

Report on a full announced inspection of

HMP/YOI MOORLAND

12 – 16 December 2005

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Crown copyright 2006
ISBN 13: 978 1-84726-011-6
ISBN 10: 1-84726-011-X
Printed and published by:
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
1st Floor, Ashley House
Monck Street
London SW1P 2BQ
England

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary	9
1 Arrival in custody	
<hr/>	
Courts, escorts and transfers	17
First days in custody	18
2 Environment and relationships	
<hr/>	
Residential units	25
Staff-prisoner relationships	28
Personal officers	29
3 Duty of care	
<hr/>	
Bullying	31
Self-harm and suicide	33
Race relations	37
Foreign nationals	39
Family and friends	40
Applications and complaints	43
Legal rights	44
4 Healthcare	47
<hr/>	
5 Activities	
<hr/>	
Education and library provision	61
Work	64
Physical education and health promotion	67
Faith and religious activity	68
Time out of cell	70
6 Good order	
<hr/>	
Security and rules	73
Discipline	76
Incentives and earned privileges	80

7	Services	
	Catering	83
	Prison shop	84
8	Resettlement	
	Resettlement strategy	87
	Sentence and custody planning	88
	Life-sentenced prisoners	90
	Offending behaviour programmes	92
	Reintegration planning	93
	Public protection	95
	Substance use	97
9	Recommendations and good practice	101
	Appendices	
	I Inspection team	i
	II Population profile	ii
	III Summary of prisoners' questionnaires and interviews	xxi

Introduction

Moorland is a complicated prison: it has two sites, one a closed training prison for adults and young offenders, and the other an open prison, some miles away, which also houses adults and young offenders. In addition, the closed prison holds some serious offenders, including young people who have been disruptive elsewhere, and life sentenced prisoners. It is to the credit of the governor and her team that this inspection found that the prison was, overall, performing satisfactorily, although a number of areas required further improvement.

Despite the challenges posed by this complexity, both Moorland open and Moorland closed prisons were essentially safe. Reception, first night arrangements and induction at the two sites were basic but adequate. The shared suicide and self-harm prevention and anti-bullying arrangements functioned satisfactorily, although managers needed to review whether the generic policies satisfactorily addressed all the different needs of the two sites. There was also scope to improve the use of security intelligence at Moorland closed prison, and a need to be more transparent about the reasons why prisoners were returned from open to closed conditions.

Staff-prisoner relations varied and the personal officer scheme was under-developed. The quality of accommodation was also variable; for example access to phones was inadequate for young offenders in Moorland open and many showers across the whole prison lacked privacy. We were concerned at the spartan conditions for those on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme at Moorland closed prison, which appeared to be more restrictive than those for prisoners undergoing punishment in the segregation unit. While race relations were well managed, the needs of foreign nationals were not. The prison's faith provision, legal services and healthcare all required improvement.

Since our last inspection, there had been an expansion in the number of prisoners purposefully employed at Moorland closed prison, although recording of time out of cell was misleading. Opportunities for gaining vocational accreditation at both sites were being missed, particularly at the open site. Education provision was generally sound, although provision for non-English speakers was under-developed.

Resettlement and reintegration activities were satisfactory; however the resettlement strategy was not based on a recent needs analysis. Consequently, there were insufficient offending behaviour and substance abuse programme places to meet apparent need. Moorland closed prison also suffered from a serious backlog of OASys assessments, which inhibited sentence planning. Moorland open prison had a well-established programme to enable appropriate prisoners to work or study in the community as part of their preparation for release.

Overall, Moorland continues to deliver a generally safe, purposeful and resettlement-orientated regime. This is commendable, given the mix of types and ages of prisoners, the range of needs that they present and the variety of accommodation in which they are held. We have identified a number of areas for further improvement. In particular, managers need to be vigilant that they do not allow a one size fits all approach to infiltrate the policies and practices of the two very different sites, both holding different populations.

Anne Owers
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

May 2006

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Moorland closed: YOI & category C training prison

Moorland open: YOI & category D resettlement prison

Area organisation

Yorkshire & Humberside

Number held

Closed YOI: 314

Open YOI: 45

Closed adult: 451

Open adult: 179

Certified normal accommodation

Closed: 770

Open: 260

Operational capacity

Closed: 791

Open: 260

Last inspection

Full:

Closed: 2001

Open: 1999

Unannounced:

Closed: Dec 2002

Brief history

HMP & YOI Moorland closed prison is a 2 split site, housing young offenders including restricted and E list status and life-sentenced prisoners. Adult category C includes a number of score 3 prisoners and prisoners who pose a risk to less secure category C prisons, usually prisoners who have been involved in incidents. Moorland closed also has a healthcare centre that provides in-patient services for HMP Lindholme and patients from Moorland closed and open.

HMP & YOI Moorland open prison is also a split site with a large proportion being adult prisoners who work outside the establishment. A percentage of young offenders work outside the establishment but most are short-term sentences.

Description of residential units

Closed site

Houseblocks 1 and 2: Convicted adult prisoners; houseblock 2: location of basic regime

Houseblock 3: Convicted young offenders

Houseblock 4: Convicted young offenders, basic regime

Houseblock 5: Two wings. All enhanced adult prisoners

Open site

A Unit: 60 adult prisoners

B Unit: 60 adult prisoners

C Unit: 60 YOI prisoners, normally short-term sentence but do have 2% of outworkers

D Unit: 40 adult prisoners – outwork unit

E Unit: 40 adult prisoners – outwork unit

Healthy prison summary

Introduction

- HP1 All inspection reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is Everyone's Concern*, published in 1999. The criteria are:
- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Safety | prisoners, even the most vulnerable, are held safely |
| Respect | prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity |
| Purposeful activity | prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them |
| Resettlement | prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending |

- HP2 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service (NOMS).

...performing well against this healthy prison test.

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

...performing reasonably well against this healthy prison test.

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

...not performing sufficiently well against this healthy prison test.

There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

...performing poorly against this healthy prison test.

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

Safety

- HP3 Admissions arrangements at Moorland closed prison were unwelcoming and too process-driven but first days' arrangements were otherwise adequate. Suicide and self-harm were well managed on both sites and, although there were procedural

weaknesses in the area of anti-bullying, outcomes for prisoners were not being adversely affected. Few prisoners sought protection and our survey data and observations indicated that most prisoners did not feel unsafe. Overall, we found that the prison was performing reasonably well against this test of a healthy prison.

- HP4 While we were satisfied that Moorland open's admission procedures covered all the essential issues, more use could have been made of a trained prisoner to contribute to the process. At Moorland closed, the emphasis was on completing the process at the expense of responding to the expressed needs of the prisoners. New arrivals could not make a telephone call and some were sceptical that staff had made one on their behalf as offered. Holding rooms were bare and stark, with nothing for prisoners to do.
- HP5 All prisoners arriving at Moorland closed prison were seen by first night staff. All new young adults were allocated to houseblock 3 where they had evening association only if their landing was scheduled for it. Adults were allocated to one of two houseblocks.
- HP6 Induction on both sites began the day after reception and involved dedicated induction staff and specialist resources. All new arrivals took part in an anti-bullying programme as part of induction.
- HP7 There had been around 150 incidents of self-harm at Moorland closed prison in the previous year, with most accounted for by 11 individuals. Good quality entries were made on self-harm records and review meetings were held on time. Listeners were well supported.
- HP8 The prison's anti-bullying strategy was effectively supported by the accredited anti-bullying programme. Five prisoners were subject to formal anti-bullying arrangements at the time of our inspection and few prisoners were seeking protection. The violence reduction officer was energetic in pursuing the role but not all key information was passed to him.
- HP9 Trends in security intelligence reports were monitored but were not effectively compared with the outcomes in terms of assaults, drug finds or other incidents. Searching following intelligence was frequently cancelled. Gaps in the pattern of mandatory drug testing at Moorland closed (see paragraph HP15) may have meant that the figure reported was lower than the actual usage in the establishment.
- HP10 Security matters in Moorland open were well managed. We had some concerns about the transparency of the grounds for some of the transfers of prisoners back to closed conditions, which did not always appear to be chiefly for reasons of security risk.
- HP11 No segregated accommodation was used at Moorland open. The segregated accommodation at Moorland closed was clean, although there was a lot of graffiti in cells. Relationships between staff and prisoners in the segregation unit were good and staff were clear about prisoners' individual special needs.
- HP12 Records showed that force had been applied 170 times at Moorland closed in the previous year. Examination of a sample indicated that around a fifth could have been de-escalated by better incident management and there was no proactive management of the process. The special cell was not over-used but a significant number of the records did not make clear why such use had been necessary. There were no examples of use of force at Moorland open.

- HP13 The number of adjudications was high at both sites. These were well managed but some charges seemed to have been laid when use of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme might have been preferable.
- HP14 The establishment offered no formal drug detoxification programme, and relied instead on received prisoners having been detoxed prior to transfer. There were plans for maintenance programmes to be extended to Moorland to enable transfers from local prisons. While we supported this proposal in principle, the establishment would struggle to provide effective clinical oversight at present.
- HP15 Mandatory drug testing was in place, with effective targeted testing at Moorland open. Inconsistent weekend testing arrangements at Moorland closed cast some doubt on the accuracy of the low (4% positive) test results recorded.

