)
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	20 (21%)
<i>10 hours or more</i>	35 (37%)
<i>Don't know</i>	11 (12%)

**Section 12: Contact with family and friends****Q12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?**

<i>Yes</i>	34 (36%)
<i>No</i>	61 (64%)

**Q12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?**

<i>Yes</i>	50 (53%)
<i>No</i>	45 (47%)

<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes	21 (22%)
	No	74 (78%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	16 (17%)
	Very easy	9 (9%)
	Easy	31 (33%)
	Neither	7 (7%)
	Difficult	15 (16%)
	Very difficult	15 (16%)
	Don't know	2 (2%)

### Section 13: Preparation for release

<b>Q13.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	72 (77%)
	No	21 (23%)
<b>Q13.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	21 (23%)
	<i>No contact</i>	23 (25%)
	Letter	20 (22%)
	Phone	10 (11%)
	Visit	34 (37%)
<b>Q13.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes	72 (77%)
	No	21 (23%)
<b>Q13.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	47 (52%)
	No	44 (48%)
<b>Q13.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	44 (47%)
	Very involved	5 (5%)
	Involved	24 (26%)
	Neither	6 (6%)
	Not very involved	7 (8%)
	Not at all involved	7 (8%)
<b>Q13.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	44 (49%)
	Nobody	15 (17%)
	Offender supervisor	24 (27%)
	Offender manager	10 (11%)
	Named/ personal officer	12 (13%)
	Staff from other departments	8 (9%)

<b>Q13.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			44 (48%)
	Yes			26 (29%)
	No			11 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			10 (11%)
<b>Q13.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			44 (48%)
	Yes			10 (11%)
	No			31 (34%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			7 (8%)
<b>Q13.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			44 (48%)
	Yes			15 (16%)
	No			16 (18%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			16 (18%)
<b>Q13.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>			
	Yes			3 (3%)
	No			44 (49%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			42 (47%)
<b>Q13.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>			
	Yes			19 (21%)
	No			70 (79%)
<b>Q13.12</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release: (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
	Employment	20 (23%)	28 (33%)	38 (44%)
	Accommodation	19 (22%)	29 (33%)	39 (45%)
	Benefits	19 (22%)	31 (36%)	36 (42%)
	Finances	21 (27%)	14 (18%)	44 (56%)
	Education	22 (28%)	21 (26%)	37 (46%)
	Drugs and alcohol	24 (29%)	29 (35%)	30 (36%)
<b>Q13.13</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>			0 (0%)
	Yes			44 (49%)
	No			46 (51%)

