

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMP Gartree**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**10 – 21 March 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	17
Section 2. Respect	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	47
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	55
Section 6. Appendices	61
Appendix I: Inspection team	61
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	63
Appendix III: Prison population profile	71
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	73
Appendix V: Photographs	89



# Introduction

HMP Gartree is one of the few category B training prisons holding men convicted of serious offences who are serving long sentences. Its task is to help the 700 or so men it holds to come to terms with their sentence and to make progress in the long process of reducing their risks before their eventual release.

Our last inspection in 2010 found a prison that was steadily improving. This inspection found that improvement was continuing in all areas with one notable exception: purposeful activities for prisoners. The prison was mostly a safe and decent place and the work to reduce the risk that men would reoffend was good. However, the amount and quality of activity available to prisoners was much too low for a training prison and threatened to undermine progress in other areas.

There were insufficient activity places for the population. Too many prisoners only had a part-time activity place and spent much of their time whiling away the years, locked in their cells. The prison did not make the best use of the activity places it did have. Much of the work was very mundane and some of the contract workshops did not have sufficient work to keep the prisoners who did attend fully occupied. The range of education on offer was too narrow. Managers had recognised that they needed to improve the range and number of activities on offer and plans were in place to do this, but it was too early to assess how successful this would be. Those prisoners who did have a full time activity place enjoyed good time out of their cells and the quality of some of the education and training on offer was good with high qualification success rates. The 'Flavors' restaurant offered particularly effective catering opportunities.

Most prisoners told us they felt safe at Gartree which, given the seriousness of the offences for which some of the men had been convicted, was a real achievement. The number of assaults was low and although there had been two self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection there was a relatively low number of self-harm incidents. This was a reflection of generally good safety processes, although there were some areas where improvements could be made. Disciplinary processes were generally well managed but some men spent too long in the segregation unit with little to occupy them.

The new incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had recently been introduced and prisoners complained to us, with justification, that they had lost their 'enhanced' status because there were not enough formal opportunities available in which they were now required to demonstrate their positive behaviour. A review was required of the list of items that prisoners were allowed to have in their possession. For example, prisoners in the art class told us that the new facilities list meant that they were allowed to have pencil sharpeners in their possession – but not pencils.

We heard many credible accounts from prisoners about the availability of drugs and 'hooch' (illicitly brewed alcohol) in the prison. Supply reduction processes were weak and it may have been that if prisoners had something more constructive to do, the ingenuity some showed in brewing hooch could have been put to better use. In any case, bored, resentful prisoners and a plentiful supply of hooch was not a good mix.

In practice, very good relationships between staff and prisoners ensured that the atmosphere in Gartree remained stable and calm. Nine out of 10 prisoners told us that staff treated them with respect and more than eight out of 10 said there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem – both better than in similar establishments we have inspected, and from the last time we inspected Gartree. Work to reduce the risk of reoffending was underpinned by good relationships, and this was better than we normally see. The environment was clean and well maintained and basic domestic processes functioned effectively. Prisoners from some minority groups reported more negatively than the population as a whole and the prison needed to do more to understand this. Support for foreign national prisoners, particularly those with limited English, was weak. Health services were good.

Rehabilitation activities correctly focused on work to address the risk that men might reoffend rather than practical resettlement support. There was a good evidence-based approach and whole-prison strategy to managing prisoners, and more men than at similar prisons told us they had done something to reduce the risk they would reoffend. Practical help was available when necessary and support for men to maintain contact with their families was good.

Gartree was running some impressive and innovative offending behaviour programmes. The effective therapeutic community had been improved by the addition of therapeutic community-plus (TC+) for prisoners who would benefit from a therapeutic approach but whose learning difficulties would normally prohibit them from taking part in such a programme. The equally impressive PIPE (psychologically informed planned environment) offered a less intensive therapeutic step down or alternative to the full therapeutic unit and was a very promising development.

In many ways, the men held at Gartree and the wider community into which they will eventually be released are served well. The prison is safe, decent and works effectively and innovatively to help men reduce the risk that they will reoffend. However, there is still room for improvement. Some processes need to be tightened up and the prison needs to do more to reduce the risks of the too easily available drugs and alcohol. Above all, Gartree must ensure there is enough good quality activity available to provide all the men it holds with purpose, structure and the possibility of progress.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

July 2014

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

Gartree is a category B training prison for adult male life-sentenced prisoners.

## Prison status

Public

## Region

East Midlands

## Number held

698

## Certified normal accommodation

708

## Operational capacity

708

## Date of last full inspection

10-14 May 2010

## Brief history

The prison opened in 1966 as a category C prison, but was adapted in 1967 for use as a dispersal prison. In the early 1990s, it re-roled to a category B life-sentenced prisoner main centre, and now houses the largest group of life-sentenced prisoners in the UK. The operational capacity has increased significantly as new units opened.

## Short description of residential units

A-D wings	generic residential wings with single cells; part of the original 1960s build and since refurbished.
G wing	drug recovery unit, all single cells, opened in 2005-06.
H wing	older population unit and the psychologically informed planned environment (PIPE) unit, all single cells, opened in 2005-06.
I wing	stand-alone induction wing housing up to 30 prisoners in double cells.
TC+	Gartree therapeutic community (GTC) holds up to 24 in single cells. designated unit for prisoners with learning difficulties or personality disorders who require additional assistance and guidance, 12 single cells.
Segregation unit	12 beds.

**Name of governor**

Ian Telfer

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service provider**

Leicester Partnership Trust

**Learning and skills provider**

Milton Keynes College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Howard Witham



# 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 *Most prisoners said they felt safe at Gartree. The transfer and reception experience was mostly positive. Prisoners felt safe on their first night and their induction was appropriate. There were a low number of violent incidents, and arrangements to support victims of bullying were reasonably good. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) had no access to prisoners at night, but the care of prisoners in crisis was mostly positive. Security and disciplinary procedures were broadly proportionate. Prisoners held in the segregation unit spoke positively about staff support. Prisoners expressed strong views that illegal drugs were still too readily available. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Gartree were good against this healthy prison test. We made 18 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S3 Prisoners were positive about their experiences during transfer to and reception at the prison. There were very few movements in and out of the prison and so reception primarily dealt with processing prisoners' property, and the area was suitable for this. First night and induction arrangements were appropriate, but many new arrivals were held on I (induction) wing in double cells for up to 10 weeks after completing their induction, which was too long, and many spent long periods on the unit with little to do. Many had not shared accommodation at their previous establishment, due to the nature of their sentence, and found this induction period frustrating.

S4 Most prisoners said that they felt safe at all times. The incidence of violence was low and bullying was generally very low level. There was good collation of data on violence but limited analysis of incidents to inform the violence reduction strategy and action plan. Investigations and subsequent monitoring for perpetrators and victims of violence were good, but targets were often perfunctory and some did not address underlying causes.

S5 There had been two self-inflicted deaths since our last inspection. The establishment had made efforts to reinforce learning from these tragic events but this required a higher profile. The establishment needed to ensure reinforcement was consistent, especially in staff gaining access to cells at night, as there was a danger of complacency given that safety overall was good. Self-harm levels were similar to our last inspection and involved a small number of prisoners. Prisoners in crisis could telephone the Samaritans during the night but had no access to Listeners. Prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm managed on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management had mixed views about their care, but most entries in ACCT documents indicated good care. Safeguarding arrangements were appropriate for the population.

S6 The general approach to security was proportionate, and the security department had provided constructive advice which had helped manage the risks in new initiatives such as the prisoner-staffed Flavors staff bistro. The flow of security information was good. Intelligence assessments were reasonable, but records of security committee meetings did not provide assurance that these, or other reports, were sufficiently discussed or that actions were followed up. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparators reported easy drug and alcohol availability in the prison and we noted some substantial finds of illicitly brewed

alcohol, including some distilled alcohol. There was evidence of good information sharing between departments but there was no detailed supply reduction strategy or action plan. Random mandatory drug testing positive results had averaged 4.16% in the previous six months against a target of 5.6%, but a high number of prisoners refused to be tested and some of the security processes for drugs and alcohol needed to be sharper.

- S7 The new national incentives and earned privileges (IEP) arrangements had been implemented sensitively and appropriately, and there were fewer prisoners on enhanced status than previously. However, the prison had been slow to provide enough opportunities for prisoners to earn enhanced status by demonstrating their commitment to rehabilitation and so it was unsurprising that many prisoners' perceptions were negative.
- S8 Most adjudications were conducted fairly and with sufficient investigation. Quality assurance was good, and regular meetings to discuss policy and practice were useful. We were satisfied that force was used proportionately and only when necessary. Most planned incidents were filmed, and there was evidence that de-escalation was used in interventions. Use of the special cell was more frequent than we expected, but was justified, and we acknowledged that some men were extremely challenging to manage. In the segregation unit, staff-prisoner relationships and the atmosphere were very good and the regime was flexible, but the exercise yard was cage-like and a legacy of the prisons' previous high security role. However, despite good efforts by managers, some stays were very long and prisoners did not have enough to occupy them purposefully, and there was not enough evidence of active case management to ensure that prisoners did not suffer psychological deterioration.
- S9 The drug free wing was a positive initiative, but drug services were still developing and prescribing regimes were not flexible enough. Clinical, mental health and psychosocial support services for substance misusers were well integrated through one provider.

## Respect

S10 *Most areas of the prison were very clean but cells in the old accommodation were very small. Staff-prisoner engagement was very good. Strategic arrangements for equality and diversity work were mostly good but perceptions were generally more negative from minority groups and we found some evidence to support their concerns. Faith provision was good and appreciated by most prisoners. Health services were much better than we normally see. Many prisoners were critical about the food, and the prison shop provided an adequate service. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S11 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Gartree were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 40 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that 22 of the recommendations had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and three were no longer relevant.*

S12 There was one main grouping of older accommodation dating from the 1960s, and another with new style wings. Both areas were impressively clean, and communal areas were also clean and well maintained. The older cells were cramped with most toilets unscreened and insufficiently private. The newer accommodation was good. Access to cleaning materials was restricted, although the cells were clean, graffiti-free and had no displays of offensive

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

materials. Showers were clean with adequate privacy. Prisoners had good access to showers, prison clothing, bedding, property, mail and telephones. Responses to prisoner applications were reasonable although not always prompt, but the establishment was trying to improve this.

- S13 Staff-prisoner relationships were much better than we normally see, and most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect and they had someone they could turn to for help. The interactions we observed were positive, and personal officer entries in prisoners' files were in-depth and showed good knowledge of their personal circumstance. The prisoner council was active in addressing prisoner concerns and involved in all aspects of the prison. We were pleased to note that prisoner representatives were invited to our final inspection feedback to the prison.
- S14 Despite the lack of a local policy, the strategic management of equality work was good. Bimonthly meetings and a meaningful action plan drove change, and there had been good equality impact assessments with a programme for future assessments. Discrimination incident investigations were generally good but took too long to complete, and report forms were not freely available on all wings. Ethnic monitoring data were usually within range, although it did not cover labour allocation. Despite regular forums, prisoners from minority groups were more negative across a wide range of areas in our survey, and the reasons for these perceptions were not fully understood. Non-English speakers were unable to study English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) beyond the entry level, which could have affected their long-term progress. H wing was generally a good environment for older prisoners.
- S15 Prisoners were positive about the faith provision, and the chaplaincy provided a wide range of services and classes. The establishment of faith representatives was a welcome initiative.
- S16 Complaint forms were not freely available on all wings. Despite this, more prisoners than the comparator said it was easy to make a complaint. Many complaints were handled reasonably well but some responses were perfunctory and defensive. Quality assurance was insufficiently robust.
- S17 There were no dedicated legal services officers but some legal advice support for prisoners was available from the offender management department. Arrangements for legal visits were reasonably good but not all solicitors knew they could request a visit on days other than Wednesday. Prisoners could borrow 'access to justice' laptops and use standalone PCs in the library.
- S18 Prisoners were very positive about their access to and quality of the health services, and the provision was much better than we normally see. The new health care centre provided an excellent facility for the care and treatment of prisoners. There was a good range of clinics and screening services, and all the waiting lists were short. However, there were too many cancellations by the prison for patients attending outside hospital appointments. Pharmacy services were good and most patients had their medicines in possession. A large amount of tradable medication was prescribed – medicines use was regularly reviewed but more focus was required. Dental services provided good care, with only three patients on the waiting list for routine appointments. There was good primary and secondary mental health care, including access to a psychiatrist.

- S19 The prison food was very unpopular, and although the quality was reasonable, prisoners felt that the portions were small. A planned bakery would increase the range of home cooked options. Opportunities for prisoners to prepare their own food and dining out facilities were limited. Consultation on food and the prison shop was good. Fewer prisoners in our survey than the comparator said the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, but we found the service was reasonable.

## Purposeful activity

S20 *There were insufficient activity places and too many prisoners were locked up during the core day. Sequencing arrangements for all activities were ineffective. The range of education was limited and work provision was mostly low level. Teaching in education and coaching in vocational training were mostly good. Achievement rates overall were good. The library was well resourced and prisoners had sufficient access. The gym offered good opportunities for recreational PE but no vocational courses. **Outcomes for prisoners were insufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S21 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Gartree were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that six of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved, two had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

- S22 Prisoners in full-time activities had a good amount of time out of cell, but we found too many locked up during working hours. Exercise was rarely cancelled, and exercise areas were reasonable.
- S23 Learning and skills managers had recognised the need to widen the number and range of activities, and were working well with partners to plan more training and work opportunities. Scheduling and communication of all activities was not effective enough in ensuring that work, training and education were always prioritised. Observations of teaching, learning and assessment were used to support staff development and performance management, but had not yet ensured consistently good quality teaching and learning across all programmes.
- S24 There were insufficient activity spaces to offer all prisoners purposeful activity throughout the working day. There was not enough work in some work areas to employ prisoners fully throughout the working day. Much of the work was mundane and very low skilled. The range of education provision was too narrow to meet the needs of all prisoners, with few higher level courses. The recognition and accreditation of skills development in work areas was insufficient. Distance learning courses, including Open University degrees, were popular and promoted well.
- S25 The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in education was good in many courses, but needed improvement in functional skills lessons. In the better lessons, a broad variety of teaching techniques and resources successfully engaged and interested learners. The quality of coaching and assessment in vocational training was good. Overall attendance was good in education and workshops. Lesson planning was good in most education and training. Individual learning plans were generally used appropriately to set and review short- and long-term targets for learners. Learning mentors and teaching assistants were used well in many lessons to support learning.

- S26 Outcomes for prisoners taking part in activities were good, and information and communications technology (ICT) achievement rates had improved and were now good. Vocational achievement rates were positive overall, and excellent on some courses. Achievements in mathematics GCSE, ESOL and functional skills courses required improvement, but the standards of work in art and the 'Flavours' staff bistro were particularly good.
- S27 The library was pleasant and provided a sufficient range of books and materials to meet the needs of all prisoners, with support for learning available. Access and uptake was good and prisoners spoke positively about the facility.
- S28 The gym and sports facilities were generally appropriate to need and included a range of cardiovascular equipment. An all-weather pitch and full-sized grassed football pitch were well used. The focus of PE was recreational, which kept prisoners occupied and healthy, but the lack of accredited vocational courses in PE was a missed opportunity. Some prisoners went to the gym when they should have been in work.

## Resettlement

S29 *The reducing reoffending policy was clear and incorporated the work of offender management. There was a large offender assessment system (OASys) backlog but we acknowledged the prison was addressing this and that it was made more demanding due to the needs of the complex long term population. Public protection arrangements were good. Resettlement pathway provision was appropriate for the population, and support for maintaining ties with children and families was good. There was a suitable range of offending behaviour programmes. Provision on the therapeutic communities and the psychologically informed planned environment (PIPE) unit was positive.*  
**Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.**

S30 *At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Gartree were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 15 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, and one had not been achieved.*

- S31 In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator said they had done something at Gartree that made them less likely to reoffend in future. The overarching reducing reoffending policy was comprehensive and covered all key issues, including offender management and planning. Objectives were clear and regularly monitored, and there was a positive approach to integrating offender management across the establishment and involving all departments in the planning and management of prisoners' sentences.
- S32 Our survey respondents were also more positive than the comparators across the range of offender management indicators. Despite the fact that over half the prison population had out-of-date OASys assessments, sentence planning arrangements were good and there was an appropriate plan to rectify the shortfall. Although variable in quality, it was encouraging, and unusual, that staff across the establishment, including personal officers, sent contributions to prisoners' sentence planning. However, beyond sentence planning the role of offender supervisors was limited, with prisoner contact mostly restricted to annual reviews and responses to applications.