Respect

- HP16 Both prison environments were reasonably well maintained but some cells converted for double use were of poor quality. The basic level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme at Moorland closed prison was in some key respects poorer than the regime for segregated prisoners. Race matters were well managed at both sites, although these procedures did not command great confidence among prisoners. The provision of legal services was weak at both sites, as were services to foreign national prisoners. Arrangements for catering, the shop and health services were adequate overall. Moorland was not performing sufficiently well against this test of a healthy prison.
- HP17 Most cells and communal areas were clean, although there was some littering outside the young adult unit at Moorland closed. The grounds at Moorland open were maintained to a high standard and had received an award from the local authority. There were enough telephones at Moorland closed to meet expectations but this was not the case in the three older units at Moorland open.
- HP18 The number of showers was adequate but few on either site offered any privacy.
- HP19 The IEP scheme commanded little confidence among prisoners. Prisoners at Moorland closed did not attend review boards.
- HP20 At Moorland closed, the regime for prisoners on the basic level, who were denied daily access to showers and telephones, was too restrictive. Interventions were available for young adults placed on basic for bullying but other basic prisoners had few opportunities to prove they were ready to progress to standard level.
- HP21 Some of the staff dealings with prisoners that we observed, particularly at the closed site, were too formal and remote. By contrast, we also saw and heard staff demonstrating care for prisoners and a capacity to respond flexibly when required, although this was rarely recorded in wing history sheets. Staff contributions to sentence management processes were limited and the role of the personal officer scheme was not made clear or supported by specific training.
- HP22 The prison shop provided a broadly adequate service but prisoners could experience delays in making their initial purchases depending on which day they arrived.

- HP23 Some prisoners at Moorland closed complained about the cold sandwich lunches, which they felt were repetitive and unimaginative. The evening meals were satisfactory.
- HP24 The strong race relations management team had prisoner representation and monitored key data across the prison. The number of racist incident reports submitted was relatively low at both sites and complainants were not usually responded to formally at the conclusion of the process. Support groups for black and minority ethnic prisoners and travellers were in place. However staff needed to investigate why, in our survey, many black and minority ethnic prisoners reported negatively on their experience at Moorland.
- HP25 No assessment was made of the needs of foreign national prisoners, of whom there were 29 at the time of this inspection. The only member of staff with responsibility for this area had been on sick leave for many months and services had suffered as a result.
- HP26 Weekly Anglican and Roman Catholic services were held at each site. Prisoners led Muslim prayers every other week as the imam alternated his attendance. Unfortunately the chaplaincy was under-resourced and this limited the range of services available.
- HP27 Legal services at Moorland closed were under-resourced, resulting in many applications being heavily delayed or not attended to.
- HP28 Effective systems were in place at both sites to manage the high number of recorded complaints. National targets for response times were being achieved.
- HP29 There was little evidence that the primary care trust was having a positive impact on healthcare across the prison and this was reflected in a service that was increasingly falling behind current standards. Prisoner perception of the quality of healthcare was not good. There were some good examples of chronic disease management and sexual health services were strong. Primary mental health provision was weak and the regime for in-patients was poor.

Purposeful activity

HP30 There had been substantial progress in this area, with many more prisoners in Moorland closed now working. Education services were mostly well delivered but there were too few accredited training opportunities in the industrial workshops and physical education at both sites. Overall, the prison was performing reasonably well against this test of a healthy prison.

HP31 More prisoners were now in employment in Moorland closed. Thirteen industrial contract workshops provided good work but this was not accredited despite the good facilities available. Good use was made of prisoners trained in industrial cleaning to help train staff and new recruits. Prisoners were trained to become assessors with the assistance of a member of staff. NVQs were gained in the kitchen, where prisoners attended training for 28 hours a week. Prisoners were encouraged to progress to NVQ level 2. Moorland open did not offer enough vocational employment-related training to meet resettlement needs. Work available at Moorland closed was not

accredited and the vocational training programmes needed to be increased to meet geographical skills shortages.

- HP32 At Moorland open prison, 29 prisoners were on the task force project (a preliminary to moving on to paid work) and 39 were in paid employment. Up to 100 prisoners could be accepted on outworking arrangements. A 75-mile radius for work placements was considered acceptable in order to facilitate continuity of employment after release.
- HP33 Employer checks were adequate and attention was paid to key issues including minimum wage legislation, health and safety issues and race awareness and diversity. Shift working was permitted and prisoners working outside the prison could see key resettlement staff in the evening. Prisoners working out were required to wear distinctive clothing.
- HP34 The education programme at both sites provided a good range, with progression available to higher levels. There was a good record of achievement of qualifications. Provision of teaching of English for speakers of other languages was under-developed.
- HP35 Library facilities at Moorland open were good with open access. Most prisoners at Moorland closed could access the library twice a week. Facilities were adequate but browsing time was limited. Computer facilities were available for those on IT courses.
- HP36 Both sites offered good opportunities to participate in the physical education programme but no accredited or vocational courses were available.
- HP37 Recording of the time prisoners spent out of cell was inflated by the system used, which made assumptions about participation in exercise periods. When we checked one midweek afternoon, 228 prisoners in Moorland closed were locked up. We concluded that employed prisoners might spend up to 8.5 hours out of cell while unemployed prisoners could get as little as 2.25 hours. The recording system did not adequately reflect this range.

Resettlement

HP38 There had been a welcome emphasis on resettlement across the prison. Arrangements to provide accommodation and employment advice were in place at both sites. Most of our surveys indicated acceptable levels of prisoner awareness of the existence of these services. Policies did not, however, reflect any recent assessment of need and risked ignoring key issues. Overall, the prison was performing reasonably well against this test of a healthy prison.

- HP39 The resettlement strategy needed urgent revision on the basis of an up to date needs analysis linked to regional strategies. Interventions needed to be determined on the basis of effective sentence planning, particularly offender assessment system (OASys) assessments.
- HP40 A sizeable number of OASys assessments were still overdue at Moorland closed prison. A number related to prisoners received from the contractually managed establishment at Doncaster, which had not been contracted to contribute to the OASys process.

- HP41 There was a significant disparity between the number of referrals to offending behaviour programmes at Moorland closed and the capacity of the establishment to meet this demand. There was a risk that prisoners serving longer terms could be disadvantaged in gaining early release if they were unable to demonstrate any reduction in reoffending risks.
- HP42 The reintegration needs of Moorland open prisoners working out were well organised. A generic assessment panel identified those who had too little time left to serve to progress to outworking and ensured that links with housing and employment advice were made. Well-integrated services at Moorland closed offered advice in key resettlement issues and our surveys indicated that these were well understood by prisoners.
- HP43 Forty-five young adults had indeterminate sentences. Annual reviews were well conducted and arrangements for the induction of new arrivals were good. Attempts were made to encourage family members to contribute to planning effective use of time in custody.
- HP44 The senior probation officer coordinated public protection arrangements at Moorland closed. Effective systems to identify persistent and prolific offenders on reception were in place. Over 240 prisoners were subject to some form of risk management restrictions but residential staff were not routinely aware of the nature of these issues.
- HP45 For some in Moorland closed, particularly young adults, access to telephones could be unpredictable because of frequent changes to evening association. Visiting arrangements were generally good in Moorland closed. The visits area was relaxed and staff supervision was unobtrusive. Closed visits arrangements remained poor and visitor searching took place in a very public area. Despite this, visitors described their treatment by staff as good.
- HP46 At Moorland open, visits were relaxed with no requirement to book ahead. Many prisoners took the opportunity to have visits in the community.
- HP47 The drugs strategy lacked coordination and there was no dedicated strategy manager. There was no current policy to assist with alcohol dependency and not enough was being done in the area of relapse prevention.

Main recommendations

- HP48 **A coherent and distinct foreign nationals policy should be developed and implemented across the prison.**
- HP49 **Opportunities should be taken across the prison to accredit work skills to improve opportunities for employment.**
- HP50 **There should be more vocational employment-related training to meet resettlement needs at Moorland open.**
- HP51 **The resettlement strategy should be re-written and based on an up to date needs analysis of the population. The distinct needs of the various sectors of the prison population should be identified and addressed.**

HP52 A health needs and staff skills analysis should be conducted to identify and inform recruitment of sufficient staff with the appropriate skills and competencies. Emphasis on the recruitment of psychiatric and learning disability nurses should be a priority.

Section 1: Arrival in custody

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners travel in safe, decent conditions to and from court and between prisons. During movement the individual needs of prisoners are recognised and given proper attention.

- 1.1 Escort and reception staff enjoyed a good relationship. There was no official policy on transferring prisoners from Moorland open back to closed conditions, and prisoners felt that staff used fear of being returned to Moorland closed to manage even minor misdemeanours.

Moorland closed

- 1.2 Escort staff complained to us that they were kept waiting at reception for up to 40 minutes while all prisoners were removed from the van. This was because all new arrivals were part-processed before other prisoners were unloaded.
- 1.3 On average, 30 prisoners a week were received at Moorland closed.

Moorland open

- 1.4 In the three months before this inspection, 27 prisoners had been transferred from Moorland closed to Moorland open but 44 prisoners had been transferred the other way. Prisoners we met at Moorland open were genuinely fearful that they would be moved back to Moorland closed for any small misdemeanour or disagreement with staff or on the basis of security suspicion. There was no protocol for when a prisoner would be moved between the two establishments.
- 1.5 On average, 15 prisoners a week were received at Moorland open.

Both sites

- 1.6 The escorting contract was provided by Global Solutions Limited. The relationship between escort and prison staff was good, and established working practices were in place.
- 1.7 The head of operations had been in post for only about seven weeks but had already met twice with the prisoner escorting contractors group. No major issues of concern had been raised at these meetings.
- 1.8 The escort vehicles we checked were clean and any rubbish was removed from each cubicle as soon as the prisoner had left it. Prisoner escort records were well completed. Prisoners were offered food and drink at regular intervals and comfort breaks were offered, even though many of the prisoners we saw arriving had not had excessive journeys. In our

survey, only 3% of respondents, against a comparator of 12%¹, said they had spent over four hours in the escort van.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 1.9 Reception procedures at Moorland closed should be reviewed to minimise the delay to other prisoners on escorting vehicles.

Moorland open

- 1.10 A clear protocol for transferring prisoners from Moorland open to Moorland closed should be established and made available to prisoners.

First days in custody

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners feel safe on their reception into prison and for the first few days. Their individual needs, both during and after custody, are identified and plans developed to provide help. During induction prisoners are made aware of prison routines, how to access available services and how to cope with imprisonment.