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester 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 Winchester 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2014	HMP Winchester 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>165</b>	<b>5960</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	9%	6%	9%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	53%	68%	53%	57%
1.3	Are you on recall?	8%	9%	8%	9%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	19%	21%	19%	21%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	5%	3%	5%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	14%	9%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	98%	98%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	96%	98%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	16%	25%	16%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	5%	5%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	12%	6%	8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	3%	1%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	22%	20%	31%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	5%	4%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	31%	31%	31%	28%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	54%	54%	54%	56%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	23%	19%	23%	15%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	52%	37%	52%	35%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	16%	10%	16%	12%
2.4	Was the van clean?	64%	60%	64%	68%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	77%	76%	77%	72%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	66%	71%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	73%	65%	73%	71%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	4%	2%	2%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	89%	81%	89%	84%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	29%	49%	29%	34%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2014	HMP Winchester 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	71%	77%	71%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	52%	63%	52%	55%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	72%	74%	72%	83%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	14%	13%	13%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	18%	22%	18%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	6%	6%	6%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	39%	31%	39%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	5%	2%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	23%	23%	23%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	27%	22%	27%	31%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	17%	17%	17%	25%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	21%	21%	21%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	8%	4%	13%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	29%	30%	29%	31%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	33%	34%	33%	34%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	82%	85%	82%	78%
3.6	A shower?	15%	33%	15%	13%
3.6	A free telephone call?	26%	59%	26%	28%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	75%	66%	72%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	53%	58%	53%	52%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	59%	61%	59%	60%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	42%	47%	42%	41%
3.7	Someone from health services?	68%	70%	68%	66%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	42%	36%	42%	38%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	20%	18%	20%	15%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	37%	48%	37%	43%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	46%	46%	46%	43%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	34%	41%	34%	34%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	33%	45%	33%	35%
3.8	Health services?	48%	51%	48%	45%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	42%	46%	42%	34%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	74%	74%	70%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2014	HMP Winchester 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	80%	88%	88%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	50%	58%	50%	49%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	81%	74%	81%	73%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	40%	36%	28%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	43%	57%	43%	45%
4.1	Get bail information?	20%	21%	20%	16%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	42%	40%	42%	38%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	29%	38%	29%	28%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	33%	54%	33%	36%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	84%	78%	84%	26%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	68%	79%	68%	71%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	70%	59%	70%	66%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	15%	35%	15%	16%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	44%	64%	44%	47%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	14%	24%	14%	13%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	7%	22%	7%	13%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	47%	43%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	49%	57%	49%	61%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	45%	52%	45%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	53%	52%	45%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	41%	46%	41%	39%
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	74%	77%	74%	75%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	55%	56%	55%	46%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	44%	44%	44%	28%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	51%	47%	50%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	35%	32%	35%	31%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	37%	33%	37%	27%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	23%	19%	23%	22%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	16%	21%	16%	21%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2014	HMP Winchester 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme</b>					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	43%	46%	43%	30%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	42%	44%	42%	34%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	7%	7%	7%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	21%	37%	21%	39%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	63%	74%	63%	64%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	68%	73%	68%	70%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	18%	29%	18%	18%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	10%	18%	10%	14%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	23%	44%	23%	34%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	53%	66%	53%	41%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	39%	43%	53%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	17%	21%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	34%	24%	34%	35%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	11%	17%	15%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11%	7%	11%	9%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	19%	14%	19%	19%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	9%	6%	9%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	7%	5%	7%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	4%	4%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	3%	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	13%	5%	13%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	5%	6%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	4%	5%	4%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2014	HMP Winchester 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	34%	28%	34%	45%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	11%	13%	21%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	4%	5%	6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	3%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	11%	16%	22%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	9%	5%	9%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	4%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	3%	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	2%	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	5%	11%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	25%	32%	25%	26%
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	25%	20%	16%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	52%	48%	52%	46%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	8%	10%	8%	7%
	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?	41%	43%	41%	36%
9.2	The nurse?	57%	55%	57%	47%
9.2	The dentist?	31%	30%	31%	31%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	37%	38%	37%	23%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	51%	50%	51%	61%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	58%	62%	58%	60%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	45%	36%	45%	43%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	38%	43%	38%	28%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2014	HMP Winchester 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	38%	34%	38%	38%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	20%	26%	20%	23%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	34%	30%	34%	35%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	9%	13%	9%	14%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%	6%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%	6%	9%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	68%	63%	68%	64%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	61%	60%	61%	37%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	88%	76%	88%	78%
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	24%	30%	24%	12%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	22%	30%	22%	13%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	45%	44%	45%	24%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	11%	18%	11%	5%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	38%	44%	38%	32%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	1%	9%	1%	7%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	20%	27%	20%	24%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	5%	8%	5%	3%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	65%	69%	65%	51%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	30%	41%	30%	30%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	45%	56%	45%	37%
	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?	32%	48%	32%	29%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	60%	68%	60%	54%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	47%	54%	47%	49%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	50%	53%	50%	38%
	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?	42%	46%	42%	32%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	33%	32%	21%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	34%	34%	34%	28%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	9%	30%	9%	5%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	25%	39%	25%	58%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2014	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2014	HMP Winchester 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	59%	43%	59%	9%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	9%	10%	9%	8%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	18%	34%	18%	20%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	50%	48%	50%	54%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36%	33%	36%	61%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	30%	37%	30%	30%
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	60%	62%	60%	54%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	59%	42%	59%	32%
13.2	Contact by letter?	14%	28%	14%	27%
13.2	Contact by phone?	14%	13%	14%	17%
13.2	Contact by visit?	26%	37%	26%	34%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	22%	32%	22%	27%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	24%	40%	24%	23%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	50%	58%	50%	19%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	32%	43%	32%	52%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	42%	32%	42%	22%
13.6	Offender manager?	52%	27%	52%	26%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	5%	11%	5%	13%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	0%	19%	0%	18%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	45%	59%	45%	18%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	62%	25%	62%	55%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	38%	31%	38%	33%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	9%	7%	9%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	5%	14%	5%	9%
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?	18%	29%	18%	26%
13.12	Accommodation?	26%	38%	26%	39%
13.12	Benefits?	39%	39%	39%	47%
13.12	Finances?	18%	24%	18%	21%
13.12	Education?	20%	29%	20%	31%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	45%	45%	45%	49%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	40%	47%	40%	34%