- S33 Appropriately, the inter departmental risk management team reviewed all new arrivals. Arrangements for managing public protection cases were good, with offender supervisors now responsible for managing their own cases.
- S34 It was rare that prisoners were released from Gartree but, when they were, the offender management unit managed the process appropriately. Released prisoners were usually accommodated in approved premises, identified by offender managers. There was little evidence that debt was a problem with the population, but a survey of this area was due. The care programme approach was used for prisoners with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care and end-of-life programmes were available but had not been used.
- S35 The visits facilities were good and visits could be booked in person by visitors and via email. The prison had facilitated family days, which were appreciated, and there were some supportive programmes for families. It was inappropriate that prisoners returning from accumulated visits had to be housed on the induction unit and wait for a new cell on normal location.
- S36 An appropriate needs analysis based on OASys and sentence planning data was continually updated to reflect the changing population. The range of accredited programmes was appropriate to the needs of the population, with around 140 places a year.
- S37 The introduction of the therapeutic community-plus (TC+), which unusually for a therapeutic community worked with prisoners with learning difficulties, and PIPE units since our last inspection has been a positive development. Both the original therapeutic community and the TC+ integrated prisoners into the wider prison regime and managed the balance between therapeutic engagement and wider provision well, and prisoners were generally very positive about their experience. The PIPE unit had been in place for approximately 12 months and provided valuable step-down progression support for prisoners who had been on very intensive therapeutic programmes or an alternative to those intensive programmes.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S38 Concern: There were insufficient activity spaces to offer all prisoners purposeful activity throughout the working day, and between a quarter and a third of prisoners were locked up during the core day. There was not enough work in some work areas to keep prisoners fully employed, and much of the work available was mundane and very low skilled.

**Recommendation: There should be enough purposeful activity, including vocational training opportunities, to engage all prisoners throughout the working day.**

- S39 Concern: Activities were not well sequenced to maximise the use of activity places, and some courses had long waiting lists. Prisoners were allowed to miss work sessions to attend recreational PE.

**Recommendation: Activities should be effectively allocated and sequenced to maximise the use of available places.**



# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

**1.1** *Most prisoners were positive about their experience of escort to the prison, although some journeys were long. Escort risk assessments considered the specific needs of individuals.*

**1.2** There were two or three prisoner arrivals a week and, overall, prisoners were positive about their experiences during transfer. Some journeys between prisons were long, and the contractor's vehicle we saw was grubby inside with some graffiti, but it was suitably equipped. We saw no evidence of delays disembarking prisoners from vans or of excessive waits in reception. Prisoners transferring out were generally informed of their move the previous evening, in time to make telephone calls. Taxis were used for most other escorts, and were clean and equipped to carry wheelchair users. Escort risk assessments were appropriate, and we saw that some prisoners with particular needs were risk assessed for non-standard restraints. Most arrivals knew in advance that they were coming to Gartree.

### Housekeeping point

**1.3** Escort vehicles should be clean and free from graffiti.

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners are treated with respect and feel safe on their arrival into prison and for the first few days in custody. Prisoners' individual needs are identified and addressed, and they feel supported on their first night. During a prisoner's induction he/she is made aware of the prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.**

**1.4** *Reception processes were efficient, and induction arrangements broadly appropriate, but prisoners found long stays on the induction wing frustrating.*

**1.5** The reception area was clean and well presented, with appropriate safer custody information displayed in holding cells. Reception staff were relaxed and welcoming. In our groups, prisoners told us that they were strip searched in reception, but we saw no evidence that this happened routinely.

**1.6** New arrivals spent short periods in reception before moving to I wing, the induction unit, where they had a basic first night interview with staff and were given a hot meal. Late arrivals were not always able to shower or make a telephone call, but we saw that the latter was facilitated in cases of particular need. Prisoners often returned to reception the day after arrival for their property to be processed.

- 1.7** Induction processes had improved since our last inspection. There was a week-long rolling programme that started on the morning after reception and covered all appropriate elements. Sessions were run by staff from departments across the prison. An Insider (prisoner peer supporter) played a useful role providing local information, but some prisoners felt uncomfortable disclosing personal information (such as next of kin address details) to him. He was available on the unit every day, and ran a formal session about local procedures at least once a week. Prisoner interpreters, rather than the professional telephone interpreting service, were used for prisoners with poor English (see recommendation 2.32).
- 1.8** Prisoners disliked I wing because it had mostly double cells, and some had become used to a single cell in other establishments. Although prisoners completed all the induction sessions within two weeks, most remained on I wing for 10-12 weeks waiting for a space in the main prison. Although they could apply for and attend activities during this time, most found this wait frustrating.

## 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.**

**1.9** *The incidence of violence was low and most prisoners felt safe. Trend analysis was underdeveloped. Investigations and monitoring of those involved in incidents of bullying and violence were good but interventions for bullies and victims were underused.*

- 1.10** Incidents of violence were low. Data collated by the safer custody team showed there had been three assaults on staff, four on prisoners and one fight in the previous six months. Most incidents were minor and few resulted in serious injury. In our survey, 27% of respondents said they had ever felt unsafe at Gartree, against the comparator of 39%, and only 10%, against 16%, said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection.
- 1.11** The violence reduction policy was up to date and specific to the population. It covered a range of interventions, including restorative justice and conflict mediation. In a prison survey of violence, only 13% of respondents said that the prison was unsafe. But the prison did not use the survey results, or the regular exit interviews, to inform its strategy to reduce violence.
- 1.12** The monthly safer custody committee was well attended and oversaw both violence reduction and suicide and self-harm prevention (see paragraph 1.19). The violence reduction report covered most indicators of violence and antisocial behaviour but there was insufficient analysis of trends and patterns to inform strategy or the subsequent action plan.
- 1.13** Allegations of bullying or antisocial behaviour were investigated through 'zero tolerance incident reporting forms' and were generally thorough. In the previous six months, 32 prisoners had been formally monitored for bullying with 24 placed on support documents and eight on behavioural compacts. Monitoring entries were good but targets were often perfunctory and did not include the range of interventions available. Many targets did not address the underlying causes of the prisoner's behaviour.

## Housekeeping points

- I.14 The prison should analyse the data collated on violence to inform the violence reduction strategy.
- I.15 Targets to challenge perpetrators and support victims of violence should be meaningful.

## 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.16** *The incidence of self-harm was similar to the last inspection. The management of prisoners subject to case management was mostly good but these prisoners had mixed views about their care. Complex cases were very well managed. Actions arising from deaths in custody had been implemented but not reviewed regularly. Prisoners had inadequate access to Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners).*

- I.17 There had been 54 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm opened in the previous six months and 51 incidents of self-harm involving a small number of prisoners, which was similar to the last inspection. This was positive considering the change in population with the addition of the TC plus (therapeutic community) and the PIPE (psychologically informed planned environment), which held some men who had previously been prolific self-harmers.
- I.18 The quality of ACCT documents was generally good. Care maps were detailed and updated, reviews were multidisciplinary, most staff entries in case records showed meaningful interaction and a caring approach, and there was evidence of effective quality assurance. However, prisoners we spoke to had mixed views about the support from staff. In the case reviews we attended, interactions were very positive. Seven prisoners subject to ACCT had been located in the segregation unit (see paragraph I.50), but the ACCTs we reviewed assured us that this had been justified.
- I.19 The safer custody meeting (see also paragraph I.12) was attended by the Samaritans although not by Listeners. A wide range of information was collated but there was limited trend pattern analysis to inform strategy. The meeting discussed complex cases, whose needs were effectively managed. The team had developed a trigger date database that included dates known to be significant to individual prisoners. These were communicated actively to relevant parties so that interventions could be put in place. There were also excellent interventions for prisoners who heard voices to reduce the likelihood of self-harm incidents.
- I.20 There had been two self-inflicted deaths in custody since our last inspection. Documents we saw indicated that most actions recommended by the Prison and Probations Ombudsman had been addressed, but we were not assured that these learning points were reviewed regularly, particularly the need for officers to access cells on their own at night in order to help preserve the life of a prisoner.

- I.21** Listeners and prisoners on ACCTs said that Listener access was restricted once cells were locked for the night, although there was access to the Samaritans telephone line. We found that there was no access to Listeners during the night, which was poor practice. There was also no Listener care suite.
- I.22** There were two constant watch cells on D wing, and 11 prisoners at risk of suicide had been located there in the previous six months. Cell doors were left unlocked and prisoners could have their own possessions and a television. We saw staff engage meaningfully with two prisoners in these cells during the inspection.

## Recommendations

- I.23** **The prison should regularly review learning points from deaths in custody recommendations.**
- I.24** **Prisoners should have unrestricted access to Listeners, as well as a care suite.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.25** The safer custody meeting should analyse trends and patterns of self-harm to inform strategy.

## Good practice

- I.26** *A trigger date database had been developed for prisoners at risk of self-harm and was used to arrange relevant interventions.*

## 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>3</sup>**

- I.27** *Safeguarding arrangements were effective.*

- I.28** There was no safeguarding policy, although there were good arrangements to identify the safeguarding risks of new arrivals, No prisoners had been released from Gartree in the previous 12 months, so contact with the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) was unnecessary. Safer custody and health services teams met weekly to discuss new arrivals at risk, and a monthly multidisciplinary complex case meeting focused on prisoners who needed enhanced support. Staff were aware of their responsibility to protect adults at risk and knew who to contact to refer a safeguarding issue.

<sup>3</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).

## 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.29** *Security arrangements were generally proportionate, but there had been insufficient attention to drug and alcohol supply reduction, and some processes had become lax.*
- I.30** The prison's general approach to physical security was not excessively risk averse. Initiatives such as the Flavours staff restaurant staffed by prisoners and opportunities for prisoners from all wings to take outside exercise together in one large area demonstrated an appropriately proportionate response to risk.
- I.31** The flow of intelligence was good with an average of 345 intelligence reports a month, and analysis was reasonable. There was a useful daily security briefing. Monthly intelligence assessments were appropriately structured and reached evidenced conclusions. Over the previous six months, the assessments had repeatedly identified concerns about the availability of drugs, alcohol and mobile telephones. This was echoed by prisoners in our survey: 37% of respondents said it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison, against the comparator of 28%, and 27%, against 15%, said alcohol was easily available. There was evidence of some diversion of prescribed medication, but the majority of finds related to illicitly brewed alcohol – 'hooch' or distilled alcohol had been discovered on 38 occasions in the previous six months. Although the intelligence assessments had been presented to the security committee meetings in January and February 2014, the minutes did not assure us that they were sufficiently discussed or that outstanding actions were completed. The assessments were not available for us to inspect.
- I.32** We were, therefore, concerned that too many intelligence-led searches requested by security managers did not take place, with a gap since mid-January 2014. We also noted that only 52% of requests for suspicion drug testing were met on time (resulting in a low positive rate of 16%), and that the establishment did not meet the weekend testing target consistently. Positive test results were mainly for Subutex (buprenorphine). The random mandatory drug testing positive rate had averaged 4.16% in the previous six months against a target of 5.6%, but refusals were high.
- I.33** Supply reduction was discussed at security and reducing reoffending meetings, and we found good information sharing between departments and service providers. However, there was no detailed supply reduction strategy or action plan.
- I.34** Visiting restrictions on prisoners were reviewed monthly, but invariably remained in place for three months. There were only four prisoners on restrictions during our inspection, but one prisoner had been subject to closed visits in the previous six months for non-visits related activity. Any visitor indicated by a drug dog was offered a closed visit or asked to leave.

## Recommendations

- I.35** There should be a detailed substances supply reduction strategy, which is actively monitored to ensure that required actions, including drug testing and searching, take place.
- I.36** The security committee should scrutinise monitoring reports, including intelligence assessments, actively and regularly, and these discussions should be recorded.

## Housekeeping point

- I.37** Closed visits should be authorised only when there is a significant risk justified by security intelligence. (Recommendation 9.74 repeated as housekeeping point)

## Incentives and earned privileges<sup>4</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.38** *The new incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had been appropriately implemented in consultation with prisoners and staff and was well understood, but effective monitoring was required to ensure fairness and more opportunities to be able to advance were required.*

**I.39** Prisoners and staff had a clear understanding of the new national IEP policy, which was being carefully and appropriately introduced over a year until November 2014. About 70% of the population was now on the enhanced level, approximately 20% fewer than before the new policy was implemented. There were a few examples of prisoners being supported to achieve an incentive level when diversity factors, such as disability, created disadvantage.

**I.40** Some prisoners felt that there were insufficient opportunities to demonstrate the commitment to rehabilitation necessary to qualify for the new enhanced level. We saw some limited evidence of prisoners and staff trying to create more such opportunities, but only one prisoner had earned enhanced status in the last three months. We felt that the prisoner perception that the Parole Board valued enhanced status as an indicator of compliance was legitimate, and that the prison's monitoring arrangements should continue to identify and resolve any unfairness.

## Recommendation

- I.41** There should be sufficient opportunities for all prisoners to demonstrate their commitment to rehabilitation.

<sup>4</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.42** *The number of adjudications had increased since our last inspection. Adjudication processes were sound. Force was used proportionately and only when necessary, but there was scope to improve governance. Staff-prisoner relationships in the segregation unit were very good, but care planning for long-stay prisoners was not effective.*

### Disciplinary procedures

- I.43** There had been 334 new adjudications in the previous six months, which was almost double that at our last inspection. The proportion of cases dismissed or not proceeded with was 20-30%, which was also high. Most charges were appropriate and adjudications were generally investigated thoroughly. The adjudication room was pleasant, with relevant documentation and a notebook for prisoners, but no pen.
- I.44** Analysis of adjudication data had improved but was still insufficient to identify patterns and trends. Closer analysis was required to understand the number of cases dismissed or not proceeded with, and to explain the significant increase in charges laid. There was comprehensive quality assurance of 10% of all charges a month by the deputy governor, and individual feedback was provided to adjudicators. Prisoners had an opportunity to contribute to adjudication standardisation meetings in advance, and managers discussed policy and practice issues arising from quality assurance processes and appeals.

### Recommendation

- I.45** **The adjudications standardisation meeting should analyse adjudication data to identify trends and patterns and take action where required.**

### The use of force

- I.46** There had been 52 use of force incidents in 2013, compared with only 28 in 2012. Analysis of the data revealed that the increase was mostly in planned incidents, which was reassuring, especially since most of these were ultimately resolved without the application of restraints (except handcuffs).
- I.47** Special accommodation had been used six times in the previous six months – three for a maximum of 10 minutes. The remaining three were longer periods, for prisoners on open ACCTs. Anti-ligature clothing had been used twice, which had been an appropriate last resort, given the prisoners' extremely challenging behaviour and active aggression. However, it was inappropriate that strip clothing was routinely available in both special cells.
- I.48** Reports of use of force incidents were reviewed by the deputy governor and were generally of good quality. A few had scope to improve reporting of the background to the incident and the justification for decisions to use special accommodation, mechanical restraints or strip searches. In one case, the times that a prisoner had entered and left special accommodation were not clear, but this had already been identified by managers. All planned incidents were

video recorded and these revealed good practice. Staff were appropriately trained. A use of force report was presented monthly to the security committee meeting, but there were no records that it had any meaningful discussion, particularly of use of special accommodation, or reviewed videos. Overall, we were satisfied that force was used proportionately and only when necessary.