- 1.11 The reception building at Moorland closed was cold and unwelcoming and the experience of prisoners was process-driven. Prisoners could spend a long time in reception with nothing to do before being located on the residential units. A first night officer post had been created and all new receptions were given basic information about the prison on the night of their arrival. The reception at Moorland open was much less formal and prisoners spent on average only an hour in reception before being located to the residential units. First night procedures were less structured, although prisoners to whom we spoke had been seen by a member of staff. Induction for prisoners on both sites started the day after reception and was coordinated by dedicated staff.

Reception

Moorland closed

- 1.12 The reception at Moorland closed was open each weekday during the core day and on weekend mornings. Approximately 30 new prisoners were received each week with around the same number being released or transferred elsewhere. The reception area was staffed by one senior officer, two officers and an operational support grade supported by two prisoner orderlies.

¹ The comparator figure is calculated by aggregating all survey responses together and so is not an average across establishments.

- 1.13 The reception building was clean and reasonably decorated but cold and unwelcoming. All new arrivals were met by the reception senior officer, who checked their warrant and other relevant paperwork before completing a locally devised reception checklist. This required staff to ask pertinent questions of new arrivals, such as whether this was their first time in custody, whether they could read or write and whether they had any immediate problems. However, these questions were read through as a 'checklist' by reception staff in the sight and hearing of other staff and prisoners. As such, there was little opportunity for a prisoner to discuss any fear or concerns he may have had. It was also not clear that all staff fully understood why they were asking the questions. We saw one prisoner who had said he could not read or write being given a typed sheet of information explaining the personal identification number telephone system and told to read it thoroughly. There were no special procedures for prisoners who could not read or write or for whom English was not their first language. Staff were not prompted to make further checks on the well-being of prisoners who said it was their first time in custody, or to explain the process in a less jargon-filled way.
- 1.14 The induction officer attended reception every day and undertook the cell-sharing risk assessment. The interviews took place in the main reception room in the sight and hearing of staff and prisoners.
- 1.15 Prisoners in reception at meal times were given something to eat but those we met complained that they had not been offered a hot drink despite being held in reception for several hours.
- 1.16 Prisoners spent a long time in reception, partly because a member of healthcare staff was not available until the afternoon. We met one prisoner who was still in reception after five hours and another two who had been there for four and a half hours. The holding rooms were bare, with nothing to occupy prisoners while they waited. Boxes to hold televisions had been made but these were not installed until later in the inspection week. Once the reception process was completed, new arrivals were collected by induction staff and taken to the relevant houseblock.

Moorland open

- 1.17 The reception at Moorland open was small but adequate. Staff told us that about 15 new receptions were received each week. Reception also dealt with up to 40 prisoners being released on temporary licence for town visits. The holding room was small but contained relevant notices and a small selection of books for prisoners to read.
- 1.18 The reception process was much less formal than at Moorland closed. Prisoners spoke highly of reception staff and how they were dealt with. This was reflected in the results of our survey, in which 85% of respondents, against a comparator of 75%, said they had been treated well or very well. Prisoners were not held in reception for excessive periods (usually up to an hour) before being taken to the residential units. They were escorted by the prisoner orderly who pointed out key facilities en route.

Both sites

- 1.19 Neither prison made formal use of prisoners in the reception process to help new arrivals settle in.

- 1.20 All new arrivals were offered a smoker's or non-smoker's reception pack to the value of £4. Both included a £2 telephone credit but this could not be used until the prisoner's personal identification telephone number (PIN) had been activated, usually the following day. The cost of the pack was recouped at a rate of 50 pence a week. Prisoners could order from the prison shop only on the same day as the rest of the establishment, which could mean waiting up to 13 days.

First night

Moorland closed

- 1.21 A post of first night officer had been created and a member of staff was on duty from 5.15pm to 8.30pm each weekday and on Saturday mornings. The first night officer saw all new arrivals on their first night to check their well-being and ensure they had been able to shower on the residential unit. The officer also checked that prisoners had received basic information about the induction programme, could offer the facility of the duty Listener and was available to answer any immediate concerns. Staff offered to contact someone on the prisoner's behalf to inform them of their whereabouts but prisoners were not given the opportunity to make a short call themselves. The association rota for young adults meant that, dependent on their day of arrival, they could spend their first night locked up rather than being able to familiarise themselves with staff and the residential unit.

Moorland open

- 1.22 Arrangements for a prisoner's first night were less structured than at Moorland closed. All new receptions were given a brief information pack on their first night containing unit rules, a free letter and information on violence reduction, the telephone system and the role of the Independent Monitoring Board. The first night officer tasks fell to reception and induction staff if the prisoner was received during the main day or to the one unit member of staff if the prisoner was received later in the afternoon and induction staff were unavailable. However, all the prisoners to whom we spoke said they had been spoken to by a member of staff, given the opportunity to discuss their concerns and told about the basic rules and routines of the prison. All were aware of what was planned for the following day and when they were due to start their induction course.

Both sites

- 1.23 Young adults spending their first night at both sites were located on one identified unit but adult prisoners could be located on one of two units. As such, it was not always easy for staff to identify which prisoners were spending their first night in Moorland and no specific first night support arrangements were in place unless a prisoner had been identified as posing a risk of suicide or self-harm.

Induction

Moorland closed

- 1.24 Induction started the day after reception. The two-week rolling induction programme covered a range of topics including prison-based information, resettlement, education and work

issues. Four trained induction staff from a pool of 12 were on duty each weekday. They coordinated and delivered the majority of modules, with staff from specialist departments contributing to certain sessions.

- 1.25 An induction presentation had recently been produced and was due to be put on the information channel available on the in-cell television system. Plans were also in place to record a voiceover to assist prisoners with poor literacy skills.

Moorland open

- 1.26 In our survey, 96% of respondents from Moorland open, significantly higher than the comparator of 86%, said they had been on an induction course in their first week. An induction member of staff was on duty each weekday and started the induction process off with a one-to-one interview with the prisoner to identify any areas of concern or need. The induction course was delivered in a dedicated classroom on unit C. This contained information and literature for prisoners, although some of it was considerably out of date.
- 1.27 The induction course was scheduled to last one week, with a second week dedicated to all prisoners completing a recently introduced preparation for work course. Prisoners completing the course gained an Open College Network 'developing skills for gaining employment' qualification. Prisoners complained to us about the content of the course and did not feel they gained much from the experience. The course covered topics such as preparing a CV, completing a job application and interview preparation but the curriculum did not offer the appropriate level of flexibility to respond to individual prisoners' needs.

Both sites

- 1.28 The reception checklist was in operation at both sites and followed the individual prisoner through the reception and induction process. This listed all modules of the induction course and staff initialled and dated these to indicate that a prisoner had received that session. Completed reception/induction checklists were then filed in prisoners' wing history sheets.
- 1.29 We reviewed a number of history sheets, which showed that prisoners were undertaking the induction course. However, no survey had been undertaken to ascertain from prisoners whether the content and delivery style of the programme met their needs. In our survey, 56% of respondents, slightly lower than the already low comparator of 59%, said the induction course covered everything they needed to know. Prisoners at Moorland open responded much more favourably, with 80% of respondents, against a comparator of 60%, saying it covered everything they needed to know.
- 1.30 Across both sites, no information was available to prisoners whose first language was not English and no information tapes were provided for prisoners who could not read the information.
- 1.31 All prisoners were also expected to attend a week-long accredited anti-bullying course delivered by education staff (see section on bullying).

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 1.32 Notices and information should be on display in the holding rooms at Moorland closed. There should be items available to help keep prisoners occupied while held there.
- 1.33 Prisoners at Moorland closed should not be held in reception for excessive periods.
- 1.34 All prisoners should be unlocked on their first evening at Moorland closed.
- 1.35 The information channel on the in-cell television should be used to communicate key information to all newly arrived prisoners.

Moorland open

- 1.36 Formal first night arrangements should be introduced for prisoners at Moorland open.
- 1.37 The curriculum of the preparation for work course offered to all prisoners at Moorland open should be flexible to meet individual requirements.

Both sites

- 1.38 All reception, first night and induction staff should be given guidance on how prisoners who cannot read or write, who are new to custody or who cannot speak English should be managed.
- 1.39 All information provided to prisoners in reception and on induction should be available in audio format and in languages other than English.
- 1.40 All prisoners should be able to access the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival.
- 1.41 All assessments conducted on a prisoner at the reception stage should be done in private offering the prisoner ample opportunity to raise any concerns or fears he may have.
- 1.42 Prisoner Insiders should be used to provide information to newly arrived prisoners.
- 1.43 All prisoners should be able to make a private telephone call on their first night.
- 1.44 Prisoners spending their first night at either site should be instantly identifiable to all staff.

Housekeeping points

Moorland open

- 1.45 Information available to prisoners during induction should be up to date and accurate.

- 1.46 Research should be carried out in to how effective prisoners find the information provided during induction.

Section 2: Environment and relationships

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.

2.1 Some cells designed for one prisoner at Moorland closed were being shared. In many cells and communal areas, there were poor levels of decoration but a planned painting programme was underway. A number of cells had broken or missing furniture and there was delay in repair and replacement. Records indicated that cell call bells were answered promptly. Apart from on three units, there were insufficient telephones. There was clear written policy preventing offensive displays but also an unofficial policy to ban football related material. At Moorland closed, all cells had integral sanitation and the purpose built double cells were provided with screening. Those cells which had been more recently been converted from singles to doubles were not provided with screening. Moorland open was clean and tidy and the grounds were extremely well maintained. Lavatory facilities were adequate but there were no partitions in the showers.