## Diversity analysis

### Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Winchester 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
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>138</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	43%	55%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	27%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	92%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	92%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	27%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	3%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	38%	30%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	69%	73%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	76%	70%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60%	50%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	75%	71%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	69%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	66%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	89%	87%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	35%	36%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	48%	30%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	83%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	21%	14%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	8%	7%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	38%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	43%	50%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	58%	51%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	72%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	47%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	46%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	42%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	7%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	62%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	76%	67%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	20%	8%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	35%	21%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	54%	41%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	19%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	36%	34%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	16%	20%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	16%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	2%

## Key to tables

## Diversity analysis

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	6%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	16%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	15%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	12%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	3%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	38%	17%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	66%	50%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	54%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	24%	49%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	8%	39%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	40%	36%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	2%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	20%	20%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	5%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	31%	32%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	20%	7%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	23%	25%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	46%	61%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	8%	10%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	46%	52%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38%	36%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability) HMP Winchester 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	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>33</b>	<b>131</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	48%	54%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	3%	19%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	15%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	18%	34%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	61%	76%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	64%	73%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	39%	54%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	87%	68%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	68%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	64%	77%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	79%	90%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	36%

## Key to tables

## Diversity Analysis

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	19%	36%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	76%	86%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	12%	16%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	0%	9%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	52%	48%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	48%	53%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	75%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	48%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	30%	45%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	27%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	8%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	65%	62%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	53%	72%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	9%	10%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	27%	22%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	57%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	41%	16%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	46%	32%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	27%	17%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	6%	3%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	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)	21%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	48%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	27%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	3%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	18%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24%	19%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	61%	50%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	91%	41%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	79%	36%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	41%	32%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	40%	36%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	3%	1%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	20%	20%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	3%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	29%	32%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	3%	10%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	16%	27%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	59%	58%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	10%	9%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	57%	49%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	41%	35%



## D wing comparator HMP Winchester 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

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D Wing Winchester 2014	A, B and C Wing Winchester 2014
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	13%	7%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	62%	52%
1.3	Are you on recall?	8%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	16%	20%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	5%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	21%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	10%	4%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	31%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	42%	27%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	36%	60%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	13%	27%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	82%	74%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	68%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	71%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	87%	89%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	28%	29%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	70%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	49%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	68%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	19%	18%