## Recommendation

- I.49 The security committee should scrutinise the use of force, and particularly special accommodation, actively and regularly.**

## Segregation

- I.50** In the previous six months, 67 prisoners had been segregated, including seven who had been managed on open ACCT documents. We were concerned that not all the latter were recorded in segregation management and review group (SMARG) documentation, and we found no records to show that managers routinely discussed this documentation. Some prisoners on ACCTs held in the unit presented significant managerial challenges, and in most cases the reasons for segregation were recorded in the ACCT document. We were satisfied that there were exceptional reasons to justify segregating prisoners on ACCTs in the cases that we reviewed, but there needed to be more scrutiny of the decisions to locate those on ACCTs in the unit to ensure it continued to be absolutely necessary.
- I.51** Cells in the segregation and progression unit were reasonable, but the shower needed refurbishment. The exercise yards were effectively cages (see photograph, Appendix V), which was disproportionate to the risks presented by category B prisoners. Excellent staff-prisoner relationships in the unit, and a flexible, respectful approach to the regime, offset these physical shortcomings.
- I.52** Prisoners understood why they were segregated, and received statutory visits and entitlements (although exercise was only for 40 minutes a day, see recommendation 3.5), even if they were serving cellular confinement on the wings. This happened most weeks, because of a shortage of spaces in the segregation unit.
- I.53** We were concerned that some prisoners were strip searched on arrival in segregation, without individual risk assessed authority. We saw some documents for prisoners who had been segregated in their own interest where this was not the case, but there was no log of strip searches, and staff varied in their understanding of the policy.
- I.54** Many prisoners had long stays in the segregation unit. In the previous six months, 18 were there for more than 28 days, including five for over 100 days. Segregation reviews were on time, and managers worked hard to secure appropriate outcomes for the prisoners in their care to ensure that any move of prison was progressive and in line with their sentence plan. However, records of reviews were not comprehensive enough to facilitate a good understanding of each case, and did not feed into effective care plans. During our inspection, none of the three long-stayers had any purposeful activity to stimulate them, and two were locked up for most of the day, despite not posing any immediate threat to order and control. Although we were satisfied that the segregation staff team was seeking good outcomes for those in their care, more could have been done to guard against psychological deterioration for those in the unit.



## Recommendations

- I.55** Managers should regularly scrutinise the reasons for prisoners on open ACCT documents to be held in segregation and assure themselves that the location is due to exceptional circumstances and for the shortest time possible.
- I.56** The segregation unit exercise yards and showers should be substantially improved.
- I.57** Prisoners segregated for longer than four weeks should have a care plan, including purposeful activity, to prevent their psychological deterioration.

## Housekeeping point

- I.58** Prisoners should only be strip searched on arrival in segregation when this is individually justified and authorised.

## 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.59** *Substance misuse services had improved. Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems could now access a range of interventions, and a drug recovery wing offered additional support. Need for clinical intervention was low, and the prison was developing dual diagnosis services for prisoners with both mental health and substance misuse needs.*

- I.60** Only six prisoners had required opiate substitute treatment in the previous six months and three were currently prescribed methadone, all on a reducing basis. In light of sentence length this was appropriate, but enforced reduction meant that some prisoners resorted to illicit use. Substance misuse nurses and a part-time counsellor were part of the mental health team. While the care of dual diagnosis prisoners was well coordinated, the counsellor carried a waiting list of 10. Funding was available for an additional counsellor and a dedicated dual diagnosis nurse.
- I.61** The substance misuse strategy had been reviewed, and the results of a needs analysis were being collated to inform the action plan. Substance misuse was discussed at reducing reoffending and security meetings, and there was good information sharing between departments.
- I.62** The health care provider's remit included psychosocial support services, which resulted in good integration and joint working between teams. In our survey, 91% of respondents said they received support for their drug problem, against the comparator of 64%, and 76%, against 58%, for their alcohol problem, and 85%, against 75%, said they found the support helpful.

- I.63** Currently, 123 prisoners were actively engaged with the substance misuse service and 10 were waiting to be assessed. In addition to one-to-one work, prisoners could access a relapse prevention module and a designated gym course. A 12-week substance recovery treatment programme, which provided structured interventions to prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems, had been piloted on the recovery wing. Prisoners on the recovery wing could also undertake additional relaxation and acupuncture, and regular compact-based drug testing was due to start. Planned new initiatives included an alcohol course, a family support group and a peer support scheme; Alcoholics Anonymous self-help groups met weekly. There was no regular forum to involve service users in service development.

## Recommendations

- I.64 Prescribing regimes for opiate-dependent prisoners should be flexible and based on individual need.**
- I.65 Provision of counselling services should be increased to reduce waiting times.**  
(Repeated recommendation 3.69).

## Housekeeping point

- I.66** The substance misuse service should develop service user feedback to inform future service developments.

## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *Communal areas were clean. Cells were clean, graffiti-free and had no displays of offensive materials, but the cell toilets lacked privacy. Prisoners had good access to showers, telephones, mail, prison clothing and bedding. Responses to prisoner applications were not always timely.*
- 2.2** External communal areas were clean and well presented. The older wings A to D were claustrophobic and afforded poor supervision; the other main wings were a newer gallery style and easier to supervise (see Appendix V: Photographs). All wings were very clean and well maintained. There was no CCTV coverage in the communal areas. Association areas were fully equipped. Some prisoners told us about excessive noise at night, but the prison was quiet when we visited at night. The prison actively dealt with any excessive noise through placing prisoners on behavioural compacts (see paragraph 1.13).
- 2.3** All cells were single occupancy, except for I wing, which accommodated new arrivals. Cells on wings A to D were cramped (see Appendix V), while elsewhere they were a reasonable size. All the cells we inspected were in a satisfactory condition and contained no graffiti or displays of offensive materials. In our survey, only 68% of respondents said they could get cell cleaning materials weekly, against the comparator of 80% and 78% at the last inspection. Staff said that access was restricted due to the poor availability of stock, and the store cupboards we saw were mostly empty, although cells were clean. Apart from a few cells, there was no privacy screening for the in-cell toilet. Access to showers was good and they were clean and sufficiently private. Cell call bells were answered promptly, and covered by good quality assurance procedures.
- 2.4** While most prisoners chose to wear their own clothes, there was good access to prison clothing and sheets, which were in a reasonable condition. Wing laundries were available except on A-D wings, which was served by a main laundry – although it provided a regular service, it was unpopular with prisoners, who felt they should be able to do their own washing. Prisoner access to their stored property was reasonable with no backlog of applications.
- 2.5** In our survey, 46% of respondents said they had problems sending or receiving mail, against the comparator of 38%, and 50%, against 45%, said that legal mail had been opened without them being present. We found no delays in the mail process and were assured that it was distributed to prisoners on the same day it was delivered to the prison. Records showed that 12 confidential letters had been opened in the year to date, most because they were incorrectly marked, but some were opened in error. If opened in error, the prisoner was given a letter signed by the duty governor with an explanation and, where necessary, an apology. The prison wrote to solicitors who failed to mark their letters as confidential. There were enough telephones on each wing for prisoners to access. Many foreign national prisoners complained of the high tariffs for overseas calls.

- 2.6** The responses to prisoner applications that we saw were mostly good and addressed the issue raised. In our survey, only 30% of respondents felt applications were dealt with quickly, against the comparator of 54%. An electronic tracking system showed that many applications were not responded to on time, but the establishment was attempting to rectify this.

## Recommendations

- 2.7** **In-cell toilets should be screened.** (Repeated recommendation 2.7)
- 2.8** **The cost of telephone calls for prisoners phoning overseas should be reduced.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.9** Prisoners should have access to cell cleaning materials each week.

## 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.**

- 2.10** *Most prisoners felt staff treated them with respect and the interactions we saw supported this. The personal officer scheme was effective. Prisoner consultation arrangements were very good.*

- 2.11** In our survey, 88% of respondents said that staff treated them with respect, against the comparator of 79%, and 82%, against 77%, said there was a member of staff they could turn to for help – both responses were higher than at the last inspection. The interactions we observed were respectful and much better than we normally see. Staff used prisoners' first names as the norm, were generally knowledgeable about individual prisoners and demonstrated a caring approach.
- 2.12** Entries by personal officers in prisoner case history notes were generally in depth and demonstrated active and effective support in helping prisoners to maintain family ties and achieve sentence planning objectives. Quality assurance had been effective in addressing inadequate entries. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator and than at the last inspection said they had a personal officer and that they found them helpful.
- 2.13** There was a very effective democratically elected prisoner council. The council met weekly and then monthly with the governor. Issues raised during the weekly meeting were addressed where possible by functional heads before they were taken to the monthly meeting. The forums were effective in addressing prisoner concerns.

## 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>5</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.**

**2.14** *The strategic management of equality work was good and underpinned by an action plan. Equality impact assessments were good. Prisoner representatives championed protected groups, and there were regular forums with minority groups. Prison life was monitored by race but not for other protected groups. Investigations into discrimination incidents were reasonably thorough but sometimes delayed. Protected groups held negative perceptions, which needed to be understood and addressed, and black and minority ethnic prisoners had mixed perceptions about their treatment. Foreign nationals could only study English at entry level. Muslim prisoners were more negative about prison life than non-Muslims. Prisoners with disabilities were underidentified and required more adjustments. A dedicated wing for older prisoners was good. Some gay and bisexual prisoners felt safe enough to declare their sexual orientation. There was no provision for young adults.*

### Strategic management

- 2.15** The strategic management of equality and diversity work was good. The equality action team (EAT) led by the governor met every other month. A member of the senior management team was the lead for each protected group. Equality was a standing agenda item at the monthly senior management team meeting. The work of the EAT was underpinned by an action plan which evidenced progress, especially on older and disabled prisoners. However, only one of the 25 actions related to race and none covered foreign nationals. There was no local equality policy to address the needs of all minority groups. Three-quarters of staff had completed training in equality and diversity.
- 2.16** Prisoners' treatment and conditions were monitored by race only, and not the other protected characteristics, through data on the systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment (SMART). Completed equality impact assessments were good and there was a future programme. A recent equality impact assessment had raised black and minority ethnic prisoners' concern that they were more likely to experience delays in transfer if they were recategorised but the prison had yet to take any action as a result, and offender management issues were not included in SMART (see also paragraph 4.21).
- 2.17** There were seven prisoner equality representatives, each representing a different protected group. They were positive about their role and the support from the EAT. There were regular forums with protected groups.

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

- 2.18** In the previous six months, 20 discrimination incidents had been reported. Investigations into these incidents were reasonably good, with victims, perpetrators and witnesses interviewed, but many investigations took long to complete. Replies were generally polite. We were not assured that one complaint that was dismissed was properly investigated. Some complaints were upheld. Quality assurance of complaints was reasonably good. The head of function reviewed all investigations and the governor signed off the final letter to the complainant. A local university lecturer reviewed some investigations but had only looked at three since July 2013. Discrimination incident reporting forms were not freely available on all wings.

## Recommendations

- 2.19** **There should be an equality and diversity policy that outlines how the needs of all protected groups will be recognised and addressed.**
- 2.20** **Prisoners' treatment and conditions, including access to employment and offender management, should be monitored and analysed to ensure equal outcomes for all protected groups.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.21** The equality action plan should address all protected characteristics.
- 2.22** Investigations into discrimination incidents should be completed promptly and quality assured regularly and independently.

## Protected characteristics

- 2.23** In our survey, respondents from protected groups responded more negatively across a wide range of areas. More work was required to understand and address these perceptions.
- 2.24** Thirty-two per cent of the population were black and minority ethnic prisoners. SMART data showed that the treatment of these prisoners was within an acceptable range across a range of indicators, but did not monitor their access to employment (see recommendation 2.20). In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners' perceptions of their treatment and conditions were mixed, and more black and minority ethnic than white respondents were negative about their treatment by escort and reception staff, food and shop provision, access to clean clothing and Listeners, complaints, and the IEP scheme, victimisation by staff and access to health services. We did not find examples of direct discrimination to support these perceptions but prisoners told us that some staff held negative stereotypes. Black history month was celebrated and appreciated by prisoners. Two per cent of the population were Gypsy, Romany or Travellers and there were regular forums with this group, and a specific prisoner Traveller representative.
- 2.25** Fifteen per cent of the population were foreign nationals. In our survey they were more negative than British prisoners across a wide range of areas – for example, only 74%, against 90%, said that most staff treated them with respect, and more foreign nationals said that they had been victimised by staff. Immigration staff visited the prison, twice a year, which was appropriate given that most prisoners were not facing imminent deportation. Regular forums with foreign nationals concentrated on support within the prison rather than practical immigration issues. Foreign nationals we spoke with wanted advice on repatriation and assisted voluntary return but were unable to obtain this in the prison. Other than at sentence planning boards, where face-to-face interpreting was used, the prison did not use

telephone interpreting to communicate with prisoners who did not speak English. Foreign nationals could only study English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) at entry level, which may have hindered their progress through sentence plans (see also paragraphs 3.13, 3.23 and recommendation 3.27).

- 2.26** In our survey, Muslim prisoners were more negative about their treatment than non-Muslims – 60%, against 22%, said that they been victimised by staff, 20% against 6% had felt threatened or intimidated by staff and only 80%, against 89%, said that most staff treated them with respect. The reasons for these perceptions were not clear as we did not find examples of direct discrimination.
- 2.27** The prison underidentified prisoners with disabilities. In our survey, 22% of respondents said they had a disability, which equated to 153 prisoners, but the prison only recorded 108 prisoners with disabilities. Prisoners with disabilities were also more negative than those without in our survey, including feelings of safety, use of force, victimisation by prisoners, threats and intimidation from other prisoners, victimisation by a member of staff, access to the library and gym, and time out of cell. New arrivals with disabilities were interviewed by a member of the equality team to establish their care needs, and a care plan was created in liaison with the health care and security departments. If necessary, these contained reasonable adjustments, although more were needed throughout the prison. For example, many prisoners on G and H wings had difficulty opening their cell doors, and H wing required slip mats and a more robust shower chair.
- 2.28** Outcomes for older prisoners were generally good. Since our last inspection, half of H wing had been allocated for prisoners over 50. The wing was calm and provided a more relaxed environment. In our survey, the responses of prisoners aged 50 and over were comparable or better than those under 50. However, older respondents were more negative about their feelings of safety. Prisoners in education only received one toilet break, which may have affected older prisoners disproportionately.
- 2.29** In our survey, 3% of prisoners said they were gay or bisexual, which equated to about 21 prisoners. The prison had identified six bisexual and seven gay prisoners, and some prisoners felt safe enough to declare their sexual orientation. There were regular sexual orientation and gender forums with prisoners. The prison had links with external support agencies for gay and bisexual men, including Trade Sexual Health and Leicester Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans.
- 2.30** One prisoner was under the age of 21 but there was no equality provision for him.

## Recommendations

- 2.31** **The prison should investigate and address the reasons for protected groups' negative perceptions.**
- 2.32** **Reasonable adjustments should be made for prisoners with disabilities.**
- 2.33** **The prison should assess the needs of young adults and, where necessary, give them support to ensure they are treated equitably.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.34 Telephone interpreting should be used with prisoners who cannot speak English where accuracy or confidentiality is required.
- 2.35 Foreign national prisoners should have advice on how to apply for the assisted voluntary return and repatriation schemes.

## 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** *The provision of faith and religious activity was good, with a wide range of services and activities, and the chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison. The introduction of prisoner faith representatives was a welcome development. Prisoners were positive about faith provision.*

- 2.37 Faith provision was good. The chaplaincy comprised a managing chaplain, chaplain and administrator. Sessional chaplains visited part time and provided for all faiths except Hindus and Mormons, which were being appointed during our inspection. Two prisoners worked as chaplaincy orderlies. The team was well integrated into the life of the prison and the full-time chaplains attended a wide range of meetings, as well as ACCT case reviews.
- 2.38 Services no longer clashed with other key elements of the prison regime, and they took place in a large, attractive and suitable multi-faith area. The chaplaincy facilitated the accredited Sycamore Tree restorative justice programme, as well as a wide range of services and study classes. The prison had appointed prisoners to act as representatives for each main faith. They wore identifying T-shirts and took part in a regular faith forum.
- 2.39 In our survey, prisoners were positive about faith provision – 62%, against the comparator of 57%, said that their religious beliefs were respected, 70%, against 65%, that they were able to speak with a religious leader in private, and 62%, against 47%, that it was easy to attend religious services.



## 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.**

**2.40** *The number of complaints was high and many could have been addressed as applications. Complaint forms were not freely available on all wings. Most complaints were handled reasonably well but some were not investigated. Quality assurance arrangements were insufficiently robust.*

**2.41** In the previous six months, prisoners had made 1,452 complaints, more than at similar prisons, but many could have been dealt with as applications if that system had been better (see recommendation 2.9). Main areas of complaint included receiving and accessing money (13%) and property (10%), and 7% of complaints were sent confidentially to the governor. Complaint forms were not freely available on all wings. Despite this, in our survey more prisoners than the comparator said it was easy to make a complaint and that complaints were dealt with fairly. Many complaints we reviewed were handled reasonably well, but a minority of responses were perfunctory and defensive. Two complaints were not investigated at all as the language used by the prisoner was deemed inappropriate. Some responses were illegible or difficult to read. Ten per cent of complaints were quality assured by a manager and a further 10% by a senior manager. Some poor responses had gone through the quality assurance process unchallenged.