Moorland closed

- 2.2 The normal accommodation at Moorland closed was in five houseblocks. Four of these were accessed from a secure corridor and were galleried, formed of three spurs, each with three landings. The fifth houseblock had been built later and alone, with cells arranged on three levels on either side of a main gallery.
- 2.3 Each of the original houseblocks was designed to hold 155 prisoners, with 78 prisoners sharing cells. These shared cells had separate washing and toilet facilities, while in single cells the toilet and wash basin was in the cell. In houseblock 1, 12 single cells had been certified to be shared by two prisoners and there were 15 such cells in houseblocks 2 and 4.
- 2.4 The living accommodation and communal areas were fit for purpose when used as originally intended. However, the single cells used for two prisoners were cramped with little or no privacy.
- 2.5 In our survey of Moorland closed, only 40% of respondents, significantly lower than the comparator of 51%, said their cell call bell was answered within five minutes. We did not observe any undue delays and the cell call system computer records were well within the five-minute response time. Senior managers also checked response times and kept records on each houseblock.
- 2.6 Houseblocks 1 to 4 had only six telephones each, giving a ratio of less than 1:25 against our expectation of 1:20. There were sufficient telephones on houseblock 5 (a ratio of 1:15).

Moorland open

- 2.7 The accommodation at Moorland open comprised five separate units. A, B and C units had been built in the 1960s and provided 60 rooms each on three levels. Prisoners were not locked in at night and had their own privacy keys. D and E units had been built much more recently and provided 40 rooms each on two levels, with en suite facilities. No prisoners in the open part of the prison had to share a room.
- 2.8 There were sufficient telephones in D and E units on Moorland open (1:20). On A, B and C units, the ratio was only 1:30 and only two of the telephones were available after 8pm.

Both sites

- 2.9 A number cells had missing or damaged furniture and required redecoration. We were told that broken furniture was being repaired in one of the prison workshops and that new furniture could easily be ordered from the Prison Service Stores but that there were delays in any new or repaired furniture that had to be fixed in cell. The works department had a programme to do this work as well as the repainting programme.
- 2.10 Many cells had no notice board but prisoners were able to display posters, pictures and photographs on a designated area of the cell wall. There was a clear policy on what constituted offensive material, including sexist and racist items, and this was explained in writing to each prisoner at induction. Prisoners also told us that they were not allowed to display football posters or the St George flag. Some staff told us that this was not the case, where others accepted that it was an unofficial policy.
- 2.11 Notices were displayed on all houseblocks and units and there was a good range of information about routines, the shop, facilities and other issues important to prisoners' lives.

Hygiene, clothing and possessions

Moorland closed

- 2.12 All cells had integral sanitation. None of the cells on the newest houseblock (5) was doubled and meals could be eaten outside the cell. On that unit, showering facilities were well provided in individual stalls. In the other units, there were adequate numbers of showers and the water when tested ran warm enough. None of these showers was screened. Some of the cells on each of the original houseblocks (1-4) had been built as double cells and were provided with screening from the lavatory area.
- 2.13 It had also been necessary to double some of the cells designed for single occupancy. These had no screening from the lavatory area and were cramped with no privacy. Both cell occupants had to eat all their meals in these cells, which was unacceptable.
- 2.14 The prison was clean and tidily maintained, although there was litter outside one of the young adult units during part of our stay.
- 2.15 Prisoners in Moorland closed could wear their own clothes and laundry facilities were available on the houseblocks.

Moorland open

- 2.16 All prisoners in Moorland open had adequate single rooms. There was no integral sanitation but there were sufficient communal facilities that prisoners could access at night as required. We were told that young adults had to request permission to use the toilets, which was unnecessary. Communal showers were available but were not screened from each other.
- 2.17 The grounds of Moorland open were maintained to a very high standard and had won local prizes for their quality. We saw no litter and prisoners and staff clearly took pride in the appearance.
- 2.18 Laundry facilities were in need of updating. Prisoners could not wear their own clothes other than on their units and this was a source of irritation. Prisoners leaving the prison to participate in community projects were required to wear distinctive clothing which some found demeaning. A new bagging system for swapping prison kit on a one-for-one basis had recently been introduced and so far this appeared successful.

Both sites

- 2.19 Although there were a large number of complaints relating to property, the majority appeared to relate to the slow processing of money and property missing on transfer.
- 2.20 A facilities list was available in reception and prisoners generally appeared to know what they could have in their possession. When passing through reception, all prisoners were subject to volumetric control, and examination of prisoners' cells did not demonstrate any significant variation from this.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 2.21 Cells designed for single occupation should not be shared. While they are shared, effective lavatory screening should be provided.
- 2.22 Showers on units 1-4 at Moorland closed should be provided with screening.

Moorland open

- 2.23 Young adults at Moorland open should be subject to the same rules about accessing lavatories at night as adult prisoners.
- 2.24 Showers at Moorland open should be provided with screening.

Both sites

- 2.25 Cell furniture should be maintained and new or repaired items should be reinstated promptly.
- 2.26 All cells and rooms should be decorated to a satisfactory standard.

2.27 Cells should have notice boards.

2.28 The official offensive displays policy should be enforced across the prison.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are treated respectfully by staff, throughout the duration of their custodial sentence, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions. Healthy prisons should demonstrate a well-ordered environment in which the requirements of 'security', 'control' and 'justice' are balanced and in which all members of the prison community are safe and treated with fairness.

2.29 Over 60% of all prisoners surveyed felt that most staff treated them with respect. While observing no blatantly disrespectful behaviour, we did find some examples of outdated and inappropriate behaviour or language. Some staff adopted a distant and purely supervisory approach towards prisoners. Others demonstrated real care and provided necessary support to individual prisoners, although this was not always reflected in written records. Opportunities to involve prisoners or give them extra responsibilities were not always exploited.

Both sites

2.30 In our survey, the number of prisoners who felt that most staff treated them with respect was close to the comparators for similar prisons, ranging from 64% (young adults/open prison) to 78% (adult prisoners/closed prison). The results for black and minority ethnic adult prisoners (closed prison) were the worst, with only 56% feeling they were treated with respect (see section on race relations). We observed no instances of staff treating or referring to prisoners in a blatantly disrespectful way but, as at our last inspection, we found examples of outdated and inappropriate language and behaviour. Prisoners were almost universally addressed or referred to by their surname alone, the serving of meals continued to be called 'feeding' and on at least one residential unit, a hand bell was rung to mark the end of association.

2.31 There was still evidence of some staff adopting a distant and formal relationship with prisoners with a focus on supervision rather than active engagement. In our survey, less than 15% of prisoners at Moorland closed, significantly lower than the comparator, said staff spoke to them most or all of the time during association. From our observations, the level of contact between staff and prisoners was variable and often relied on the prisoner making the initial approach.

2.32 On the other hand, we did find examples of staff demonstrating real care and concern for individual prisoners and trying to respond to their needs in the most appropriate and sensitive way. From discussions with staff, it was clear that some knew a great deal about the circumstances of certain prisoners and had made considerable effort to address their problems and provide them with necessary support. Unfortunately, these levels of knowledge and effort were rarely reflected in written entries in prisoner wing history sheets and were therefore at risk of going unrecorded and unrecognised.

2.33 Moorland closed provided few opportunities for prisoners to contribute to decision-making processes for relevant areas, such as incentives and earned privileges (IEP) and sentence planning boards. Little use was made of prisoners willing to take on the extra responsibility of

helping and advising other prisoners in a range of settings (e.g. mentoring and resettlement advisors.)

Recommendations

Both sites

- 2.34 Management expectations about appropriate behaviour and use of language should be made known to staff and monitored.
- 2.35 Prisoners should participate in sentence planning boards and incentives and earned privileges reviews and be used as Insiders and employment and resettlement advisors.

Personal officers

Expected outcome:

Prisoners' relationships with their personal officers are based on mutual respect, high expectations and support.

- 2.36 The re-launched personal officer policy had improved standardisation but failed to produce an effective personal officer scheme. The policy document was unhelpfully vague and had not been supported by appropriate training or guidance for staff. Links between the scheme and sentence planning were weak. Regular entries were made in wing history sheets but the quality of these was poor. Overall, the proportion of prisoners who rated their personal officer as helpful or very helpful was significantly worse than the comparator, although over 60% of prisoners did have a member of staff they could turn to for help.

Both sites

- 2.37 Re-launched during 2005, the personal officer policy had helped to standardise how the scheme was applied. However, staff and managers acknowledged that it was not particularly effective. Staff at Moorland closed told us they were not allocated enough time to complete personal officer tasks, while those at Moorland open said low staffing levels made it more likely that a prisoner would speak to whichever member of staff was on duty rather than wait for his personal officer. The policy document supported both these viewpoints as it stated, in bold, 'If a personal officer is not present on a particular day it falls to the landing officer to complete this work' and 'the underpinning message of the system must be that every officer is a personal officer'. The policy was unhelpfully vague and did not provide the structured support to prisoners that we would expect to find in training and open prisons.
- 2.38 The policy document did not contain any detailed guidance on how to fulfil the requirements of the role. Apart from some on-the-job coaching by middle managers, staff had received no training on subjects such as interview techniques, report writing, motivational interviewing or pro-social modelling.
- 2.39 Most staff to whom we spoke knew the requirements of the scheme and specifically that, where possible, the personal officer would take responsibility for writing any reports on their

prisoners. Although the policy recognised that, if used correctly, the scheme could influence sentence planning, the actual links with sentence planning were weak. None of the officers to whom we spoke knew what their prisoners' sentence planning targets were. Generally, weekly entries were being made in prisoners' wing history sheets but these were usually in the form of a stamp with little or no additional information.

- 2.40 With the exception of young adults at Moorland open, the percentages of prisoners who had met their personal officer in the first week and who rated their personal officer as helpful or very helpful were significantly below the comparators. However, between 64% (adult/closed) and 75% (adult/open) said they had a member of staff they could turn to for help if they had a problem.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 2.41 The personal officer policy should contain a clearer description of what is required of a personal officer and be supported by appropriate training or written guidance to assist staff in undertaking the role.
- 2.42 The personal officer scheme should be integrated with the sentence planning process.
- 2.43 The quality of wing history sheet entries should be improved and should reflect face-to-face contact with the prisoner.