**Key to tables**

	D Wing Winchester 2014	A, B and C Wing Winchester 2014
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		
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	8%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting family?	30%	42%
3.4 Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	3%
3.4 Did you have any money worries?	11%	26%
3.4 Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	24%	28%
3.4 Did you have any physical health problems?	16%	17%
3.4 Did you have any mental health problems?	16%	22%
3.4 Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	14%	2%
3.4 Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	22%	30%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6 Tobacco?	79%	83%
3.6 A shower?	15%	15%
3.6 A free telephone call?	25%	26%
3.6 Something to eat?	82%	60%
3.6 PIN phone credit?	54%	52%
3.6 Toiletries/ basic items?	67%	55%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>		
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	57%	37%
3.7 Someone from health services?	70%	66%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	46%	40%
3.7 Prison shop/ canteen?	22%	20%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	41%	36%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	65%	40%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	38%	32%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	35%	32%
3.8 Health services?	46%	47%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	43%	41%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	59%	78%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	82%	91%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	85%	82%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>		
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	44%	33%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	53%	40%
4.1 Get bail information?	26%	18%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D Wing Winchester 2014	A, B and C Wing Winchester 2014
	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		
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	37%	44%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	24%	30%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	27%	33%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	72%	87%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	72%	67%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	87%	64%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	24%	9%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	33%	46%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	8%	16%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	8%	7%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	56%	38%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	44%	49%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	52%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	41%	40%
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	47%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	14%	26%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	16%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	52%	40%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	55%	38%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	9%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67%	61%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	76%	65%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	25%	13%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	13%	7%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	39%	17%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	58%	40%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	18%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	45%	31%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18%	17%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D Wing Winchester 2014	A, B and C Wing Winchester 2014
	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?	18%	9%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	29%	17%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	13%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	6%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	8%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	10%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	8%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	21%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	5%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	21%	39%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	15%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	7%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	16%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	8%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	1%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	D Wing Winchester 2014	A, B and C Wing Winchester 2014
	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		
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	18%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	54%	50%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	8%	7%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	51%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	49%	44%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	29%	42%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	21%	19%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	24%	38%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	13%	7%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	11%	5%
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	31%	21%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	30%	19%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	37%	49%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	6%	13%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	39%	38%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	0%	2%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	17%	21%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	35%	31%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	36%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	10%	8%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	2%	32%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	53%	62%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	2%	10%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	27%	13%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	51%	50%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	37%	36%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	24%	32%
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	31%	20%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	11%	8%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	9%	3%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester (West Hill) 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 Winchester (West Hill) 2014	Category C Trather prisons	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>101</b>	<b>6486</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	2%	1%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	11%	10%	11%	4%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	24%	6%	24%	29%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	7%	10%	7%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	10%	3%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	99%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	14%	27%	14%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	4%	3%	8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	13%	6%	4%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	3%	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	18%	13%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	6%	7%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	34%	37%	34%	33%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	54%	52%	54%	58%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	21%	46%	21%	14%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	43%	73%	43%	48%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	13%	8%	13%	10%
2.4	Was the van clean?	63%	66%	63%	57%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	82%	81%	82%	76%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	75%	71%	75%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	72%	61%	72%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	9%	18%	9%	2%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	89%	92%	86%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	43%	52%	43%	37%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	Category C Trainer prisons	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	84%	82%	74%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	61%	74%	61%	62%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	65%	61%	65%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	16%	8%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	18%	15%	18%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	5%	3%	5%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	30%	20%	30%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	2%	2%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	18%	14%	18%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	18%	13%	18%	12%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	13%	12%	13%	10%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	18%	12%	18%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	2%	4%	2%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	26%	18%	26%	21%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	30%	37%	30%	41%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	66%	75%	66%	76%
3.6	A shower?	22%	29%	22%	17%
3.6	A free telephone call?	33%	42%	33%	37%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	62%	66%	66%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	55%	50%	55%	55%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	55%	44%	55%	50%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	40%	52%	40%	39%
3.7	Someone from health services?	61%	70%	61%	67%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	47%	32%	47%	39%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	17%	21%	17%	13%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	53%	51%	53%	55%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	44%	42%	44%	45%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	45%	45%	45%	40%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	39%	44%	39%	37%
3.8	Health services?	44%	54%	44%	50%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	45%	49%	45%	39%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	83%	76%	77%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	Category C Trainer prisons	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	97%	91%	97%	96%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	56%	63%	56%	53%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	99%	83%	99%	84%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	34%	48%	34%	38%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	38%	52%	38%	50%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	15%	13%	17%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	38%	41%	38%	41%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	40%	43%	40%	25%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	70%	68%	70%	62%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	93%	98%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	74%	79%	74%	76%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	90%	72%	90%	83%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	38%	32%	24%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	65%	69%	65%	74%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	25%	26%	25%	16%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	16%	26%	16%	5%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	61%	45%	61%	32%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	58%	57%	58%	46%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	53%	47%	34%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	50%	59%	50%	38%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	48%	50%	48%	34%
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	83%	80%	88%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	66%	61%	66%	48%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	41%	48%	41%	40%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	60%	50%	52%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	44%	34%	44%	33%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	43%	36%	43%	42%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	18%	18%	11%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	31%	29%	31%	18%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme</b>					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	53%	54%	53%	61%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	Category C Trainer prisons	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	47%	49%	51%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	5%	4%	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?	50%	40%	50%	20%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>				
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	77%	75%	78%
7.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	82%	75%	82%	71%
7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	28%	29%	28%	15%
7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	17%	20%	17%	9%
7.5 Do you have a personal officer?	68%	72%	68%	63%
For those with a personal officer:				
7.6 Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	81%	63%	81%	67%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>				
8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?	29%	32%	29%	26%
8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	13%	5%	5%
8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	22%	23%	22%	16%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	10%	12%	8%
8.5 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	6%	7%	3%
8.5 Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.5 Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	14%	12%	10%
8.5 Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of medication?	4%	4%	4%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of debt?	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	3%	1%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	1%
8.5 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.5 Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.5 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%	2%	2%
8.5 Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.5 Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.5 Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.5 Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	4%	5%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	4%	0%	2%
8.5 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	4%	4%	1%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>				
8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	28%	28%	24%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	Category C Trainer prisons	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	10%	10%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	12%	14%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	4%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	5%	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	2%	6%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	4%	4%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	4%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%	2%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	19%	39%	19%	21%
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	32%	25%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	53%	54%	53%	61%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16%	13%	16%	13%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	39%	47%	39%	37%
9.2	The nurse?	44%	59%	44%	47%
9.2	The dentist?	35%	42%	35%	48%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	30%	43%	30%	31%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	47%	47%	46%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	93%	85%	93%	91%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	31%	26%	31%	25%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	25%	49%	25%	36%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	22%	23%	22%	30%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	Category C Trainer prisons	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	21%	17%	21%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	37%	31%	37%	30%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	21%	20%	21%	19%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	8%	7%	2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%	7%	8%	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?	61%	64%	61%	72%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	61%	64%	61%	55%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	87%	79%	87%	85%
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	66%	43%	66%	35%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	51%	38%	51%	30%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	75%	52%	75%	56%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	41%	21%	41%	24%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	74%	60%	74%	57%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	17%	16%	17%	10%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	26%	26%	26%	34%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	17%	13%	17%	11%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	95%	83%	95%	69%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	49%	42%	49%	38%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	79%	73%	79%	51%
	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?	51%	59%	51%	49%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	86%	79%	86%	73%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	50%	60%	50%	68%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	81%	71%	81%	65%
	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?	56%	53%	56%	67%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	43%	47%	43%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	40%	46%	40%	26%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	44%	36%	44%	39%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	43%	46%	43%	72%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	51%	74%	51%	1%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	Category C Trainer prisons	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	37%	16%	37%	27%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	36%	35%	36%	32%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	53%	44%	53%	50%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	24%	22%	16%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	42%	26%	42%	50%
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>					
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	77%	83%	77%	58%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	33%	34%	33%	40%
13.2	Contact by letter?	28%	38%	28%	35%
13.2	Contact by phone?	14%	25%	14%	6%
13.2	Contact by visit?	48%	33%	48%	28%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	77%	69%	77%	23%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	51%	70%	51%	32%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	59%	55%	59%	53%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	28%	47%	28%	43%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	53%	35%	53%	28%
13.6	Offender manager?	21%	27%	21%	20%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	26%	13%	26%	33%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	18%	17%	18%	17%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	55%	65%	55%	46%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	20%	22%	20%	14%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	32%	29%	32%	32%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	7%	4%	5%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	22%	17%	22%	16%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
13.12	Employment?	43%	34%	43%	44%
13.12	Accommodation?	43%	37%	43%	57%
13.12	Benefits?	46%	39%	46%	62%
13.12	Finances?	24%	27%	24%	43%
13.12	Education?	36%	36%	36%	58%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	49%	45%	49%	60%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	49%	55%	49%	53%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Winchester (West Hill) 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
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>85</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	41%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	41%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	81%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	36%	80%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	67%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	38%	66%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	69%	64%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	50%	65%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	78%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	96%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	29%	35%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	44%	75%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	13%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	17%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35%	66%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	29%	63%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	35%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	12%	57%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	65%	84%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	52%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	35%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	0%	57%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	5%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	59%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	65%	85%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	0%	20%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	59%	71%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	59%	24%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	1%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	29%	19%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	12%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	12%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	1%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	24%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	31%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	25%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	13%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	7%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	0%	29%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	25%	59%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	49%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	50%	28%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	38%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	41%	79%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	22%	16%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	41%	24%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	20%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	41%	43%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	88%	37%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	35%	45%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	48%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	22%	41%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	71%	50%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	41%	19%