### Recommendation

**2.42 All complaints should be investigated and responded to, and quality assurance should be robust. Complainants who use inappropriate language should be given constructive feedback.**

## 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.**

**2.43** *There were no legal services officers. Prisoners could borrow laptops to work on their cases. Not all solicitors knew they could request a legal visit on days other than Wednesdays.*

**2.44** There were no dedicated legal services officers but there was some legal advice support for prisoners from the offender management unit. Prisoners could borrow one of six 'access to justice' laptops to work on their case or use standalone PCs in the library. Legal visits took place every Wednesday but the prison would accommodate visits outside of these times in exceptional circumstances. Lawyers confirmed that arrangements for visiting prisoners were good but some were not aware that they could request a visit on days other than Wednesdays. There was one private room for legal visits.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.45** Legal representatives should be aware they can request a legal visit on days other than Wednesdays in exceptional circumstances.

## 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.**

- 2.46** *Very good health care was provided in a new health care centre. Good relations had been established with the provider of services and there were good clinical governance arrangements. Prisoners had very good access to the services and were very positive about the quality of care. Pharmacy services were satisfactory apart from some high levels of opiate prescribing. Dental services were very good with little waiting time for appointments. Primary and secondary mental health care worked well together and provided a range of care and treatment for patients.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.47** Health services commissioning arrangements were well established, and the governor and health care manager had active roles with the partnership board. Clinical governance arrangements ensured that information and issues were taken upwards, and the health care manager represented the department at the prison's senior management team. The manager was responsible for the delivery of all services apart from secondary mental health care and dental provision. A health needs assessment had been completed in 2013 and was awaiting final publication.
- 2.48** There was a very stable health care workforce and only one vacancy at the time of our inspection. Staff were well qualified to deliver a range of appropriate services. Training was overseen by the provider and the health care manager and there were good opportunities for staff development. Information was relayed at staff meetings and the team said that they felt well supported. Clinical supervision was mainly informal and needed further documentation.
- 2.49** The new health care centre had been opened shortly after our last inspection and provided a very good environment for the care and treatment of patients.
- 2.50** Clinical records were maintained electronically on the SystmOne IT system and were well written, indicating patient involvement as appropriate. Old paper records were stored effectively.
- 2.51** Emergency resuscitation equipment, including automated external defibrillators (AEDs), was located appropriately around the prison and was checked weekly. During our inspection, additional checks for the AEDs were implemented to ensure that records of daily battery checks were maintained. Thirty-nine discipline staff had received additional training in the use of the AEDs.

**2.52** Prisoners in our survey were very positive about access to and the quality of health care provided. A 'buddy' system had been established for health care representatives for each wings and they met monthly to discuss health care issues. There were about 10 health care complaints a month. Those that we sampled included written responses and, more recently, typed responses that were more detailed and professional. Some responses were brief but generally sensitive, and gave the prisoner the opportunity to discuss the matter further if required. Health promotion events and literature was available in the health care centre and in reception, but there was no information on the wings and no health care notice boards to advise prisoners of the services available or the results of meetings.

## Recommendation

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

## Delivery of care (physical health)

**2.54** Reception provided satisfactory facilities for the initial health screening of new arrivals, which was usually done by one of the mental health nurses. Prisoners were given a leaflet outlining the health services available, and all were seen subsequently that week for a secondary health care screen.

**2.55** Four GPs provided a clinic every weekday morning with two additional afternoon clinics. The out-of-hours service was provided by the same group as for the local community. Nursing staff were available 24 hours and provided care in the health care centre and on the wings when required. Nursing staff ran specialist chronic disease clinics and three were also nurse prescribers.

**2.56** Prisoner access to health services was very good, and waiting times for all clinics were short. They could use the services through making a confidential health care application or attending the daily 'special sick' clinic for new cases. Nurses held triage clinics daily and there was open access for patients with urgent needs. Patients were able to see a GP routinely within three days. Condoms were available from the health care centre on request.

**2.57** Health care staff had good relations with the staff of the segregation unit, a nurse saw all prisoners there at least daily, and a GP visited the unit three times a week.

**2.58** The prison provided 20 escorts a week for patients attending outside hospital appointments. Appointments were managed effectively by one of the health care administrators, but often over 20% had to be cancelled due to delays in the escort process.

## Recommendation

**2.59 The escort arrangements for outside hospital appointments should be managed effectively to avoid unnecessary cancellations.**

## Pharmacy

- 2.60** The pharmacy was in the health care centre, and was clean, tidy and an appropriate size. Two pharmacy technicians counselled prisoners on medicines use, ran a smoking cessation clinic and undertook medicine use reviews. A pharmacist visited weekly but had no contact with patients.
- 2.61** Medicines were supplied promptly from the pharmacy room except for the substance misuse service, which was administered on A wing. Medicines were mainly supplied on a named patient basis. Some stock was kept and used for special sick or on prescription when supplies could not be obtained from the pharmacy without delay. Night time medicines were taken to the cells late in the evening by nursing staff.
- 2.62** Medicines were prescribed and administered on standard prescription administration charts. They were mainly supplied in possession through an up-to-date in-possession policy. New arrivals were risk assessed for in-possession medication and if their circumstances changed, but there were no regular reviews. Medicines prescribed for 84 days were not transferred to new charts for patients, and consequently there were often multiple prescription charts in use for patients on long-term medication.
- 2.63** There were a limited range of medicines available through special sick and single doses were administered for pain relief. There were no patient group directions (authorising appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine). There was excessive prescribing of tramadol, and the management of pain did not follow the recommended procedure, which led to excessive prescribing of opiates.
- 2.64** Medicines management was satisfactory with procedures to manage dispensing incidents and near misses. There were up-to-date standard operating procedures but no record that these had been read and signed by staff. The medicines management committee had appropriate representation, met regularly and reviewed medicines use, including medicines subject to abuse.

## Recommendations

- 2.65 Prisoners should be able to see a pharmacist on request.**
- 2.66 In-possession medication risk assessments should be reviewed at appropriate intervals, and the policy should reflect this.**
- 2.67 Patient group directions should be implemented to allow registered nurses to supply more potent medicines.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.68** Only one prescription chart at a time should be used for each patient.
- 2.69** Pain management should be reviewed to reduce excessive prescribing of opiates.
- 2.70** All pharmacy procedures and policies should be signed by the relevant staff. (Recommendation 5.42 repeated as housekeeping point)

## Dentistry

- 2.71** Dental services were provided by Kamjit Aulak and prisoner access to care was very good. The dental surgery had been opened with the new health care centre and provided a very good suite of two rooms that were well equipped for the care and treatment of patients. There were four dental and one hygienist session a week, and a very small waiting list – with only three patients at the time of our inspection.
- 2.72** Patients were triaged by the dental nurse to ensure priority to those in urgent need of treatment. We observed patients being treated respectfully while their privacy was maintained. The dentist and dental nurse were very professional in their approach, and patients could be referred to the hygienist when required. Emergency resuscitation equipment was shared with the health care centre. Dental records and appointments were maintained solely on the SystmOne electronic record.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.73** Two teams of mental health professionals continued to work well together providing primary and secondary mental health care. The secondary care in-reach team was provided by a separate contract with Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust. The teams were based in the health care centre and could see patients in consultation rooms and on the wings.
- 2.74** Patients could access primary mental health care through the health care application process or through referral from a GP, and caseloads averaged 35. The team also included a professional counselling service.
- 2.75** The secondary care caseload averaged 70 patients with referrals from the primary care team or the GPs. The team provided a range of mental health services, including groups for prisoners with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), stress control and anxiety management. There was also a group for prisoners who found it difficult to cope with living in the prison environment. Mental health nurses attended all ACCT reviews.
- 2.76** All care was recorded electronically on SystmOne. Care was managed in a multidisciplinary manner with monthly meetings attended by staff from primary care, psychology and the therapeutic communities. A psychiatrist provided two sessions a week with generally short waiting times for appointments. Transfers of prisoners to secure mental health units were generally swift.
- 2.77** Both teams provided mental health awareness training for discipline staff.

## 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.**

**2.78** *The food was very unpopular but we found that it was reasonable. The kitchen and serveries were managed well. Facilities to self-cater and dine in association were limited. Consultation arrangements led to change.*

**2.79** The food was very unpopular with most prisoners. In our survey, only 11% of respondents said that food was good, against the comparator of 39%. Many prisoners said that the quality of food was poor and the quantities were small. We found the quality and quantity to be reasonable.

**2.80** The menu operated over a four-week cycle and catered for religious and medical diets. Six options, including hot dishes, were available at lunch and the evening meal. A planned bakery section in the kitchen would increase the number of homemade products. Breakfast packs were issued the evening before they were to be consumed and were inadequate.

**2.81** The kitchen was clean and had recently been awarded a five star hygiene certificate by the local council. Thirty prisoners were employed in the kitchen and could attain national vocational qualifications (NVQs) in catering. Arrangements to separate halal food from non-halal food during storage, preparation and cooking were adequate. Wing serveries were clean, supervised well and prisoners were correctly dressed. Facilities to cook on wings were limited to a microwave and toaster, and were insufficient to encourage prisoners to maintain or learn new skills in catering. Dining out facilities were limited on most wings.

**2.82** Prisoners were consulted through a monthly food forum, a biannual survey and comments sheets on serveries. The prison responded to these, and comments led to changes.

### Recommendations

**2.83** **The prison should explore and address prisoners' negative perceptions of the food.**

**2.84** **Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten.** (Repeated recommendation 8.10)

**2.85** **Improved self-catering facilities should be provided, with hotplates and adequate cold storage.** (Repeated recommendation 8.9)

**2.86** **Prisoners should be able to eat meals together.** (Repeated recommendation 2.8)

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.87** *Consultation arrangements on the prison shop were good, but prisoners were negative about the choice available. External managers attended the prison to address prisoners' concerns. Prisoners had access to a wide range of catalogues.*

**2.88** There was extensive consultation over the goods available from the prison shop. In addition to prisoner council meetings, there were quarterly canteen consultation meetings. The prison had invited regional managers from NOMS and the shop supplier DHL to address prisoners' concerns over the price and range of goods on the list. Despite this, in our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator (34% against 52%) said the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, and even more black and minority ethnic, foreign national and Muslim respondents were negative about the range of goods available for them.

**2.89** Following changes to the national incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, prisoners could no longer have property sent to them from family or friends but they could order goods from a wide range of catalogues, although they had to pay administration and delivery charges for these.

### Recommendation

**2.90** **Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee 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>6</sup>**

- 3.1** *Prisoners in full-time activities had a good amount of time out of cell, but we found too many prisoners locked up during working hours. Exercise was rarely cancelled, and outside exercise areas were reasonable.*
- 3.2** The published regime allowed prisoners a good 10.25 hours a day out of cell on weekdays, and 8.25 hours at weekends. Correct unlock and lock-up times were generally observed, but in roll checks during our inspection we found between 25% and 32% of prisoners locked up during activity periods. Part-time activity scheduling meant that most prisoners had at least some activity each day, but many did not achieve the maximum time unlocked.
- 3.3** Outside exercise was available for 40 minutes each weekday evening (see also paragraph 1.52), and was rarely cancelled. During the winter months, this took place on the G and H wing exercise ground, which has lights. Ninety minutes exercise was offered each weekend morning. Coats were available for prisoners who needed them. The exercise yard was pleasant, but there was no exercise equipment and few benches. The sports field was used for exercise when weather conditions permitted.
- 3.4** Final evening lock up was at 6.15pm, but four nights a week, prisoners could organise a late unlock to contact family and friends or participate in some extracurricular activities, such as attend the gym.

#### Recommendation

- 3.5 All prisoners, especially those in segregation, should be offered at least one hour's exercise in the open air every day, during daylight hours.**

<sup>6</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.**

**3.6** *There were insufficient activity places, and sequencing arrangements for all activities were ineffective. The range of education was limited and work provision was mostly low level. Teaching in education required improvement, but coaching in vocational training was good. Achievements overall were good. The library was well resourced and prisoners had sufficient access.*

**3.7** *Ofsted<sup>7</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

*Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Required improvement*

*Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: Good*

*Quality of learning and skills and work provision: Required improvement*

*Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: Required improvement*

### Management of learning and skills and work

**3.8** The educational and vocational training provision provided by Milton Keynes College required improvement. The leadership and management of learning and skills were good in vocational training but required improvement in the work and education areas. Senior leaders and managers had high aspirations for the prisoners and promoted the benefits of education and training effectively. Staff throughout the establishment clearly understood the importance of education in improving the lives of prisoners. Managers had achieved several recommendations from the previous inspection, but had not yet secured consistently good outcomes for all groups of prisoners.

**3.9** Managers had recognised the need to widen the number and range of activities. Partnerships with further education colleges and private training providers had increased the number of training opportunities. There were well-developed plans for additional higher education opportunities and additional workshops, but it was too early to judge their effectiveness.

**3.10** Observations of teaching and learning assessment were used to support staff development and performance management. However, they had not yet ensured consistently good quality provision. The identification and sharing of best practice were ineffective – for example, the quality and suitability of learning resources used by different teachers on similar courses varied significantly.

<sup>7</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>.

- 3.11** Activities were insufficiently well sequenced to maximise the use of places and some courses had long waiting lists (see main recommendation S39). Attendance and punctuality on all courses and activities were good, but prisoners were allowed to miss work sessions to attend recreational PE (see paragraph 3.37).

### Provision of activities

- 3.12** Most prisoners had access to part-time work, training or education, with 372 work, 47 training and 203 education places. An additional 84 prisoners were on Open University (OU) and distance learning courses. There were insufficient activity spaces to offer all prisoners purposeful activity throughout the working day (see main recommendation S38).
- 3.13** Education programmes provided by Milton Keynes College included courses in information and communications technology (ICT), art, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), English and mathematics, personal and social development, and a few GCSEs in English, history and religious education. The range of the education provision was too narrow to meet the needs of all prisoners, with little ESOL provision or higher level courses.
- 3.14** Contract work was available in packing, carpet refinishing, recycling, rag cutting and textile production. Too much work was mundane and very low skilled. Many prisoners were insufficiently challenged and became bored. Some contract workshops had insufficient work to occupy prisoners fully.
- 3.15** Vocational training included painting and decorating, catering, recycling, performing manufacturing operations and customer service, and provided good opportunities for learners to develop work skills. Courses in cleaning, producing sewn products and warehousing funded through Weston College were due to end when the current learners finished. A catering course in the Flavours staff bistro provided very good training for learners in a busy, realistic work area.
- 3.16** A Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA) workshop offering ICT qualifications was closed during the inspection. Appropriate literacy and numeracy support was provided for prisoners in workshops.
- 3.17** Distance learning courses, including Open University degrees, were promoted well, and included the physical sciences, business, arts, humanities and sports-related activities. Additional courses were organised through the University of the Third Age (U3A) for prisoners over 50.

### Recommendation

- 3.18** **Contract work should be more purposeful and fully occupy prisoners throughout the working day.**

### Quality of provision

- 3.19** The quality of coaching and assessment in vocational training was good, and allowed prisoners to gain confidence quickly and develop practical skills effectively. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in many education courses was also good, but aspects of functional skills lessons required improvement. Staff were knowledgeable, and very skilled in successfully motivating prisoners to overcome their barriers to learning.

- 3.20** Education induction was appropriate. Prisoners gained a good understanding of the careers advice and education options open to them. Initial assessment of their English and mathematics skills was accurate. However, diagnostic testing for specific learning needs or disabilities was carried out in busy classrooms with many distractions, and ESOL learners had difficulty concentrating.
- 3.21** Teachers planned effectively for learning, but not consistently well across all courses. Individual learning plans were generally used appropriately to set and review learning targets. However, the recognition of skills development in work areas was insufficient. The personal, social and employability-related skills that prisoners improved at work were not recorded sufficiently.
- 3.22** In the better lessons, a broad variety of teaching techniques and resources were used well. We saw two GCSE sessions that were particularly stimulating and challenging. Most GCSE and ICT learners demonstrated very clear understanding and knowledge of their subjects, had a real enthusiasm for learning and made good progress.
- 3.23** There was insufficient sharing or consistency of good practice in the teaching resources used across English and mathematics courses. The range of prisoners' abilities, attainment and understanding of English language in functional skills sessions was frequently too broad to enable effective teaching and learning, and opportunities for individualised learning were limited. There were inadequate arrangements to develop sufficiently the English speaking, reading and comprehension skills of ESOL learners.
- 3.24** Classroom and teaching assistants provided effective support for learning in most education sessions. There was good use of qualified peer mentors in vocational training areas to support, help and coach learners. Prisoners had access to specialist additional learning support but it was too limited, particularly when prisoners took longer to complete their courses.
- 3.25** Vocational training areas were clean, tidy, well equipped and well maintained. Assessment was well planned and in accordance with awarding body requirements. However, there was no formal system for observing the coaching provided for these courses.