Section 3: Duty of care

Bullying

Expected outcome:

Everyone feels safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Active and fair systems to prevent and respond to bullying behaviour are known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and inform all aspects of the regime.

3.1 A violence reduction senior officer (VRSO) was in post and the strategy had recently been reviewed. In our survey, 29% of adult respondents in Moorland closed said they had felt unsafe at some point in Moorland, specifically in association areas and the wing showers. A quarter of black and minority ethnic prisoners felt they had been victimised because of their race or ethnic origin. Violence reduction meetings were taking place and, in a positive initiative, all inductions had to complete the week-long anti-bullying course.

Moorland closed

- 3.2 A local anti-bullying strategy and policy had been recently reviewed (November 2005) and was still in the process of implementation. Monthly violence reduction meetings were taking place, chaired by a member of the senior management team. These meetings were well attended and included prisoner representatives. The agenda was comprehensive but the information from these meetings was not always cascaded to staff.
- 3.3 In our survey, 29% of adult respondents in Moorland closed said they had felt unsafe at some point in Moorland. Moreover 25% of black and minority ethnic prisoners felt they had been victimised due to their race or ethnic origin (see section on race relations). Prisoners we met said that verbal bullying was mostly present among young people. The most common places where bullying was occurring were on association and in the shower areas.
- 3.4 At Moorland closed, the VRSO was made aware through various sources that bullying could have been taking place in an area. He would enter this information into what was known as the violence reduction log. Staff would hopefully be made aware of this and monitor the prisoner for bullying activity. If no evidence was found, the prisoner's name would remain on the log but no further action would be taken. A review would be held on any prisoner found to have been bullying and the VRSO would decide what action should be taken. This could include demotion to basic regime and moving the prisoner to houseblock 2 or 4, where he would remain on the basic regime until deemed suitable to move up in status. Some one-to-one intervention was available to help young adults on basic for bullying to address their behaviour but there was nothing for adults.
- 3.5 The establishment had recently introduced violence reduction representatives but they had received no formal training and were unclear of their role. Prisoners expressed particular concern about the establishment walkway, which they felt was one of the prime areas for bullying and assaults. Victims of bullying were interviewed by the VRSO but there was no set protocol on how to deal with them. The identity of the VRSO was advertised on the wings but there was no formal contact structure for prisoners or their families and friends.

Moorland open

- 3.6 Moorland open worked to the same strategy and policy at Moorland closed but implementation and practice were different.
- 3.7 We observed young people exhibiting bullying-type behaviour, with water being thrown under doors, name calling and what was known as 'cell trashing'. Young people described this as harmless fun but it had been badly received on some occasions.
- 3.8 Prisoners complained to us that if there were any suspicion of bullying behaviour they would be returned to the closed site without opportunity to explain themselves or put their point of view.

Both sites

- 3.9 The establishment had introduced a week-long anti-bullying course that all prisoners attended at the end of the induction programme. Prisoners spoke well of the course, which was well delivered by a dedicated team. Since the introduction of this course, the incidence of bullying has been reduced by 62%. At the time of our inspection, 19 prisoners were waiting to start the course, one of whom had been waiting for 10 days. A recent decision to reduce the class size from 20 to 13 had also been made and would result in further delays. Plans were in place to introduce a system whereby any prisoner accused of bullying would re-take the course. No staff had received anti-bullying training.
- 3.10 The VRSO tried to collate and analyse all information relevant to bullying but had sometimes been let down by information not being passed on or by incorrect recording of information that had led to misunderstandings. This was also the case at Moorland open, and the VRSO and shadow VRSO rarely got together to discuss strategy. We found one prisoner who had been self-harming due to being bullied. The VRSO was unaware of this, even though the prisoner was on an open self-harm monitoring booklet (F2052SH). Violence logs on the wings were not always being updated and history sheets also lacked entries relating to bullying activity. At Moorland open, we found evidence that information was not being collated effectively.
- 3.11 There was no opportunity for prisoners or their families to report concerns about bullying through a special dedicated telephone service.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 3.12 Cameras should be installed in the walkway at Moorland closed.
- 3.13 Prisoner violence reduction representatives should receive formal training before being appointed.

Moorland open

- 3.14 Prisoners suspected of bullying at Moorland open should not be immediately transferred back to closed conditions without being given a chance to change their behaviour.

Both sites

- 3.15 Both sites should develop their own anti-bullying strategy or sub-strategies as the current practice is not entirely transferable.
- 3.16 Additional resources should be provided to ensure that prisoners are not waiting excessive periods to start the anti-bullying course.
- 3.17 The violence reduction senior officer (VRSO) should be made aware of all information relevant to bullying.
- 3.18 The VRSO and shadow VRSO should meet regularly.
- 3.19 Interventions should be introduced for all prisoners identified as bullies.
- 3.20 A reporting helpline number should be published for families and friends to report bullying.
- 3.21 A victim support protocol should be developed to standardise the support provided to prisoners who have been bullied and should take account of the specific needs of both sites.
- 3.22 Staff should receive anti-bullying training.

Good practice

- 3.23 *All prisoners attended a week-long anti-bullying course at the end of the induction programme. Since the introduction of this course, the incidence of bullying had been reduced by 62%.*

Self-harm and suicide

Expected outcome:

Prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide are identified at an early stage, and a care and support plan is drawn up, implemented and monitored. Prisoners who have been identified as vulnerable should be encouraged to participate in all purposeful activity. All staff are aware of and alert to vulnerability issues, and appropriately trained and have access to proper equipment and support.

- 3.24 There were relatively low levels of self-harm, with over three-quarters of incidents involving only 11 individuals. A recently reviewed policy took account of recent developments but the management team had not been engaged in the review. The team met regularly and received a range of data but it was not well evaluated. The quality of case reviews was reasonable, with frequent management checks, but attendance was often limited. All staff had received suicide awareness training. Listeners were well supported and occasional problems were quickly resolved. A low proportion of prisoners said they could access Listeners or the Samaritans.

Moorland closed

- 3.25 In 2005, an average of about 12 incidents of self-harm had been recorded each month. Monitoring had been carried out on 62 prisoners and nine prisoners were being monitored when we inspected. There had not been a death in custody since before our last inspection.
- 3.26 Suicide and self-harm prevention was coordinated by a full-time violence reduction officer (VRO). He was a senior officer and was assisted by a senior officer working at Moorland open. The VRO had a good overview and knowledge of individual cases. He showed us that those prisoners who were involved in most incidents (11 individuals had accounted for over three-quarters of incidents) had a history of self-harm before arriving at Moorland. All but one of these prisoners were no longer considered to be at risk and their monitoring had ended.
- 3.27 The comprehensive suicide prevention policy had been reviewed shortly before our inspection. The existing policy had terms of reference for the suicide prevention management team (SPMT) and referred to regular reviews of practices and work to reduce self-harm and suicides. However, there was no evidence from the minutes of the bi-monthly SPMT meetings that the team had been involved in the policy review. The VRO told us that he, his counterpart from Moorland open and the manager who chaired the meetings had conducted the review.
- 3.28 The terms of reference of the SPMT specified a membership that represented a wide range of disciplines across all relevant parts of the prison. A much smaller group attended meetings. In May, for instance, only the chair, the VRO, two members of the Independent Monitoring Board and two other staff had attended. There was slightly better representation at subsequent meetings and these included some Listeners but many absences were not recorded as apologies. The terms of reference included 'healthcare manager/in-reach nurse' but we were told that a mental health in-reach (MHIR) nurse attended only if there were specific issues to address. A MHIR nurse had attended only one of the last four meetings. The Samaritans were regularly represented and had maintained good links with the prison over many years.
- 3.29 The VRO regularly submitted statistics about incidents of self-harm and those who were being monitored. These included the location, classification (adult or young adult), method of self-harm and reasons given. There were also comparisons with previous years but there was little discussion of these data or any evaluation to inform the team meeting and help them to develop policy. In our last inspection report, we recommended that the Listeners meetings should include anonymous statistics to help monitor trends. The prison had responded by referring to the data already discussed at SPMT meetings. These, for example, would not include referrals where bullying was said to be involved and thus the SPMT would be less aware of perceived levels of bullying among prisoners.
- 3.30 Records of monitoring were maintained on form F2052SH, although the prison was just about to change to the new assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) system. We were told that all staff had received training in suicide awareness but the training records showed that only 35% of the 556 staff had been trained in the last three years. Two-thirds had been trained at some time and 80 had been trained in the new system. The VRO and a visiting psychiatrist had been to the Royal Maudsley hospital to study self-harm management.
- 3.31 Most entries in F2052SHs were reasonable quality and they were checked by the VRO two or three times a week. Care plans were satisfactory. Reviews were held on time and fully involved the prisoner when he was willing and efforts were made to engage with all those at risk. In approximately a third of the cases sampled, there had been only two staff present (generally the VRO and a chaplain), despite some cases needing mental healthcare. In one

case, we found that two members of the prisoner's family had attended the review but this was not routine. A course that could be delivered by the psychology department to help prisoners overcome self-harm was being considered.

- 3.32 There were notices in all main areas informing prisoners and visitors how to get help. Listeners said that they felt supported by staff, particularly the VRO, and that any problems caused by staff not following various agreed protocols were quickly resolved. The Listeners told us that staff did not resent this intervention and that things were gradually improving. The Listeners met the VRO weekly and the head of residence each fortnight but no records were kept of the issues discussed. There was a weekly record of referrals to Listeners, showing the reasons, but this was not passed on to staff. Listeners attended the SPMT on a rota.

Moorland open

- 3.33 There were very low levels of self-harm at Moorland open and no prisoners were being monitored during our inspection. There was no care suite or safer room there but prisoners told us that they would be returned to Moorland closed if they were considered to be at risk of self-harm. During the inspection, we learned that a prisoner who had just been moved to Moorland open had caused concern and that a doctor had recommended a return to Moorland closed where he could be monitored in the healthcare department.