## Diversity Analysis



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

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability	
				Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>86</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	2%	0%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	94%	100%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	13%	14%	6%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	2%	0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	6%	0%	7%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			29%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	7%	6%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	38%	33%	40%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	79%	74%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	63%	75%	79%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	82%	78%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	50%	64%	78%	59%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	100%	59%	74%	63%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	75%	60%	67%	60%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	79%	79%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	98%	94%	98%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	33%	33%	33%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	60%	72%	74%	70%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	99%	94%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	13%	35%	33%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	13%	16%	11%	17%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	69%	61%	79%	58%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	63%	58%	39%	61%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60%	45%	67%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	44%	52%	61%	49%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	88%	81%	89%	79%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	50%	50%	50%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	69%	52%	71%	51%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	51%	47%	50%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	5%	0%	5%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	75%	89%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	94%	80%	79%	81%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	25%	16%	39%	12%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	94%	65%	71%	68%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	28%	11%	32%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	0%	6%	0%	6%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	44%	16%	26%	20%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	13%	12%	0%	15%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	11%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	6%	1%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	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)	6%	0%	6%	0%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	25%	22%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	15%	0%	17%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	4%	6%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	1%	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	31%	2%	6%	6%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	25%	61%	18%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	54%	54%	78%	49%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	69%	43%	61%	45%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	69%	25%	47%	28%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	50%	36%	26%	39%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	56%	77%	61%	76%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	38%	14%	21%	16%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	38%	25%	33%	25%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	25%	16%	11%	17%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	63%	40%	47%	42%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	46%	11%	50%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	69%	39%	53%	41%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	69%	48%	47%	52%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	38%	37%	39%	37%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	63%	51%	22%	58%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	25%	6%	25%