## Recommendations

- 3.26** **The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved to a consistently good standard across all the provision through the identification and sharing of best practice.**
- 3.27** **Provision in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) should be improved to meet the needs of all prisoners.**

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.28** Outcomes for most prisoners in education or training were good. Most vocational training courses had very high success rates. Achievement rates on the many education courses in cookery and ICT, as well as on the small number of GCSE courses, were high. Prisoners developed and demonstrated good skills. Standards of work in art, the Flavours bistro and painting and decorating workshops were very good. Achievement rates on ESOL and English courses were low in 2012-13; they had improved in the first half of 2013-14, but required further improvement. The progress of ESOL learners was frequently slow. Achievement on mathematics courses at all levels required improvement.

- 3.29** Prisoners were well motivated, worked well with others and recognised the value of education and training. Those with significant barriers to learning developed useful social skills, engaged well with the prison regime and enjoyed their learning. Relationships between learning and skills staff and prisoners were very respectful, and there was a quiet, calm atmosphere.

## Recommendation

- 3.30** **The success rates on ESOL, English and mathematics courses should be improved.**

## Library

- 3.31** The library, operated by Leicester City Council, was a good facility, well used by prisoners. Monthly loan rates were very high. Prisoner access to the library was good with morning, afternoon and evening sessions from Monday to Thursday and on Saturday morning. Staffing was adequate, with a full-time manager, one part-time member of staff and six library orderlies. Occasional staff absences led to short-term closures but an additional part-time member of staff had recently been appointed.
- 3.32** The library stocked a very good range of fiction and non-fiction, magazines, newspapers, DVDs, legal journals and Prison Service orders, and was responsive to prisoner requests for particular authors, titles or series. The range of foreign language books had increased significantly since the last inspection. Although the booking system for computer access was now fairer, the demand from OU and distance learning students was far higher than the number of computers available. An effective Toe by Toe reading mentoring service involved three mentors supporting 30 prisoners.
- 3.33** Fines for late returns had decreased substantially. The library did not know its book loss rate as there had been no audit of stock for the past three years.

## Housekeeping point

- 3.34** The library should complete an audit to monitor stock loss rates.

## 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.**

- 3.35** *Access to recreational PE provision was good. The gymnasium and PE facilities were very good and provided a sufficient range of activities to meet the needs of different groups of prisoners, but no vocational qualifications were offered. There were effective links with the health care department.*

- 3.36** Six well-qualified and experienced PE instructors provided a good range of recreational PE courses. PE facilities were very good and consisted of a large sports hall, a large cardiovascular area and large free weights room. Outside facilities were good and included a full-sized grassed football pitch and a large all-weather surface pitch. A wide range of recreational PE included a variety of team games, circuit training and racquet sports.
- 3.37** Induction to the gym was prompt and thorough. All prisoners had access to at least two PE sessions a week, although most could access more depending on their IEP status. On average, 78% of the population used the PE facilities. Prisoners had timetabled recreational PE sessions each week, but these included sessions during the working day when many should have been attending work. Although prisoners did not receive any pay if they went to PE during the day, they were allowed to miss their normal work to take part in recreational PE. The PE department did not offer any accredited vocational PE courses.
- 3.38** An annual prisoner survey helped staff to develop and improve the recreational PE. There were some links with the local community – for example, a local over-40s football team visited to play against a similar age prisoner team.
- 3.39** The department had good links with the health care department and substance misuse team. Prisoners could be referred to improve their health and well-being, for example, for help with weight loss and general health and fitness programmes. Mental illness referrals were also made as staff were experienced and qualified to work with this group. Healthy living and healthy eating were promoted on notice boards around the prison.
- 3.40** Showers in the gym were adequate as most prisoners preferred to shower in their living accommodation. Suitable classrooms were available to support theoretical teaching and coaching. The weights room sometimes had to close when insufficient ventilation made the floor slippery, as noted in our 2010 inspection.

## Recommendations

- 3.41** **Daytime recreational PE should not be timetabled for prisoners who should be attending work or training.**
- 3.42** **The prison should provide accredited vocational PE courses for prisoners.**

## Housekeeping point

- 3.43** Ventilation in the free weights room should be improved.

## 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 prison had a clear and comprehensive strategy to manage prisoners through the offender management process, and took a 'whole prison' approach to the assessment of prisoners to manage their progress effectively.*

**4.2** Offender management and resettlement were managed jointly as a reducing reoffending function. Given the long-term population held at Gartree and the low number of prisoners released, some aspects of the resettlement pathways, including accommodation, were all but irrelevant to the population, and this was reflected in the prison's overarching strategic approach. The reducing reoffending policy was comprehensive and outlined the establishment's key functions. It also identified how work was to be taken forward, and the support and provision that prisoners could expect.

**4.3** The reducing reoffending management team met monthly with appropriate representation from departments across the prison. Minutes indicated that discussions were comprehensive and wide ranging, and there was a clear drive to develop and integrate an effective service and recognise the needs of this specific population. Senior managers had very clear ideas about how best to take the work of offender management and reducing reoffending forward, to develop an effective service and create a positive culture of change. This was largely reflected in the 'whole prison' approach to managing prisoners, and all departments were encouraged, and expected, to be actively involved in the assessment and management of prisoners through offender management. While there was still some way to go in ensuring consistently high standards of engagement and evaluation, this was an effective and positive approach. In our survey, 72% of prisoners said they had done something or something had happened to them while they were at Gartree that would make them less likely to reoffend in the future, which was significantly better than the comparator and at the last inspection.

**4.4** Booklets for prisoners, which were regularly updated, outlined how Gartree managed work with them, the function and activity of the offender management unit (OMU), the range of programmes and the wider indeterminate sentence system. The information was comprehensive and informative.

**4.5** The prison's population needs analysis was described as a 'live' document, based on OASys (offender assessment system) assessments and sentence planning data, and constantly updated as information was forwarded from the OMU. The needs analysis was used to manage the demand and need for offending behaviour programmes, and was a useful means of assessing the needs of the population.

## 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.**

**4.6** *Offender management and planning were generally well managed and effective. Sentence planning targets were not always specific enough, but it was positive that contributions were received from all departments working with prisoners. Offender management staff received casework management supervision, and training was due to support their greater engagement outside sentence planning. Public protection arrangements were sound.*

**4.7** The OMU consisted of seven officer offender supervisors, each with an allocated case administrator. A full-time probation officer was responsible for public protection work, practice development with offender supervisors, and as the throughcare manager for the accredited programmes (see paragraph 4.35). Cases were allocated across the team with each offender supervisor having a caseload of around 100. Prisoners were nominally divided into three phases: phase one had at least 10 years to serve on their tariff (the minimum time in custody); phase two had four to 10 years; and phase three were those with four or fewer years to go. Offender supervisors had a broad mix of prisoners on their caseload.

**4.8** For most prisoners, the move to Gartree had been progressive, or at least planned. Virtually all arrived with a sentence plan, and most came to take part in one of the offending behaviour programmes. An OMU representative saw new arrivals during their induction, and they were usually seen by their allocated offender supervisor within a fortnight. A sentence planning review board was usually held within three months of arrival to review sentence plans and ensure appropriate targets were in place.

**4.9** Although all prisoners at Gartree were serving an indeterminate sentence, only 43 were serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP) and were formally the responsibility of the community based offender manager – 94% of the population were the responsibility of the Prison Service and offender supervisors remained responsible for OASys and sentence plans. Significantly more prisoners in our survey than the comparator said that they had a named offender supervisor, and 96%, against 85%, said they had a sentence plan.

**4.10** Sentence planning arrangements were good overall. All departments across the prison that worked with the prisoner were asked to make contributions, including employers, education staff and personal officers. Although the quality of contributions varied, we saw some excellent examples, including a very insightful contribution from a personal officer. It was also encouraging that more prisoners in our survey than at the last inspection said that they were involved in setting their sentence plan targets, and 76%, against the comparator of 66%, said that their targets could be achieved at Gartree. The overall quality of the sentence plans that we reviewed was reasonably good, although too many were vague and non-specific – such as, 'should use his time constructively' or 'should improve his pro-social behaviour'.

**4.11** In our survey, 91% of respondents said they had a named community offender manager, and in most cases these offender managers attended sentence planning boards. The offender manager attended approximately 20% of all sentence planning boards in person and a further 75% via a conference call. Video conferencing was not yet available.



- 4.12** Up until about six months previously, OASys reviews were only undertaken on phase one and two prisoners every three years, with reviews in between focusing only on the potential for recategorisation. While the department attempted to rectify this shortfall, technically there was a backlog of 372 – at one point it had reached 412 but was gradually being reduced. It was planned that all prisoners would be up to date by the end of 2014 as their annual review took place.
- 4.13** In many cases, offender supervisor contact with prisoners was minimal and restricted to the annual review. Prisoners were seen on submission of an application or at the weekly drop-in surgeries that each offender supervisor attended fortnightly, but there was little contact outside this. This lack of contact was offset somewhat by the whole prison approach to offender management and the fact that many other staff worked with prisoners. In our survey, only 34% of prisoners said that no one was working with them to achieve sentence planning targets, against the 41% comparator, and 34%, against 28%, said their personal officer was working with them.
- 4.14** Offender supervisors did not undertake any one-to-one work with prisoners, although the psychologists carried out some assessments and such work, especially on request from the Parole Board. The head of offender management was planning to introduce training for offender supervisors in a variety of skills to boost their ability to engage with prisoners. It was also anticipated that as offender supervisors moved to the new dual role of supervisory officer/offender supervisor and more staff were recruited, more of their time would be spent on the wings and in contact with prisoners. In preparation for this, and to support the development of offender supervisors, the probation officer allocated to offender management had begun to undertake casework supervision with the team, which staff saw as positive.
- 4.15** At the time of the inspection, 89 prisoners were past their tariff. Although in the most extreme example this was 29 years, in most cases it was only a few years. In some cases, the prison was working hard to help the prisoner make necessary progress but, given the relative infrequency of offender supervisor contact, we were concerned that some of the more complex cases or intransigent prisoners might be missed.

## Recommendations

- 4.16** **There should be quality assurance of the contributions to sentence planning.**
- 4.17** **Sentence planning targets should be clear, specific and measurable.**
- 4.18** **The prison should ensure that prisoners who are beyond their tariff are prioritised for contact and engagement to facilitate their progress.**

## Public protection

- 4.19** The nature of the population meant that all prisoners would be managed under multi agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) on their release. As a consequence, public protection at Gartree focused primarily on child protection and harassment. The probation officer screened all new arrivals, regardless of any similar action at their former establishment. In most cases this was merely a safety net, as prisoners presenting a potential issue had, invariably, already been identified. Nevertheless, for the same reasons, all new arrivals were considered at the next monthly inter departmental risk management team (IDRMT) meeting. At the time of the inspection, 154 prisoners were identified as a risk to children (in most cases because their offence was witnessed by or directly affected children

rather than because a child was a direct victim), and a further 46 were subject to harassment restrictions.

- 4.20** Arrangements to manage public protection were generally good. Offender supervisors attended IDRMT meetings when one of their prisoners was being considered. Attendance at the meeting was generally reasonable from across the establishment.

## Categorisation

- 4.21** At the time of the inspection, Gartree held 75 category C prisoners (11% of the population). All prisoners were subject to an annual review, and in those we looked at, decisions to recategorise or not were generally appropriate. However, there were delays in transferring some prisoners, often because they were within their 'parole window' or because there were limited spaces in some areas. Some prisoners held a perception, expressed in our prisoner groups and in our survey, that recategorised black and minority ethnic prisoners were likely to experience longer delays in transfer (see also paragraph 2.16 and recommendation 2.20).

## 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.**

- 4.22** *Very few prisoners were released from Gartree, with none in the previous 12 months. The focus of resettlement pathway providers was appropriate for the population, and prisoners had sufficient time to plan progressive moves effectively. The range of accredited programmes met the needs of most, and there was good support for prisoners to maintain contact with their family and friends.*

- 4.23** It was rare that prisoners were ever released directly from Gartree, and none had been released in the previous 12 months. If they were released, their offender supervisor liaised with the supervising offender manager to ensure all necessary factors were in place. In practice, prisoners were invariably released to approved premises and, as a consequence, there was no accommodation service in the prison.

## Education, training and employment

- 4.24** The quality of the National Career Service provided by Futures required improvement. New arrivals met a careers adviser and developed an appropriate understanding of their career and training opportunities. However, the resulting action plans were not sufficiently well linked to sentence plans and offender management.

## Health care

- 4.25** Sufficient preparation time was given for prisoners being transferred and any necessary medicines were supplied to them. The care programme approach was used for prisoners with enduring mental health problems. Palliative care and end-of-life policies and protocols were available but their use had not been required.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.26** The substance misuse team was well integrated with clinical substance misuse and mental health services. They shared care plans with the OMU, sent progress reports and contributed to sentence planning reviews and parole reports. In the past year, four clients of the service with a high treatment need had successfully transferred to Garth therapeutic community.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.27** There was no specific finance, benefit and debt support, and assessments had consistently identified little or no demand for such a service. In practice, prisoners with such problems would have had these dealt with before their arrival at Gartree. Nevertheless, the prison was planning a survey for prisoners covering demand for such a service and would look at provision if required.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.28** The visitors' centre was operated by the charity PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust) and provided a wide range of information to visitors. The environment was relaxed, and there was appropriate support for children from trained play workers in the centre and the prison visits room. PACT ran refreshment shops in both areas, and was assisted by trusted prisoners in the visits hall. Visitors could book visits in person at the centre or via email, which was appreciated.
- 4.29** Domestic visits were available four times a week, which included morning and afternoons at weekends. The prison could accommodate up to 40 families at a time. Visitors who booked in early at the visitors' centre could guarantee a two-hour visit.
- 4.30** The visits hall was large, light and airy (see photograph, Appendix V) and refreshments were available through a pre-paid voucher system. Prisoners and visitors could use the toilet facilities during their visits and, following a rub down search, could return to their visit. We observed a relaxed atmosphere in the visits hall, and visitors were allowed to embrace prisoners in a respectful way at the start and finish of visits. Visitors we spoke to were positive about their visits experience. Prisoners did not have to wear bibs in visits as the biometrics system (an electronic fingerprint system) and identification cards were used for security identification.
- 4.31** Family visits were provided four times a year and adult-only visits at least twice a year. These were open to all prisoners, regardless of their IEP status. These visits continued over the lunch period with food provided by the prison.
- 4.32** In our survey, 37% of respondents, significantly more than at our last inspection, said that staff supported them to maintain contact with their families and friends. Despite this, we were concerned that, while almost half the population did not receive visits, prisoners wishing to go to another prison for accumulated visits had to give up their cell and employment and on return, usually after about six weeks, would have to go through the induction wing again and could subsequently be allocated to any wing. For some prisoners this was a significant deterrent.

## Recommendation

- 4.33 Prisoners leaving Gartree for accumulated visits should be able to return to their original cell and employment.**

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.34** The prison maintained a comprehensive needs analysis in the form of a database of all prisoners to manage and monitor their participation in offending behaviour programmes. The analysis was based on information gathered from OASys and sentence planning data.
- 4.35** The prison delivered a range of programmes that broadly reflected the evaluated needs of the population. The thinking skills programme (TSP) was scheduled to be delivered five times a year and Resolve (designed to address those with a history of violence) three times a year. The healthy relationships programme (HRP) was also due to be delivered three times a year, including both the moderate and intensive versions, and in the previous 12 months the prison had run a pilot of the violence reduction programme (VRP) - 30 prisoners were anticipated to go through this programme in the following 12 months. Approximately 140 prisoners were likely to attend an accredited offending behaviour programme at Gartree during 2014-15.
- 4.36** Two further accredited programmes were the Sycamore Tree restorative justice course and substance recovery treatment programme (SRTP). The SRTP had delivered one pilot to date and two further courses were anticipated in the following year.
- 4.37** In our survey, 87% of prisoners said they had been involved in an offending behaviour programme while at Gartree, which was significantly more than the comparator or the last inspection. Waiting lists for most programmes were relatively short, although many prisoners expressed frustration at the time they did have to wait. While the majority of prisoners were likely to meet the criteria for the VRP, the prison was, appropriately, prioritising phase three prisoners.