Both sites

- 3.34 There were some problems with accessing Listeners at night, particularly at Moorland open. The discussions recorded in the SPMT minutes indicated that there was still no protocol for issuing a mobile telephone to prisoners so that they could contact the Samaritans at night. Some staff apparently remained reluctant to allow Listeners to see those who asked during the night. Our survey corroborated this impression, with only 58% at Moorland open, significantly lower than the comparator of 72%, saying they were able to speak to a Listener at any time. At Moorland closed, the result was 47% against a 67% comparator. There were similarly poor results in relation to access to the Samaritans or Listeners during the first 24 hours. At Moorland open, only 29%, against a comparator of 41%, said they had access, while the figure for Moorland closed was 20% against a comparator of 35%.
- 3.35 The protocol for access to a Listener at night was set out in the section of the policy listing the specific duties of the night orderly officer. There were separate instructions for the closed and open sites but strangely the requirement that the duty governor be contacted in the case of such a request from an 'E' list or restricted status prisoner also applied to all prisoners at Moorland open. This may have reflected a different approach to self-harm from staff at this site.
- 3.36 There was no indication of use of segregation to prevent self-harm. At Moorland closed, there were no safer cells in houseblocks 1 to 4 but there were four such cells on the newer houseblock 5. The protocols were in place and prisoners considered at risk were generally placed in easily supervised, shared accommodation following a risk assessment. However, there was no protocol for the use of the safer cells. The only Listener (care) suite was on the healthcare unit, where there was also a room with closed circuit television (CCTV). Both these facilities were subject to a protocol. Use of the room with CCTV was limited to cases where mental deterioration had led to threatening, damaging or self-harming behaviour that was difficult to manage in normal accommodation.

- 3.37 Staff on night patrol were unclear how to access ligature knives and did not carry them as normal practice. These life-saving implements were locked in a display cabinet but the patrol on one unit did not know how to access it. They were also vague about how they would react to coming across someone who was self-harming. Knowledge of how to use inundation points was also lacking.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 3.38 A mental health in-reach nurse should routinely attend suicide prevention management team meetings.

Housekeeping points

Moorland closed

- 3.39 There should be a protocol for the use of the safer cells.

Moorland open

- 3.40 Prisoner access to Listeners at Moorland open should be at least as easy as for those at Moorland closed.

Both sites

- 3.41 All prisoners should be able to speak to the Samaritans at all times.
- 3.42 The programme for training in suicide and self-harm prevention should cover all staff who deal with prisoners, and include how to access/use ligature knives and use of inundation points.

Housekeeping points

Both sites

- 3.43 A record of the discussions at the meetings with Listeners' should be kept.
- 3.44 Anonymised statistics from Listeners should be provided to suicide prevention management team.

Race relations

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners experience equality of opportunity in all aspects of prison life, are treated equally and are safe. Diversity is embraced, valued, promoted and respected.

3.45 Race relations at both sites were well managed with active involvement of prisoner representatives, good use of monitoring data and support groups for black prisoners and travellers. The full-time diversity officer had only recently taken up post but had a good understanding of his role and the key issues. We were told that the low number of racist incident complaints submitted by prisoners reflected proactive work by prisoner representatives. Prisoners were told verbally of the outcome of any investigation. Research done in January 2005 had not identified any particular areas of concern. Our prisoner survey showed that black and minority ethnic prisoners rated education and programmes highly but reported aspects of their treatment by staff as significantly worse than white prisoners.

Both sites

- 3.46 At the time of the inspection, 20% of prisoners at Moorland were from black or minority ethnic backgrounds; the two largest groups were Black/Black British and Asian/Asian British. Of the 454 staff whose work involved some direct contact with prisoners, 17 (3.7%) were from black or minority ethnic groups. Managers were not complacent about this situation and were involved with nearby HMP Lindholme in actively trying to recruit more black and minority ethnic staff. Despite a lapse while new staff were trained to deliver the diversity training package, 75% of all staff at Moorland had received diversity training in the previous three years.
- 3.47 Race relations were well managed by an active race relations management team (RRMT) that was chaired by the deputy governor and included prisoner representatives. The RRMT's action plan demonstrated a wide range of activity across a number of areas. It was, however, out of date as it included completed action points from 2004 and did not have sufficient target dates for current projects. A current priority was overseeing the completion of diversity impact assessments on prison policies.
- 3.48 The RRMT and the senior management team received monthly ethnic monitoring reports based on a traffic light system that highlighted potential areas of concern. Notes of the RRMT showed that issues of concern were shared with relevant staff and investigated. Monitoring for the previous month had highlighted an issue also identified in our prisoner survey: an apparent over-representation of black and minority ethnic prisoners using the gym.
- 3.49 There had been an unavoidable delay in filling the vacant post of race relations liaison officer (RRLO) and senior managers had set up temporary cover arrangements for some six to eight weeks. The full-time diversity officer/RRLO had taken up post on 1 November 2005 and already had a good grasp of his various tasks and responsibilities and a clear understanding of the relevant issues. He was supported in his work by assistant RRLOs (one for each residential unit in Moorland closed and one for Moorland open). The diversity officer had good links with the security department and violence reduction officer, and there was evidence of good exchange of information and intelligence between these departments. There were systems to identify racially motivated offenders and to alert staff across the prison but, as in many other prisons, no specific interventions were yet in place to challenge racist behaviour.

- 3.50 Prisoners wishing to make a racist incident complaint were encouraged to discuss it first with one of the prisoner race relations representatives. We were told that this filtering/support mechanism was one reason for the comparatively low level of formal complaints (40 in Moorland closed and 15 in Moorland open since January 2005). We read a sample of the completed investigation forms and found an even split between complaints made by prisoners (about other prisoners and staff), by staff (about or on behalf of prisoners) and complaints from other sources such as referrals from adjudications and the Independent Monitoring Board. It was clear that the investigating officer always interviewed the complainant and there were references to the complainant being told the outcome of the investigation. We did meet one prisoner who believed his investigation was still ongoing even though it had been concluded.
- 3.51 Some initiatives were in place either to support minority groups or to promote diversity. A successful diversity week had been run in November 2005. The induction programme for adult prisoners (closed) included a short anti-racism course that many prisoners told us was interesting and helpful. Representatives of outside agencies helped the prison run a black prisoner support group and a travellers group. Prisoners from Moorland open came to Moorland closed to attend these meetings.
- 3.52 Race relations research carried out by psychology staff in January 2005 showed the majority of prisoners felt fairly treated in respect of their ethnic or racial background and that the major concern for black and minority ethnic prisoners was the prison food. In a visitor survey carried out at the same time, 41% of respondents agreed that racist comments by staff were rare, 5% thought black and minority ethnic visitors were treated unfairly and 6% had witnessed inappropriate comments toward other visitors, prisoners or staff members.
- 3.53 In our survey, 35% of black and minority ethnic prisoners, against a comparator of 16%, felt they had been victimised, insulted or assaulted by a member of staff and 25%, against a comparator of 0%, felt they had been victimised because of their race or ethnic origin. These views were also expressed by prisoners during the inspection.
- 3.54 The complaints we received from black and minority ethnic prisoners were broadly similar to those raised by white prisoners. Our survey identified a number of areas in which the experience or perception of black and minority ethnic prisoners was significantly better than that of white prisoners. For example, more black and minority ethnic prisoners felt that education and offending behaviour courses were likely to help them on release and 69% of adults (closed), compared to 53% of white prisoners, thought they had done something while at Moorland that made them less likely to offend in future. However, black and minority ethnic prisoners rated some aspects of their treatment by staff as significantly worse than that of white prisoners:
- Across the two sites, between 44% and 64% of black and minority ethnic prisoners felt they were treated well or very well in reception (compared to between 64% and 86% of white prisoners)
 - 56% of adults in Moorland closed thought most staff treated them with respect (compared to 83% of white prisoners)
 - Five of the 18 adults (closed) and three of the seven young adults (open) said they had been victimised by a member of staff because of their race or ethnic origin
- 3.55 We suggested to senior managers that these survey results warranted investigation.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 3.56 Programmes or guidance should be available to prison and probation staff to enable them to challenge racist offenders confidently and appropriately.
- 3.57 All staff should be trained in cultural, racial and diversity issues.
- 3.58 Prisoners should receive a written response advising them of the outcome of any investigation into a racist incident complaint.
- 3.59 The race relations management team should investigate the reasons lying behind the poorer survey responses from black and minority ethnic prisoners referring to their experience of staff treatment, staff respect and victimisation.

Housekeeping point

Both sites

- 3.60 The race relations action plan should be updated to separate completed projects from current work and to set specific target dates for action points.

Foreign nationals

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners who are foreign nationals should have the same access to all prison facilities as other prisoners. All establishments should be aware of the specific needs that prisoners who are foreign nationals have and implement a distinct strategy, which aims to represent their views and offer peer support.

- 3.61 The policy document was not specific to Moorland and contained no action plan. The race relations management team dealt with foreign national issues. Discipline staff had links with the Immigration Service and none of the 29 foreign national prisoners were being held beyond their sentence. The gap created by the foreign national coordinator's sickness absence had not been filled and services for this group of prisoners were generally underdeveloped.

Both sites

- 3.62 Moorland held 29 foreign national prisoners from 18 different countries. The foreign nationals policy borrowed heavily from work done at other prisons and was not specific to Moorland. There was no action plan and foreign national issues were covered by the race relations management team. Liaison with the Immigration Service was handled mainly by discipline staff, with the parole clerk dealing with prisoners serving four years or more and the home detention curfew clerk managing those cases involving sentences of less than four years. None of the foreign national prisoners were being held beyond the end of their sentence.