## Therapeutic community

- 4.38** *In addition to the therapeutic community, the prison now offered the therapeutic community-plus (TC+) for prisoners with learning disabilities and the psychologically informed planned environment (PIPE), which offered a lower level of support than either therapeutic community. All three units were integrated into the wider prison and prisoners were expected to work in workshops or attend education with other prisoners. Prisoners attended the units voluntarily, staff were specifically selected to work there, and most prisoners were positive about their experiences. The three units were an extremely positive opportunity for men to progress through the system.*

- 4.39** Along with the Gartree therapeutic community (TC), which was in place at our last inspection, the prison now had two further communities; the TC+, designed for 12 prisoners with learning disabilities and/or an intelligence level below 80, and a psychologically informed planned environment (PIPE) pilot programme for up to 60 prisoners as part of a national strategy for managing prisoners with personality disorders. These additional two programmes meant that Gartree now offered a significant further level of intervention to address offending behaviour for almost 100 prisoners.

- 4.40** Each of the three units offered a varying level of intervention, with the TC and TC+ each providing therapeutic input each weekday morning with prisoners engaging with the wider prison community each afternoon. Input on the TC+ was more oriented to being 'taught', while work on the larger TC was more 'facilitated'. In both units, prisoners were encouraged to address issues relating to their offending and wider relationship needs and to take responsibility for supporting others in the community. In doing so participants were helped to address issues relating to the level of harm they posed. The TC+ had an increased proportion of staff providing interventions, and included speech, art and music therapists. A therapeutic lead officer worked across both the TC and TC+. Prisoners attended the units voluntarily and maintained a link with their 'parent' wing. Prison staff working on the two TCs were specifically selected and trained.
- 4.41** The PIPE unit had been in place for approximately 12 months and offered a lower level of therapeutic input that was limited to three structured sessions a fortnight, including two with the personal officer. Some other sessions were available voluntarily. The unit was a step down from the intensity of the therapeutic community, but nevertheless offered a level of support that for many men, helped them progress back to normal location or even release. Although prisoners could go to the PIPE after completing the TC, in most cases this was not the usual route and prisoners came from elsewhere in the prison. While to date largely a resource for Gartree prisoners, the unit was likely to become part of a national resource.
- 4.42** Overall the three units offered an extremely positive environment for men who had, in most cases, due to personality disorders and other related behaviour problems, struggled to make progress through the mainstream prison system. Prisoners on each unit were generally positive about their experiences, what they had learned, and the support offered from staff.



## 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 There should be enough purposeful activity, including vocational training opportunities, to engage all prisoners throughout the working day. (S38)
- 5.2 Activities should be effectively allocated and sequenced to maximise the use of available places. (S39)

### Recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.3 The cost of telephone calls for prisoners phoning overseas should be reduced. (2.8)

### Recommendations

To the governor

#### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.4 The prison should regularly review learning points from deaths in custody recommendations. (1.23)
- 5.5 Prisoners should have unrestricted access to Listeners, as well as a care suite. (1.24)

#### Security

- 5.6 There should be a detailed substances supply reduction strategy, which is actively monitored to ensure that required actions, including drug testing and searching, take place. (1.35)
- 5.7 The security committee should scrutinise monitoring reports, including intelligence assessments, actively and regularly, and these discussions should be recorded. (1.36)

#### Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.8 There should be sufficient opportunities for all prisoners to demonstrate their commitment to rehabilitation. (1.41)

#### Discipline

- 5.9 The adjudications standardisation meeting should analyse adjudication data to identify trends and patterns and take action where required. (1.45)

- 5.10** The security committee should scrutinise the use of force, and particularly special accommodation, actively and regularly. (1.49)
- 5.11** Managers should regularly scrutinise the reasons for prisoners on open ACCT documents to be held in segregation and assure themselves that the location is due to exceptional circumstances and for the shortest time possible. (1.55)
- 5.12** The segregation unit exercise yards and showers should be substantially improved. (1.56)
- 5.13** Prisoners segregated for longer than four weeks should have a care plan, including purposeful activity, to prevent their psychological deterioration. (1.57)

#### Substance misuse

- 5.14** Prescribing regimes for opiate-dependent prisoners should be flexible and based on individual need. (1.64)
- 5.15** Provision of counselling services should be increased to reduce waiting times. (1.65, repeated recommendation 3.69).

#### Residential units

- 5.16** In-cell toilets should be screened. (2.7, repeated recommendation 2.7)

#### Equality and diversity

- 5.17** There should be an equality and diversity policy that outlines how the needs of all protected groups will be recognised and addressed. (2.19)
- 5.18** Prisoners' treatment and conditions, including access to employment and offender management, should be monitored and analysed to ensure equal outcomes for all protected groups. (2.20)
- 5.19** The prison should investigate and address the reasons for protected groups' negative perceptions. (2.31)
- 5.20** Reasonable adjustments should be made for prisoners with disabilities. (2.32)
- 5.21** The prison should assess the needs of young adults and, where necessary, give them support to ensure they are treated equitably. (2.33)

#### Complaints

- 5.22** All complaints should be investigated and responded to, and quality assurance should be robust. Complainants who use inappropriate language should be given constructive feedback. (2.42)

#### Health services

- 5.23** Prisoners should have access to health care information and health promotion material in a range of languages. (2.53)



- 5.24** The escort arrangements for outside hospital appointments should be managed effectively to avoid unnecessary cancellations. (2.59)
- 5.25** Prisoners should be able to see a pharmacist on request. (2.65)
- 5.26** In-possession medication risk assessments should be reviewed at appropriate intervals, and the policy should reflect this. (2.66)
- 5.27** Patient group directions should be implemented to allow registered nurses to supply more potent medicines. (2.67)

#### Catering

- 5.28** The prison should explore and address prisoners' negative perceptions of the food. (2.83)
- 5.29** Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten. (2.84, repeated recommendation 8.10)
- 5.30** Improved self-catering facilities should be provided, with hotplates and adequate cold storage. (2.85, repeated recommendation 8.9)
- 5.31** Prisoners should be able to eat meals together. (2.86, repeated recommendation 2.8)

#### Purchases

- 5.32** Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.90)

#### Time out of cell

- 5.33** All prisoners, especially those in segregation, should be offered at least one hour's exercise in the open air every day, during daylight hours. (3.5)

#### Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.34** Contract work should be more purposeful and fully occupy prisoners throughout the working day. (3.18)
- 5.35** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved to a consistently good standard across all the provision through the identification and sharing of best practice. (3.26)
- 5.36** Provision in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) should be improved to meet the needs of all prisoners. (3.27)
- 5.37** The success rates on ESOL, English and mathematics courses should be improved. (3.30)

#### Physical education and healthy living

- 5.38** Daytime recreational PE should not be timetabled for prisoners who should be attending work or training. (3.41)
- 5.39** The prison should provide accredited vocational PE courses for prisoners. (3.42)

### **Offender management and planning**

- 5.40** There should be quality assurance of the contributions to sentence planning. (4.16)
- 5.41** Sentence planning targets should be clear, specific and measurable. (4.17)
- 5.42** The prison should ensure that prisoners who are beyond their tariff are prioritised for contact and engagement to facilitate their progress. (4.18)

### **Reintegration planning**

- 5.43** Prisoners leaving Gartree for accumulated visits should be able to return to their original cell and employment. (4.33)

## **Housekeeping points**

### **Courts, escort and transfers**

- 5.44** Escort vehicles should be clean and free from graffiti. (1.3)

### **Bullying and violence reduction**

- 5.45** The prison should analyse the data collated on violence to inform the violence reduction strategy. (1.14)
- 5.46** Targets to challenge perpetrators and support victims of violence should be meaningful. (1.15)

### **Self-harm and suicide**

- 5.47** The safer custody meeting should analyse trends and patterns of self-harm to inform strategy. (1.25)

### **Security**

- 5.48** Closed visits should be authorised only when there is a significant risk justified by security intelligence. (1.37, recommendation 9.74 repeated as housekeeping point)

### **Discipline**

- 5.49** Prisoners should only be strip searched on arrival in segregation when this is individually justified and authorised. (1.58)

### **Substance misuse**

- 5.50** The substance misuse service should develop service user feedback to inform future service developments. (1.66)

### **Residential units**

- 5.51** Prisoners should have access to cell cleaning materials each week. (2.9)

## Equality and diversity

- 5.52** The equality action plan should address all protected characteristics. (2.21)
- 5.53** Investigations into discrimination incidents should be completed promptly and quality assured regularly and independently. (2.22)
- 5.54** Telephone interpreting should be used with prisoners who cannot speak English where accuracy or confidentiality is required. (2.34)
- 5.55** Foreign national prisoners should have advice on how to apply for the assisted voluntary return and repatriation schemes. (2.35)

## Legal rights

- 5.56** Legal representatives should be aware they can request a legal visit on days other than Wednesdays in exceptional circumstances. (2.45)

## Health services

- 5.57** Only one prescription chart at a time should be used for each patient. (2.68)
- 5.58** Pain management should be reviewed to reduce excessive prescribing of opiates. (2.69)
- 5.59** All pharmacy procedures and policies should be signed by the relevant staff. (2.70, recommendation 5.42 repeated as housekeeping point)

## Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.60** The library should complete an audit to monitor stock loss rates. (3.34)

## Physical education and healthy living

- 5.61** Ventilation in the free weights room should be improved. (3.43)

## Example of good practice

- 5.62** A trigger date database had been developed for prisoners at risk of self-harm and was used to arrange relevant interventions. (1.26)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Kieron Taylor	Team leader
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Catherine Shaw	Head of research, development and thematics
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Gemma Quayle	Research trainee

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Mick Bowen	Health services inspector
Matthew Tedstone	Care Quality Commission
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Nick Crombie	Ofsted inspector
John Grimmer	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 2010, reception and first night arrangements generally met the needs of the population, but induction took too long. Most prisoners felt safe and there were satisfactory violence reduction procedures. There was some good care for prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm, but some of the processes could have been better. The level of use of force was very low and the segregation unit was well run. There was an appropriate supply reduction strategy for drugs and illicit alcohol. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.*

#### **Recommendations**

Induction arrangements should be revised to ensure all prisoners receive a structured introduction to Gartree the day after arrival and complete the formal induction programme without undue delay. (1.14)

##### **Partially achieved**

Specific interventions to challenge bullies should be developed. (3.13)

##### **Achieved**

The role of FI and the criteria for entry should be clarified to ensure appropriate prisoners are able to benefit from the support available. (3.14)

##### **No longer relevant**

Staff should be trained in the operation of the violence reduction strategy and the effective monitoring of alleged bullies. (3.15)

##### **Achieved**

All death in custody action plans should be completed and periodically reviewed at the safer prison meeting to ensure continued compliance with recommendations. (3.29)

##### **Partially achieved**

Assessment, care in custody and teamwork reviews should be multidisciplinary, chaired consistently by the case managers responsible for the cases and consider the full range of potential support for prisoners at risk. (3.30)

##### **Achieved**

Observation of prisoners at risk should not be made at routine and predictable times. (3.31)

##### **Not achieved**

A programme of refresher assessment, care in custody and teamwork training should be introduced. (3.32)

**Achieved**

All staff should be familiar with the Listener scheme and provide access to Listeners 24 hours a day. (3.33)

**Not achieved**

There should always be sufficient trained staff on duty to provide prompt and effective responses to emergency situations. (3.34)

**Achieved**

The local security strategy should include guidance on the circumstances when squat searching is carried out and the level of authorisation required, which should be recorded and monitored. (7.8)

**Achieved**

Closed visits should be authorised only when there is a significant risk justified by security intelligence. (9.74)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point I.37)

Data relating to adjudications, including nature of charge, location of prisoner and reporting officer, should be routinely monitored for patterns and trends, with appropriate action taken to address any emerging issues. (7.23)

**Partially achieved.**

Regardless of plea, adjudicators should investigate all charges thoroughly before deciding whether or not a prisoner is guilty. (7.24)

**Achieved**

Use of force records should provide a full and thorough account from each member of staff involved, including the circumstances leading up to their involvement in the incident and the reasons for use of handcuffs. (7.25)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should remain in a special cell only for as long as the reason for their relocation to such a cell continues to apply. (7.26)

**Achieved**

Segregation unit staff should receive training on de-escalation, race equality, suicide prevention, mental health, personality disorder and motivational interviewing. (7.27)

**Not achieved**

Provision of counselling services should be increased to reduce waiting times. (3.69)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.65)



## Respect

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

*At the last inspection, in 2010, staff-prisoner relationships were reasonably positive, but the personal officer role was underdeveloped. Living conditions were generally good. There was little satisfaction with the food. Prisoners had little confidence in the applications system. The standard of replies to complaints was improving. Facilities for legal visits were inadequate. Some good work had recently begun in all areas of diversity, but there was insufficient support for men with disabilities and for foreign national men who did not speak or understand English well. Health care provided some good services, which were expected to improve with a move to a new building. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

Personal officer work should be further developed to ensure that all personal officers provide active and effective support to prisoners for whom they are responsible and help them maintain their family ties and achieve sentence plan objectives. (HP38)

**Achieved**

Diversity work should include open consultation forums with minority groups to discuss some of the poor perceptions of their treatment and action taken as necessary. (HP 39)

**Achieved**

Systems to identify prisoners with disabilities should be established to ensure they receive appropriate support, with individual care plans as necessary setting how their identified needs will be met. (HP40)

**Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

In-cell toilets should be screened. (2.7)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.7)

Prisoners should be able to eat meals together. (2.8)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.86)

Managers should check the promptness of cell responses daily from the automated system, note where there have been significant delays and take remedial action. (2.9)

**Achieved**

Washing machines should be provided on each of the main wings to allow men to do their own laundry. (2.10)

**Not achieved**

Applications should be receipted, responded to promptly and monitored by managers for timeliness and quality. (3.39)

**Partially achieved**

Officers should actively interact with prisoners on the wing. (2.16)

**Achieved**

Managers should check records at least monthly and ensure that personal officer entries reflect prisoners' individual circumstances, including family issues and progress against sentence plan targets. (2.20)

**Achieved**

Race and diversity training for officers should be prioritised and further training in cultural and religious awareness delivered to help ensure all prisoners are treated appropriately irrespective of background. (4.18)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should be informed of the selection process for responsible jobs and the steps taken to ensure such jobs are fairly allocated and monitored by ethnicity. (4.19)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should be informed in writing of the outcome of, or progress with, their reported incident within 28 days and appropriate action taken when complaints are justified. (4.20)

**Achieved**

The foreign national coordinator should be allocated enough time to meet and develop services for foreign national prisoners, including the provision of advice on immigration matters, and establish links with independent immigration advisory services. (4.30)

**Not achieved**

All foreign national prisoners should be offered a five-minute call to their family abroad once a month irrespective of whether they have had a visit. (4.31)

**Achieved**

Relevant documents and notices, including rules, should be translated into relevant languages and professional telephone interpreting services used to communicate with prisoners as necessary, particularly in relation to sentence planning and other confidential matters. (4.32)

**Partially achieved.**

A formal carer scheme should be established. (4.40)

**Achieved**

A Muslim chaplain should be appointed with sufficient time to meet the needs of Muslim prisoners. (3.55)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should have appropriate access to religious leaders of their own faith to provide pastoral support. (3.56)

**Achieved**

Religious services should not clash with regime activities. (3.57)

**Achieved**

Complaints data should be routinely analysed by specific subject area, such as prisoner location, ethnicity, age and disability, to identify and, where necessary, respond to emerging trends. (3.40)

**Partially achieved**

Guidance for dealing with complaints about staff should be introduced to ensure that all are properly investigated by someone other than the direct line manager and all are scrutinised by a senior manager. (3.41)

**Partially achieved**

Appropriate consultation facilities should be provided to meet the demand for legal visits. (3.47)

**Achieved.**

Sufficient laptop computers should be provided for prisoners pursuing appeals. (3.48)

**Achieved.**

The x-ray machine should be serviced at least every three years and the radiation protection file should be completed. (5.8)

**Achieved**

Policy documents relating to CoSSH and risk assessment reviews should be held in the surgery. (5.9)

**Achieved**

Refrigerator temperatures should be correctly maintained and recorded. (5.10)

**Achieved**

All emergency equipment, including drugs, should be subject to comprehensive review and regular recorded audits. (5.22)

**Partially achieved**

Original prescriptions should be scanned onto the pharmacy computer. (5.41)

**No longer relevant**

All pharmacy procedures and policies should be signed by the relevant staff to show they have agreed to adopt them. (5.42)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, as housekeeping point 2.70)

Medicines with limited use should have the date of opening recorded. (5.43)

**No longer relevant**

Paperwork relating to registration, indemnity, Hepatitis B immunity status, CPD and CPR training for all dental staff should be present. (5.51)

**Achieved**

Dental record-keeping and treatment plans should be in accordance with current guidelines. (5.52)

**Achieved**

Clinical records should be stored in lockable fire-proof cabinets. (5.53)

**No longer relevant**

Cover should be provided for the dentists' annual and sick leave. (5.54)

**Achieved**

Oral health promotion literature should be available. (5.55)

**Achieved**

Food portions should be of an adequate size for adult male prisoners and the catering department provided with sufficient budget for this. (8.7)

**Achieved**

Menu choices should meet the cultural requirements of all prisoner groups. (8.8)

**Achieved**

Improved self-catering facilities should be provided, with hotplates and adequate cold storage. (8.9)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.85)

Breakfast should be served on the day it is to be eaten. (8.10)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.84)

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection, in 2010, time out of cell was satisfactory for prisoners in full-time activity, but there were insufficient activity places and up to 20% of men were locked in cells during the day. The quality of education provision was good, but the range was not sufficiently wide. Many jobs provided some structured training, but the personal skills that prisoners developed were not always recognised and recorded. Library facilities were good and very popular. PE facilities were also good and prisoners had reasonable access to the gym. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

Sufficient activity places should be provided to provide purposeful activity places for all prisoners and reduce the amount of time prisoners spend locked in cells. (HP41)

**Not achieved**

### Recommendations

The nationally calculated time out of cell figure should more accurately reflect the actual experience in prisons. (6.42)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should be offered a full hour of exercise in the fresh air daily at a later time in the day. (6.43)

**Partially achieved**

Waterproof and warm clothing should be available for prisoners who want to exercise in poor weather. (6.44)

**Achieved**

Effective arrangements should be introduced for Criminal Records Bureau vetting and recording of all learning and skills staff. (6.23)

**Achieved**

The prison should develop and introduce ways to recognise and record the skills acquired at work by prisoners who are not following accredited courses. (6.24)

**Not achieved**

There should be more opportunities for prisoners to develop their personal and social skills. (6.25)

**Achieved**

Improvements should be made in the achievement of key skills. (6.26)

**No longer relevant**

The time prisoners wait before starting an education course should be reduced. (6.27)

**Partially achieved**

The use of individual learning plans should be improved. (6.28)

**Achieved**

The range and volume of library stock for foreign national prisoners should be increased. (6.29)

**Achieved**

Library fines should be reduced to reflect prisoners' ability to pay. (6.30)

**Achieved**

The number of showers for prisoners using the PE facilities should be increased. (6.35)

**No longer relevant**

## Resettlement

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

*At the last inspection, in 2010, the reducing reoffending policy did not set out a sufficiently strategic vision of the aim and purpose of Gartree, but some analyses of the needs of the population had been undertaken. Sentence planning and offender management arrangements operated well and most plans were up to date. The therapeutic community provided an excellent opportunity for men to examine the causes of their offending and help reduce their risk. A range of appropriate programmes was run, but prisoners were frustrated about waits. Some recent guidance had been prepared to help structure expectations. There was no drugs programme, but an alcohol programme had just been introduced. Further development of the children and families pathway was needed. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

The reducing reoffending policy should set out an appropriate strategic vision of the aim and purpose of Gartree, with targets to meet the specific and different needs of prisoners in relation to their stage of sentence. This should be effectively communicated to prisoners so that they are clear what will happen at each stage. (HP42)

**Achieved**

### Recommendations

Changes in prisoners' circumstances and/or behaviour should be reflected in reviews of OASys assessments. (9.32)

**Achieved**

Personal officers should attend and contribute to sentence planning meetings. (9.33)

**Achieved**

Sentence plan targets should clearly distinguish between objectives and methods. (9.34)

**Partially achieved**

Clear guidance should be provided about the role and responsibilities of external probation officers in relation to life-sentenced prisoners. (9.35)

**Achieved**

A minimum standard of regular contact between offender supervisors and prisoners should be met and all contact recorded. (9.36)

**Not achieved**

Information provided by prisoners about programmes completed in other prisons should be corroborated and recorded. (9.37)

**Achieved**

Life-sentenced prisoners' progress should not be hampered because of failure to provide suitable facilities to meet their health care needs in lower category prisons. (9.38)

**Achieved**

An alcohol treatment programme that meets the needs of the prison's population should be introduced. (9.57)

**Achieved**

An action plan to develop services under the children and families pathway should be developed based on a needs analysis and monitored at reducing reoffending committee meetings. (9.71)

**Achieved**

All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (9.72)

**Achieved**

The visitors' centre should be fully staffed at weekends. (9.73)

**Achieved**

A suitable and appropriately equipped play area should be provided and supervised at all times. (9.75)

**Achieved**

Family days should be open to all prisoners and prisoners should have more than one opportunity a year to attend these. (9.76)

**Achieved**

There should be a qualified family support worker to support prisoners in maintaining effective relationships with their families and to identify and help those who wish to rebuild relationships. (9.77)

**Achieved**

A new therapy manager should be appointed as soon as possible. (9.107)

**Achieved**

Efforts should be made to reflect the diversity of Gartree's population in the therapeutic community. (9.108)

**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 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	1	689	99.0%
Recall	0	6	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	4	0.6%
10 years and over (not life)	0	2	0.3%
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	645	99.1%
Life	1	45	6.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>969</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	1	0.1%
21 years to 29 years	158	22.7%
30 years to 39 years	223	32.0%
40 years to 49 years	171	24.5%
50 years to 59 years	100	14.3%
60 years to 69 years	40	5.7%
70 plus years: maximum age=73	4	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	1	585	84.1%
Foreign nationals	0	108	15.5%
<b>Total</b>			

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category B	1	615	88.4%
Category C	0	75	10.8%
Category D	0	5	0.7%
Other	0	1	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	1	418	60.1%
Irish	0	3	0.4%
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	14	2.0%
Other white	0	40	5.7%
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	17	2.4%
White and black African	0	4	0.6%
Other mixed	0	5	0.7%
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	22	3.2%
Pakistani	0	21	3.0%
Bangladeshi	0	3	0.4%

Chinese	0	7	1.0%
Other Asian	0	31	4.4%
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	70	10.0%
African	0	15	2.2%
Other black	0	19	2.7%
Other ethnic group	0	5	0.7%
Not stated	0	2	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	3	0.4%
Church of England	0	197	28.3%
Roman Catholic	0	121	17.4%
Other Christian denominations	0	72	10.3%
Muslim	1	117	16.9%
Sikh	0	16	2.3%
Hindu	0	6	0.9%
Buddhist	0	34	4.9%
Jewish	0	2	0.3%
Other	0	6	0.9%
No religion	0	122	17.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0.0%	8	1.1%
1 month to 3 months	1	0.1%	22	3.2%
3 months to six months	0	0.0%	34	4.9%
Six months to 1 year	0	0.0%	64	9.2%
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0%	138	19.8%
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0%	236	33.9%
4 years or more	0	0.0%	186	26.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.1%</b>		

### Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0.0%
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	1	629	90.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>90.4%</b>

### Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0.0%	2	50.0%
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0%	1	25.0%
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0%	1	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.6%</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 10 March 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Gartree was 697. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 205 prisoners.

We received a total of 161 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 79%. No questionnaires completed via interview. Eighteen respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 19 questionnaires were not returned and seven were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	23
B	22
C	23
D	20
F	7
G	30
H	30
I	2
Segregation unit	4

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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:

- The current survey responses from HMP Gartree in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other Category B trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in eight Category B trainer prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Gartree in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Gartree in 2010.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- 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

### Section I: About you

<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	<i>Under 21</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		37 (23%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		51 (32%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		39 (24%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		20 (13%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		11 (7%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		2 (1%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		160 (99%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		0 (0%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		7 (4%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		26 (16%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>Life</i>		120 (75%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		21 (13%)
	<i>No</i>		140 (87%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		160 (100%)
	<i>No</i>		0 (0%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i>		159 (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>	96 (60%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 4 (3%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 8 (5%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	17 (11%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	4 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)

<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Arab</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	2 (1%)		

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

Yes	3 (2%)
No	149 (98%)

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

<i>None</i>	31 (20%)	<i>Hindu</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Church of England</i>	51 (33%)	<i>Jewish</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Catholic</i>	26 (17%)	<i>Muslim</i>	20 (13%)
<i>Protestant</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	9 (6%)	<i>Other</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	9 (6%)		

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

<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>	155 (97%)
<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	2 (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	35 (22%)
No	124 (78%)

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

Yes	7 (4%)
No	151 (96%)

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

Yes	84 (52%)
No	77 (48%)

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

Yes	61 (38%)
No	100 (62%)

**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>	33 (20%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	108 (67%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	20 (12%)

**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>	33 (21%)
Yes	88 (56%)
No	24 (15%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (8%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	33 (21%)
Yes	19 (12%)
No	99 (62%)

	<i>Don't remember</i>		8 (5%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>		
	Yes		99 (62%)
	No		41 (26%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		19 (12%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>		
	Yes		129 (81%)
	No		23 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		8 (5%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>		
	<i>Very well</i>		40 (25%)
	<i>Well</i>		78 (49%)
	<i>Neither</i>		30 (19%)
	<i>Badly</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		4 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		5 (3%)
<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>		123 (77%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>		17 (11%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>		18 (11%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		5 (3%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>		
	Yes		143 (89%)
	No		16 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		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>		102 (64%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>		39 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		18 (11%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>		
	Yes		136 (87%)
	No		11 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		10 (6%)
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>		
	<i>Very well</i>		43 (27%)
	<i>Well</i>		91 (57%)
	<i>Neither</i>		19 (12%)
	<i>Badly</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		3 (2%)
	<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>	19 (12%)	<i>Physical health</i> 13 (8%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Mental health</i> 19 (12%)

Contacting employers	1 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	2 (1%)
Contacting family	17 (11%)	Getting telephone numbers	10 (6%)
Childcare	0 (0%)	Other	4 (3%)
Money worries	14 (9%)	Did not have any problems	92 (58%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal	14 (9%)		

**Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?**

Yes	37 (24%)
No	25 (16%)
Did not have any problems	92 (60%)

**Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Tobacco	74 (47%)
A shower	76 (49%)
A free telephone call	59 (38%)
Something to eat	84 (54%)
PIN telephone credit	57 (37%)
Toiletries/ basic items	70 (45%)
Did not receive anything	27 (17%)

**Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Chaplain	91 (58%)
Someone from health services	108 (69%)
A Listener/Samaritans	66 (42%)
Prison shop/ canteen	46 (29%)
Did not have access to any of these	18 (12%)

**Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

What was going to happen to you	95 (61%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	71 (46%)
How to make routine requests (applications)	81 (52%)
Your entitlement to visits	70 (45%)
Health services	91 (59%)
Chaplaincy	90 (58%)
Not offered any information	34 (22%)

**Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?**

Yes	136 (87%)
No	16 (10%)
Don't remember	4 (3%)

**Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?**

Have not been on an induction course	11 (7%)
Within the first week	83 (54%)
More than a week	51 (33%)
Don't remember	10 (6%)

**Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?**

Have not been on an induction course	11 (7%)
Yes	111 (73%)
No	18 (12%)

*Don't remember* 13 (8%)

**Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?**

*Did not receive an assessment* 13 (8%)  
*Within the first week* 33 (22%)  
*More than a week* 67 (44%)  
*Don't remember* 40 (26%)

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

**Q4.1 How easy is it to.....**

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	27 (18%)	63 (41%)	26 (17%)	13 (9%)	10 (7%)	13 (9%)
<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	23 (16%)	65 (46%)	19 (14%)	4 (3%)	4 (3%)	25 (18%)
<i>Get bail information?</i>	3 (3%)	11 (9%)	12 (10%)	2 (2%)	5 (4%)	85 (72%)

**Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?**

*Not had any letters* 17 (11%)  
*Yes* 76 (50%)  
*No* 58 (38%)

**Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?**

*Yes* 94 (62%)  
*No* 6 (4%)  
*Don't know* 51 (34%)

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	130 (85%)	20 (13%)	3 (2%)
<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	152 (99%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	114 (75%)	35 (23%)	2 (1%)
<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	105 (68%)	48 (31%)	1 (1%)
<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	111 (73%)	24 (16%)	18 (12%)
<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	110 (72%)	41 (27%)	2 (1%)
<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	60 (39%)	44 (29%)	48 (32%)

**Q4.5 What is the food like here?**

*Very good* 4 (3%)  
*Good* 13 (8%)  
*Neither* 40 (26%)  
*Bad* 46 (30%)  
*Very bad* 50 (33%)

**Q4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?**

*Have not bought anything yet/ don't know* 0 (0%)  
*Yes* 53 (34%)  
*No* 101 (66%)

**Q4.7 Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?**

*Yes* 99 (64%)  
*No* 7 (5%)  
*Don't know* 48 (31%)

<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes	95 (62%)
	No	21 (14%)
	Don't know/ N/A	38 (25%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes	108 (70%)
	No	13 (8%)
	Don't know/ N/A	33 (21%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	32 (21%)
	Very easy	65 (43%)
	Easy	29 (19%)
	Neither	5 (3%)
	Difficult	5 (3%)
	Very difficult	2 (1%)
	Don't know	14 (9%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>	
	Yes	131 (86%)
	No	18 (12%)
	Don't know	3 (2%)
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications (<i>If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)</b>	
		<i>Not made one</i> Yes      No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	6 (4%)      78 (53%)      62 (42%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	6 (4%)      38 (28%)      91 (67%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>	
	Yes	112 (74%)
	No	20 (13%)
	Don't know	20 (13%)
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints (<i>If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)</b>	
		<i>Not made one</i> Yes      No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	29 (20%)      47 (32%)      72 (49%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	29 (21%)      36 (26%)      75 (54%)
<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>	
	Yes	30 (20%)
	No	120 (80%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	13 (9%)
	Very easy	26 (17%)
	Easy	46 (30%)
	Neither	46 (30%)
	Difficult	16 (11%)
	Very difficult	5 (3%)



### Section 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme

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

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	1 (1%)
Yes	100 (64%)
No	41 (26%)
<i>Don't know</i>	15 (10%)

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

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	1 (1%)
Yes	70 (46%)
No	71 (47%)
<i>Don't know</i>	9 (6%)

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

Yes	6 (4%)
No	150 (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>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	123 (83%)
<i>Very well</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Well</i>	7 (5%)
<i>Neither</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Badly</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Very badly</i>	4 (3%)

### Section 7: Relationships with staff

**Q7.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?**

Yes	134 (88%)
No	19 (12%)

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

Yes	125 (82%)
No	27 (18%)

**Q7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?**

Yes	56 (36%)
No	98 (64%)

**Q7.4 How often do staff normally speak to you during association?**

<i>Do not go on association</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Never</i>	17 (11%)
<i>Rarely</i>	40 (26%)
<i>Some of the time</i>	53 (34%)
<i>Most of the time</i>	31 (20%)
<i>All of the time</i>	11 (7%)

**Q7.5 When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?**

<i>I have not met him/her</i>	6 (4%)
<i>In the first week</i>	80 (52%)
<i>More than a week</i>	41 (27%)

Don't remember 26 (17%)

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

Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her 6 (4%)  
 Very helpful 50 (33%)  
 Helpful 52 (35%)  
 Neither 21 (14%)  
 Not very helpful 16 (11%)  
 Not at all helpful 5 (3%)

**Section 8: Safety**

**Q8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?**

Yes 42 (27%)  
 No 114 (73%)

**Q8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?**

Yes 16 (10%)  
 No 138 (90%)

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

Never felt unsafe 114 (78%) At meal times 9 (6%)  
 Everywhere 6 (4%) At health services 11 (7%)  
 Segregation unit 2 (1%) Visits area 2 (1%)  
 Association areas 8 (5%) In wing showers 8 (5%)  
 Reception area 0 (0%) In gym showers 1 (1%)  
 At the gym 5 (3%) In corridors/stairwells 12 (8%)  
 In an exercise yard 11 (7%) On your landing/wing 12 (8%)  
 At work 10 (7%) In your cell 7 (5%)  
 During movement 13 (9%) At religious services 3 (2%)  
 At education 5 (3%)

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

Yes 36 (23%)  
 No 119 (77%)