- 3.63 Systems were in place to provide free monthly telephone calls and we saw some evidence of interpreting services having been used.
- 3.64 Earlier in 2005, an officer had been nominated as foreign national coordinator and had started a foreign national support group. When this officer went on long-term sick in August 2005, no contingency plans had been put in place and work in this area had stalled. Managers acknowledged that this area of work was underdeveloped and needed attention.

Recommendation

Both sites

- 3.65 There should be a foreign nationals coordinator responsible for both sites who is conversant with the needs of foreign national prisoners.

Family and friends

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are encouraged to maintain contact with family and friends through regular access to mail, telephones and visits.

- 3.66 Prisoners' mail was processed promptly and prisoners received most mail on the day it arrived. Censorship of mail was at a reasonable level. Access to telephones was variable and unpredictable. New booking systems made it easier for visitors to arrange visits. There was a high take up of reception visits (within the first week) and most visits sessions were well attended. There had been no improvements to the visitors' car park, entry and search area or the special visits room at Moorland closed. Otherwise, the facilities for visitors were good, including a well run visitors' centre and a staffed crèche. Visits took place in a comfortable and relaxed atmosphere on both sites. Some prisoners from Moorland open on community visits had to wear prison clothing, which was inappropriate. Security restrictions were used sparingly.

Mail and telephones

Both sites

- 3.67 As the Post Office could not guarantee early delivery, staff from both sites collected all prison post each morning to ensure prompt sorting and delivery to prisoners. Most regular mail was distributed to residential units by early afternoon on the same day. Suitable systems were in place to deal with legal correspondence, recorded delivery mail and letters containing money to be credited to prisoners' accounts. Censorship of mail was at a reasonable level, covering all high risk and security targeted prisoners plus a random 5% of other mail. In our survey, only adult prisoners at Moorland open reported problems with sending or receiving mail but we found no evidence to support this.
- 3.68 Access to telephones varied depending on the number available (see paragraphs 2.6 and 2.8) and the frequency of association. In our survey, between 29% and 46% of all prisoners at both sites, significantly higher than the comparators, recorded problems with accessing telephones.

We were not satisfied that all prisoners had regular and predictable access to telephones or that calls could be made at times of the day or week that were most likely to be convenient to the recipient of the call. Although staff were alert to potential problems, no systems were in place to supervise formally or ensure fair access to the telephones.

Visits

Moorland closed

- 3.69 A new computerised booking system included an efficient visitor identification record that reduced the time taken to check visitors' details at various stages of their entry into the prison. Following the transfer of the booking system to the external visitors' centre in July 2005, the number of domestic visits taking place each day had increased. The number of visitors regularly exceeded 60 each session and was often close to the maximum of 85. Visitors could book their next visit while at the visitors' centre. Recent research showed that 82% of prisoners at Moorland closed had received at least one visit.
- 3.70 High priority was given to facilitating reception visits and this was reflected in our survey: 48% of adults and 51% of young adults, significantly better than the respective comparators of 27% and 38%, had a visit in their first week.
- 3.71 Moorland closed ran visits for two hours on five afternoons a week. Traditionally, visits had never taken place on Monday, and the Friday session had been dropped earlier in 2005 as a cost-saving exercise.
- 3.72 As in 2002, the visitors' car park at Moorland closed was in a poor state of repair and was not secure. When we visited at the weekend, there was rubbish and broken glass on the car park. There had been incidents of cars being broken into and visitors were advised against leaving any personal belongings in their vehicles. The area inside the main prison gate where visitors were received and searched was cramped and provided no privacy. Searching took place not only in front of other visitors but also in full view of the main staff entrance. The special visits room where most legal and other professional visits took place remained, as at our last inspection, unfit for purpose with only two enclosed interview rooms. We were told of proposals to upgrade both the entry and special visits areas.
- 3.73 Otherwise, the facilities for visitors were of a good standard and visits took place in a comfortable and relaxed environment. A well-equipped visitors' centre was open from 12.30pm to 4pm when visits ended. Visitors' centre staff were employed directly by the prison and recent staff absences had placed additional strain on them at a time of increased demand. Visitors clearly appreciated the services provided by the centre and also by the crèche in the main visits hall, which was staffed by workers from the Humber pre-school learning alliance. Visitors could buy refreshments from a shop run by WRVS volunteers but visits staff told us this often closed around 3pm leaving no facility for visitors who arrived late. A separate room was provided for enhanced prisoners but as this was made almost entirely of glass and was subject to extreme temperature variation, several prisoners chose to take their visit in the larger and often noisier main hall.
- 3.74 Prisoners were called to the visits hall once their visitor had checked in at the visitors' centre. Neither prisoners nor visitors were kept waiting for long periods before entering the visits hall. Visitors were allowed unrestricted access to toilets and prisoners were searched before being allowed back into the visits hall. Security restrictions on visits were sensibly applied. At the time of the inspection, only 16 prisoners had any restrictions on the people allowed to visit

them and 11 prisoners were subject to closed visits (four of these had been placed on closed visits prior to transferring to Moorland).

Moorland open

- 3.75 In our survey, similar numbers to the comparator said they had received a visit in their first week.
- 3.76 Visits took place only at a weekend and the demand for weekday visits had not been explored. Based on the figures for the three weeks before the inspection, between 50% and 60% of the Moorland open population either received a visit or went on a community visit each weekend. When on community or other town visits, prisoners on the standard level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme were required to wear prison clothing and a similar requirement for enhanced prisoners had been removed only a few weeks earlier (see section on residential units). This practice was degrading and was an unnecessary barrier to prisoners' successful reintegration into the community.
- 3.77 As in Moorland closed, visits took place in a comfortable and relaxed environment in a large airy room with tables spaced out allowing a degree of privacy to each family. Visitors to Moorland open could buy refreshments from vending machines in the foyer of the visits building.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 3.78 The standard and safety of the visitors' car park at Moorland closed should be improved.
- 3.79 The entry and search area for visitors at Moorland closed should be redesigned to provide adequate space and privacy.
- 3.80 Prisoners and their professional visitors should be able to conduct meetings and interviews in private.
- 3.81 The level of staffing in the visitors' centre should be sufficient to meet demand.

Both sites

- 3.82 All prisoners should have daily access to telephones.
- 3.83 Prisoners should be able to telephone their family and friends at times that can be arranged in advance and are likely to be convenient to the recipient of the call. If restrictions have to be placed on the time prisoners can access telephones, staff should provide supervision to ensure fair access.
- 3.84 The potential need for additional or extended visits sessions at both sites should be reviewed at least annually to ensure that all prisoners who wish to are able to receive visits.

Housekeeping points

Moorland closed

- 3.85 Visitors should be able to purchase refreshments in the main visits hall irrespective of their time of arrival.

Applications and complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective application and complaint procedures are in place, 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.

- 3.86 All applications made at Moorland closed were recorded in each wing's application book. There were few complaints at Moorland open, while at Moorland closed there had been 1000 complaints in the year to date. These were effectively managed, responses were timely and mostly addressed the key issues raised. Applications at Moorland open were dealt with effectively and with no unnecessary formality.

Moorland closed

- 3.87 At Moorland closed, applications were recorded in the wing applications book each day and despatched to the relevant department. A number of local forms were in use for frequently raised topics. The adult prisoners were reasonably satisfied with the promptness of responses (54% against a comparator of 49%) but there was less satisfaction among the young adults (14% against a comparator of 21%). As the same system operated, it was not clear why this should have been so.
- 3.88 Complaints were running at a high level, with 1000 recorded in the year to date. Complaints were placed in a locked box to which only the night orderly officer had a key. They were then passed to the complaints clerk each weekday for action. We tested the system and our complaint was processed the following day.
- 3.89 Complaints were effectively managed and over 98% were answered within three days. Local guidance forms were in place to advise staff answering complaints how answers should be phrased. We examined 15% of answered complaints and were satisfied that the overwhelming majority were legible and answered the question raised. In some cases, staff answering the complaint were identified only by their role rather than their name.
- 3.90 The largest single topic (16% of all complaints recorded) concerned lost property, although over half of these referred to losses elsewhere. It was not clear how the statistics of complaints analysed by topic were being used to manage performance.
- 3.91 Confidential access complaints were managed effectively, with the governor responding to these personally where appropriate.

Moorland open

- 3.92 Applications and complaints at Moorland open were relatively rare, with most concerns being addressed informally and a relatively high level of satisfaction expressed in our survey. The only area where there was concern was the speed with which applications were addressed but it was not clear why this was so.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 3.93 Staff answering complaints should always be identified.
- 3.94 Analysis of complaints should be developed in order to improve responses to prisoners and inform relevant departments.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are told about their legal rights during induction, and can freely exercise these rights while in prison.

- 3.95 At Moorland closed, the legal service provision was not adequate to meet demand. It was not sufficiently well promoted or easily accessible to prisoners. Legal reference books were locked up with no displays to inform prisoners what was available and how to get access to them. The legal services officer at Moorland open had enough time to fulfil the role. Legal and prison service reference material was on display in the open learning centre.

Moorland closed

- 3.96 Four prison officers were trained to provide legal services. Only one was allocated time for the task; the others provided cover when he was on leave. Legal services were profiled for nine hours each week but only half the planned time was allocated in the months before the inspection because legal services was second on the list of tasks to drop when there were staff shortages. Prisoners were informed about the work of the legal services officer (LSO) as part of the induction process.
- 3.97 The LSO worked in the library and was not easily accessible to prisoners. Notices informing prisoners about the LSO and including his photograph had been put on display on each houseblock and in reception the week before the inspection.
- 3.98 There were approximately 30 Criminal Court of Appeal letters waiting to be served on prisoners and some of these were over six weeks old. These were not given high priority because most prisoners also received copies of these directly from their solicitors. However, for those who did not, this delay could potentially be very detrimental to their case. There had been about 86 applications to see the LSO in the previous six months, only half of which had received any response. These were prioritised by seeing the prisoners who pestered the most.