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

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) 18 (12%)  
 Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) 13 (8%)  
 Sexual abuse 1 (1%)  
 Feeling threatened or intimidated 21 (14%)  
 Having your canteen/property taken 3 (2%)  
 Medication 3 (2%)  
 Debt 3 (2%)  
 Drugs 2 (1%)  
 Your race or ethnic origin 4 (3%)  
 Your religion/religious beliefs 3 (2%)  
 Your nationality 5 (3%)  
 You are from a different part of the country than others 3 (2%)  
 You are from a traveller community 0 (0%)  
 Your sexual orientation 3 (2%)  
 Your age 4 (3%)  
 You have a disability 3 (2%)  
 You were new here 6 (4%)  
 Your offence/ crime 7 (5%)  
 Gang related issues 1 (1%)

<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>	
	Yes	43 (28%)
	No	112 (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>	18 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Medication</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
<b>Q8.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	90 (64%)
	Yes	17 (12%)
	No	33 (24%)

### 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	3 (2%)	12 (8%)	57 (38%)	27 (18%)	39 (26%)	12 (8%)
	The nurse	3 (2%)	22 (15%)	79 (52%)	22 (15%)	20 (13%)	5 (3%)
	The dentist	9 (6%)	5 (3%)	35 (23%)	17 (11%)	46 (31%)	38 (25%)
<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:</b>						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	4 (3%)	19 (13%)	62 (41%)	27 (18%)	26 (17%)	14 (9%)
	The nurse	4 (3%)	20 (13%)	75 (50%)	25 (17%)	16 (11%)	9 (6%)
	The dentist	9 (6%)	24 (16%)	56 (38%)	29 (20%)	15 (10%)	13 (9%)
<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>						
	<i>Not been</i>					2 (1%)	
	<i>Very good</i>					17 (11%)	
	<i>Good</i>					50 (33%)	
	<i>Neither</i>					40 (26%)	
	<i>Bad</i>					26 (17%)	
	<i>Very bad</i>					16 (11%)	
<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>						
	Yes					73 (47%)	
	No					82 (53%)	

<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>	82 (53%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	52 (34%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	8 (5%)
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	40 (26%)
	<i>No</i>	113 (74%)
<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>	113 (74%)
	<i>Yes</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	16 (11%)

### Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	136 (88%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	27 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	127 (82%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Very easy</i>	34 (23%)
	<i>Easy</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	67 (45%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Very easy</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>Easy</i>	24 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i>	15 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	76 (51%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	143 (94%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	140 (95%)
<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>	124 (85%)
	<i>Yes</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	127 (84%)
	Yes	19 (13%)
	No	6 (4%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	114 (77%)
	Yes	29 (20%)
	No	5 (3%)

## 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	8 (5%)	18 (12%)	58 (40%)	27 (18%)	22 (15%)	13 (9%)
	Vocational or skills training	14 (10%)	10 (7%)	48 (33%)	29 (20%)	23 (16%)	20 (14%)
	Education (including basic skills)	5 (3%)	22 (15%)	75 (51%)	25 (17%)	17 (12%)	2 (1%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	18 (13%)	6 (4%)	17 (12%)	34 (24%)	42 (29%)	26 (18%)
<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>					13 (9%)	
	Prison job					114 (75%)	
	Vocational or skills training					25 (17%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					55 (36%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					36 (24%)	
<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	5 (4%)	58 (42%)	61 (45%)	13 (9%)		
	Vocational or skills training	14 (12%)	57 (50%)	26 (23%)	18 (16%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	5 (4%)	83 (65%)	27 (21%)	12 (9%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	17 (13%)	75 (58%)	28 (22%)	10 (8%)		
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					8 (5%)	
	<i>Never</i>					7 (5%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					29 (19%)	
	<i>About once a week</i>					86 (56%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i>					23 (15%)	
<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>					9 (6%)	
	Yes					103 (67%)	
	No					41 (27%)	
<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>					32 (21%)	
	<i>0</i>					24 (16%)	
	<i>1 to 2</i>					20 (13%)	
	<i>3 to 5</i>					62 (41%)	
	<i>More than 5</i>					14 (9%)	

<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>	25 (16%)
	<i>0</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	52 (34%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	29 (19%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	15 (10%)
<b>Q11.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>0</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	113 (75%)
<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>	12 (8%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	28 (19%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	50 (33%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	24 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (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>	54 (37%)
	<i>No</i>	93 (63%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	70 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	82 (54%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>No</i>	139 (91%)
<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>	22 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Easy</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Neither</i>	26 (17%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	46 (30%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (1%)

### 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%)
	<i>Yes</i>	137 (91%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (9%)

<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>	13 (9%)
	<i>No contact</i>	31 (21%)
	<i>Letter</i>	67 (45%)
	<i>Telephone</i>	34 (23%)
	<i>Visit</i>	52 (35%)
<b>Q13.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	137 (91%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (9%)
<b>Q13.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	144 (96%)
	<i>No</i>	6 (4%)
<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>	6 (4%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>Involved</i>	58 (39%)
	<i>Neither</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	22 (15%)
<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>	6 (4%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	46 (32%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	63 (44%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	39 (27%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	46 (32%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	31 (22%)
<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>	6 (4%)
	<i>Yes</i>	108 (73%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (9%)
<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>	6 (4%)
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (23%)
	<i>No</i>	65 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	41 (28%)
<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>	6 (4%)
	<i>Yes</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	59 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	60 (41%)
<b>Q13.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	64 (44%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	65 (45%)

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

Yes	26 (18%)
No	116 (82%)

**Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release: (please tick all that apply to you.)**

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	16 (11%)	28 (20%)	96 (69%)
Accommodation	17 (12%)	23 (17%)	98 (71%)
Benefits	14 (10%)	21 (16%)	99 (74%)
Finances	15 (11%)	19 (14%)	100 (75%)
Education	16 (12%)	33 (24%)	87 (64%)
Drugs and alcohol	22 (17%)	30 (23%)	81 (61%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
Yes	102 (72%)
No	40 (28%)



## Appendix V: Photographs

### Exercise Yard



### Cellular accommodation on A wing



## Inside of H Wing



## Visits Hall



## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Gartree 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 Gartree 2014	Category B trainer prisons comparator	HMP Gartree 2014	HMP Gartree 2010
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>161</b>	<b>1170</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	3%	1%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	2%	0%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	4%	30%	4%	4%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13%	13%	13%	8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	97%	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.)	33%	31%	33%	32%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	4%	2%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	13%	15%	13%	10%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	21%	22%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	13%	4%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	52%	40%	52%	40%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	38%	49%	38%	54%
<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?	67%	63%	67%	64%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	70%	77%	70%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	15%	12%	15%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	62%	71%	62%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	81%	71%	81%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	66%	74%	61%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	77%	58%	77%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	11%	19%	11%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	89%	87%	89%	87%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	64%	72%	64%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Gartree 2014	Category B trainer prisons comparator	HMP Gartree 2014	HMP Gartree 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	87%	79%	87%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	84%	73%	84%	63%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	42%	60%	42%	51%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	20%	12%	18%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	2%	8%	2%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	3%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	11%	21%	11%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	4%	0%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	9%	13%	9%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	13%	9%	11%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	8%	19%	8%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	12%	17%	12%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	6%	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	6%	21%	6%	12%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	60%	41%	60%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	47%	57%	47%	37%
3.6	A shower?	49%	40%	49%	51%
3.6	A free telephone call?	38%	46%	38%	40%
3.6	Something to eat?	54%	67%	54%	65%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	37%	14%	37%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	45%	49%	45%	
<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?	58%	38%	58%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	69%	59%	69%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	42%	30%	42%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	30%	21%	30%	15%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	61%	49%	61%	28%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	46%	43%	46%	26%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	52%	40%	52%	25%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	45%	40%	45%	20%
3.8	Health services?	59%	52%	59%	30%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	58%	44%	58%	28%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	87%	83%	87%	80%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Gartree 2014	Category B trainer prisons comparator	HMP Gartree 2014	HMP Gartree 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	91%	93%	88%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	78%	66%	78%	56%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	92%	83%	92%	
<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?	59%	60%	59%	62%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	63%	60%	63%	62%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%	12%	12%	6%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	50%	45%	50%	55%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	62%	56%	62%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	85%	69%	85%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	98%	99%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	76%	74%	76%	76%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	68%	80%	68%	78%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	73%	46%	73%	55%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	72%	74%	72%	65%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	40%	33%	40%	50%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	11%	39%	11%	11%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	34%	52%	34%	32%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	65%	64%	50%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	57%	62%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	70%	65%	70%	56%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	62%	47%	62%	
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	86%	86%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	56%	56%	56%	44%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	30%	54%	30%	35%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	74%	68%	74%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	40%	34%	40%	27%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	32%	34%	32%	28%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	17%	20%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	47%	34%	47%	40%
<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?	64%	63%	64%	58%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Gartree 2014	Category B trainer prisons comparator	HMP Gartree 2014	HMP Gartree 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	46%	49%	46%	41%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	4%	4%	5%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	62%	51%	62%	
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	88%	79%	88%	71%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	82%	77%	82%	72%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	36%	54%	36%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	27%	32%	27%	17%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	96%	85%	96%	87%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	71%	67%	71%	50%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	27%	39%	27%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	16%	10%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	23%	25%	23%	25%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	14%	12%	12%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	6%	8%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	25%	14%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	5%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	6%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	4%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	5%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	3%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	6%	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	1%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	28%	28%	35%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Gartree 2014	Category B trainer prisons comparator	HMP Gartree 2014	HMP Gartree 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	11%	12%	20%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	19%	8%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	3%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	6%	5%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	4%	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	5%	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	0%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	3%	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	4%	1%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	5%	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	34%	44%	34%	47%
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	46%	31%	46%	34%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	67%	58%	67%	62%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	27%	13%	27%	6%
	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?	55%	41%	55%	37%
9.2	The nurse?	65%	54%	65%	52%
9.2	The dentist?	58%	43%	58%	37%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	45%	35%	45%	24%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	48%	47%	49%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	89%	94%	89%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	26%	28%	26%	25%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	59%	53%	59%	
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	12%	13%	12%	12%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Gartree 2014	Category B trainer prisons comparator	HMP Gartree 2014	HMP Gartree 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	18%	11%	18%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	37%	28%	37%	31%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	27%	15%	27%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	6%	6%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%	6%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	91%	64%	91%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	76%	58%	76%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	85%	75%	85%	92%
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	52%	60%	52%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	40%	39%	40%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	67%	54%	67%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	16%	30%	16%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	76%	78%	76%	65%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	17%	16%	17%	13%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	36%	35%	36%	36%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	24%	21%	24%	28%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	96%	92%	96%	78%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	44%	47%	44%	44%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	88%	81%	88%	39%
	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?	56%	59%	56%	88%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	96%	89%	96%	68%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	68%	67%	68%	79%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	87%	82%	87%	58%
	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?	66%	56%	66%	83%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	71%	43%	71%	71%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	67%	42%	67%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	50%	48%	50%	43%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	29%	49%	29%	35%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	84%	75%	86%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	16%	18%	16%	13%



## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Gartree 2014	Category B trainer prisons comparator	HMP Gartree 2014	HMP Gartree 2010
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<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?	37%	41%	37%	30%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	46%	38%	46%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	9%	15%	9%	8%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	18%	9%	18%	
<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?	91%	92%	91%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	23%	28%	23%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	49%	39%	49%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	25%	40%	25%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	38%	31%	38%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	91%	84%	91%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	96%	85%	96%	94%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	57%	56%	57%	45%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	34%	41%	34%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	46%	38%	46%	
13.6	Offender manager?	29%	34%	29%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	34%	28%	34%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	23%	19%	23%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	76%	66%	76%	80%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	24%	34%	24%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	16%	18%	16%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	12%	6%	12%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	16%	18%	11%
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?	23%	26%	23%	
13.12	Accommodation?	19%	28%	19%	
13.12	Benefits?	18%	31%	18%	
13.12	Finances?	16%	26%	16%	
13.12	Education?	28%	29%	28%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	27%	28%	27%	
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?	72%	63%	72%	66%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Gartree 2014

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>53</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>136</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	32%	4%			20%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	100%	96%	100%	95%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			81%	26%	95%	23%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	1%	10%	1%	0%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	38%	1%	21%	12%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	26%	24%	22%	25%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	7%	0%	5%	0%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	59%	49%	83%	48%	55%	51%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	77%	62%	76%	65%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	75%	78%	57%	80%	70%	79%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	91%	71%	89%	80%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	88%	67%	87%	65%	87%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	35%	46%	33%	43%	60%	40%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	66%	70%	71%	69%	50%	72%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%	86%	80%	88%	75%	89%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	98%	90%	89%	93%	95%	92%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	60%	60%	48%	61%	63%	59%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	78%	88%	74%	87%	63%	88%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%	95%	99%	100%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	66%	75%	68%	73%	48%	77%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	4%	15%	10%	11%	5%	12%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	16%	44%	5%	39%	5%	39%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	48%	72%	37%	68%	48%	67%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	58%	63%	52%	63%	63%	61%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	72%	68%	55%	72%	84%	68%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	87%	89%	86%	74%	88%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	68%	77%	48%	77%	50%	77%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	55%	68%	63%	64%	45%	66%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	28%	56%	32%	49%	42%	48%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	3%	5%	4%	10%	3%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	86%	89%	74%	90%	80%	89%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	84%	81%	79%	83%	79%	82%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	16%	32%	5%	30%	0%	30%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	98%	95%	100%	96%	100%	95%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	18%	32%	27%	27%	25%	28%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	12%	5%	11%	15%	10%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	16%	27%	27%	23%	16%	25%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	8%	17%	11%	14%	16%	14%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	1%	11%	2%	11%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	1%	5%	2%	11%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	2%	21%	1%	11%	2%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	2%	2%	5%	2%	5%	2%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	42%	20%	42%	26%	60%	22%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	10%	7%	5%	8%	20%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	16%	0%	11%	4%	30%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	10%	0%	5%	3%	25%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	1%	16%	1%	10%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	1%	0%	2%	5%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	38%	50%	39%	47%	16%	51%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	56%	73%	74%	66%	37%	72%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	36%	53%	35%	49%	50%	48%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	22%	29%	30%	26%	37%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	20%	47%	21%	40%	32%	40%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	76%	76%	75%	76%	74%	76%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	12%	19%	15%	17%	16%	17%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	40%	34%	40%	36%	37%	37%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	24%	24%	20%	25%	32%	23%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	80%	66%	70%	71%	79%	70%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	67%	42%	63%	48%	60%	48%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	27%	31%	30%	29%	35%	28%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	80%	72%	74%	76%	74%	75%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	18%	15%	35%	13%	11%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	47%	46%	58%	44%	45%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	8%	10%	0%	11%	5%	10%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Gartree 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

		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>35</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>127</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	15%	13%	6%	15%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	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.)	23%	37%	12%	38%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9%	0%	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	15%	13%	3%	16%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			44%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	4%	10%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	37%	56%	39%	56%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	77%	72%	91%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	68%	80%	70%	79%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	89%	94%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	85%	91%	82%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	72%	34%	39%	43%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	66%	70%	69%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	74%	91%	79%	89%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	93%	84%	95%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	52%	61%	59%	59%

## Key to tables

## Diversity analysis

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	81%	86%	93%	83%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	99%	97%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	72%	73%	84%	70%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	9%	12%	27%	7%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	32%	56%	29%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	65%	72%	63%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	55%	64%	75%	58%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	71%	75%	69%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	87%	91%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	68%	76%	78%	72%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	57%	66%	79%	60%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	47%	58%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	3%	0%	5%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	88%	87%	91%	87%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	72%	85%	88%	81%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	27%	27%	46%	21%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	91%	98%	97%	96%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	22%	25%	28%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	8%	16%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	31%	21%	19%	25%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	22%	11%	12%	14%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	2%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	7%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	9%	1%	7%	2%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	9%	0%	7%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	36%	26%	6%	34%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	6%	8%	3%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	3%	6%	0%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	3%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	2%	3%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	3%	0%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	6%	0%	3%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	43%	48%	66%	41%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	64%	69%	72%	66%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	74%	39%	78%	39%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	50%	20%	25%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	39%	29%	40%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	66%	78%	63%	79%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	19%	19%	16%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	37%	36%	37%	36%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	19%	25%	25%	24%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	59%	75%	59%	74%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	15%	60%	16%	58%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	29%	28%	37%	26%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	55%	81%	75%	75%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9%	17%	19%	15%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	50%	46%	26%	52%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	10%	0%	12%