Applications that had been dealt with were recorded but there was no record of the time taken to respond or the waiting list. There was no monitoring of the type of requests made by prisoners and no management oversight of this work.

- 3.99 Legal text books and Prison Service orders were available in the library, although these were locked up out of sight and not advertised.
- 3.100 Most responses to questions in our survey about legal services were significantly worse than the comparators. Only 26% of young adults and 42% of adults, against respective comparators of 34% and 62%, knew how to access legal books; 60% of adults and 51% of young adults, against respective comparators of 73% and 63%, said they could get access to their legal representative; and 43% of adults and 40% of young adults, against respective comparators of 52% and 43%, said they could get access to leave to appeal. Prisoners also reported having significantly worse access to legal visits and legal costs compared to their respective comparators.

Moorland open

- 3.101 The one LSO was flexible in the time he could give to this role and was able to respond to any requests for help or information within one or two days. There had been approximately 30 applications in the last six months and there was no waiting list.
- 3.102 Prisoners were informed about the LSO and how to contact him and as part of the reception process. Legal texts and Prison Service information was available in the open learning centre. Responses to questions in our survey about information and access to legal services were similar to the comparators.

Recommendation

Moorland closed

- 3.103 Provision of legal services at Moorland closed should meet prisoners' needs and be monitored in relation to the demand and response time.

Section 4: Healthcare

Expected outcomes:

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

4.1 Moorland was a first wave prison integrated in to the Doncaster East Primary Care Trust (PCT) in April 2004. Primary healthcare was provided by Primecare (FMS), which had been the provider prior to integration with the PCT. It appeared that very little had changed in terms of the management of services and personnel. Healthcare was provided at the open and closed sites by one healthcare team. There were significant staffing difficulties in the department in terms of numbers and some clinical specialists compounded by long-term sickness among nursing staff. Some areas of primary care were well developed and managed by specialist staff but there were no primary mental health services and in-patients had a very limited regime. Significant changes to services and some staff attitudes were required if healthcare at Moorland was to progress and mirror services available in the community.

Environment

Moorland closed

- 4.2 Healthcare was located in a two-storey purpose-built structure close to all houseblocks. The upper floor was dedicated to primary care, administration and specialist teams and the lower floor was the in-patient unit.
- 4.3 The upper floor was generally well maintained. All areas were clean and tidy. The accommodation led off from a central corridor and emergency bells were appropriately placed throughout the department. However, there was a shortage of office space, patient interview rooms and IT equipment.
- 4.4 Entry to primary care was through secure gates, which led into a bright and airy waiting room with fixed seating and a good selection of health promotion material for prisoners to read or take away. Two offices were located in the waiting area, one used by the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) team and the other by healthcare staff.
- 4.5 Leading off from the waiting area were the administrative and clinical areas. The main treatment room was also used as a nurses' station. It was adjacent to the waiting room and was functional, neat and tidy and reasonably well equipped, although it had no computer and only one telephone line. There was a range of medicine storage cupboards and a medicine trolley, all of which were locked securely when not in use. A secure hatch leading in to the waiting room was used to administer medications to prisoners. Emergency equipment was appropriate and was checked weekly.
- 4.6 Next to the nurses' treatment room was a doctor's office, which could be accessed either from the treatment room or from the main corridor. The office was fit for purpose except that there were no screens to provide privacy for patients undergoing physical examination.

- 4.7 The administrative office was quite large and appropriately furnished. There were several filing cabinets holding clinical records (CRs) and an additional desk that was often used by other healthcare staff.
- 4.8 The pharmacy was at the other end of the corridor and was accessed through a secure gated door, to which the technicians held the keys. The pharmacy had the ability to function as a fully operational dispensary but was not being used as such. It contained a range of lockable wooden and metal medicine cabinets that were full of stock.
- 4.9 The dental surgery was large, bright and generally clean. The equipment was quite new but the flooring was old and quite marked. Electrical sockets were not well sited and there was no autoclave printer. There were sufficient instruments for daily use but there were only one contra-angle and straight hand piece available. The amalgam mixer was old and therefore more likely to leak.
- 4.10 There were secure treatment rooms on all the houseblocks. All were clean and tidy and held limited amounts of medications.
- 4.11 The in-patients unit was accessible through secure gated doors from the primary care unit and the main corridor. The whole area was clean and in a reasonable state of decoration. There were 18 beds, nine of which were on the certified normal accommodation. There was also a three-bed crisis suite that was managed by healthcare staff, two gated cells and one camera cell. One of the cells had been adapted for use as an interview room but contained no alarm bell.
- 4.12 At the time of the inspection, up to six prisoners were being held in cells. The majority of those requiring beds were mental health patients. One room was occupied by a prisoner located in healthcare for respite purposes and two prisoners were lodged there for no apparent clinical reason.
- 4.13 The office was located next to the association room and was functional. A window in the office allowed staff to observe prisoners in the association room. Further down the corridor was another office that also overlooked the association room.
- 4.14 The association room itself was large but dull and uninviting. The chairs and tables were metal and plastic. Opposite was another large room that was being cleared to make way for use as a meeting room.
- 4.15 Along the corridor was a room that had been converted from two cells. This was known as the 'snoozelum room' and was used by the mental health in-reach (MHRIT) team for therapeutic purposes. It was appropriately furnished, well decorated and, although not in use at the time, would clearly be beneficial to patients.
- 4.16 The treatment room was used to store a limited amount of medications and other equipment. It was adequate for purpose and contained a limited range of lockable cupboards.
- 4.17 Showers were available and could be accessed by prisoners with disabilities. Other equipment suitable for use by these prisoners was readily available through the PCT.

Moorland open

- 4.18 The healthcare department was a separate building in the centre of Moorland open. There was a small waiting area with uncomfortable wooden benches, a treatment room and several offices/consulting rooms. Some health promotion leaflets were available in the waiting area.
- 4.19 At the far end of the building was a large open area that had previously been an eight-bed 'sick bay' but was no longer in use. Adjacent to this was a large, light and airy room used for small groups and counselling. There was also a bath and ablutions area. The resuscitation bag was kept in the treatment room but the prison did not have a defibrillator. There were no documented, regular checks of the emergency equipment; we were told it was checked after use.
- 4.20 There were minimal first aid kits on the house units. Medications were kept in three lockable metal cupboards and thermolabile medications were stored in a drugs fridge. The minimum and maximum temperatures of the fridge were checked daily. Infection control measures were reasonable throughout the department but no paper hand towels were available.

Records

Moorland closed

- 4.21 Clinical records (CRs) were held in locked filing cabinets in the administrative office. We reviewed a selection of CRs and found them to be well maintained and with good entries from the majority of clinical staff. On completion of a prisoner's time at Moorland, the CR was stored in a room in the in-patient area. We were told that it had not been properly organised but that it would be sorted out in the near future.
- 4.22 Dental record-keeping was good, although entries were not copied to the patients' CRs and there was no statistical record of treatments carried out.
- 4.23 Prescriptions were written on standard charts, filed by houseblock and kept in the main treatment room. Those we reviewed were generally well maintained but we did find some that had not been completed fully. For example, patients' diagnoses were missing and there were occasions when medication was not recorded as being given and no explanation was given.
- 4.24 A set of clinical policies and protocols was being updated.

Moorland open

- 4.25 CRs were kept in lockable filing cabinets in the main office, which was locked when not in use. Prescription charts were filed in the treatment rooms. The CRs that we sampled had adequate documentation, although we found one example of a Hepatitis vaccination having been given without an authorised prescription. Prisoners signed the prescription charts when they collected their in possession medications and all the charts we looked at appeared to be in order.
- 4.26 When a prisoner left the establishment, his CR was sent to the discipline office and stored with his other records.

- 4.27 Nurses told us that on occasions CRs did not arrive until the prisoner had been with them for several days. This is a problem with open prisons when prisoners make their own way to the establishment and paperwork is sent on from their previous prison only once their arrival has been confirmed.
- 4.28 There were no clinical information management systems for CRs. Clinical policies were reasonable but were not signed or dated.

Staffing

Both sites

- 4.29 The healthcare manager for both sites was a principal officer (PO) grade registered mental nurse (RMN). He had joined the prison on promotion and had been at Moorland for approximately 10 months. He was not on the senior management team (SMT) and carried out orderly officer duties across the prison. He was answerable to a governor grade manager who was also the head of risk and offender management and who represented healthcare on the SMT.
- 4.30 Across both sites, there were a total of 16 whole time equivalent (WTE) nurses. Four were full-time senior healthcare officer (SHCO) grade registered general nurses (RGNs). The remainder were E grade equivalent RGNs, except for one who was also an RMN. There were no other RMNs. Two of the nurses had completed specialist courses, one in the management of patients with HIV and another in the management of patients with sexually transmitted diseases. Both ran individual clinics in their specialty and one had been short-listed for a Nursing Standard Chief Nursing Officer's Special Award for Prison Nursing. Three non-nurse-qualified healthcare officers (HCOs) supported the nurses. Three members of the care team had been on long-term sick leave.
- 4.31 Moorland open was staffed by two full-time RGNs who worked a regular two-week rota, often on their own. They were responsible for the total management of Moorland open and did not have any administrative support. They told us they felt somewhat isolated from Moorland closed and expressed some concern that the healthcare manager did not visit Moorland open regularly. They therefore did not feel part of the overall team.
- 4.32 Agency staff were used regularly across both sites and the prison had built up a small cohort of regular agency nurses, all of whom went through an induction programme and were key trained. Family friendly shifts were in place. At night, there was one nurse or HCO and one operational support grade (OSG) on duty in the healthcare centre. There was no discipline support to the healthcare department.
- 4.33 All nursing staff had up to date staff training records. Clinical supervision was available but there was little uptake due, we were told, to staff shortages.
- 4.34 There were two full-time pharmacy technicians and one full-time administrative assistant (AA). The AA was responsible for all administrative functions throughout the healthcare departments and in our view was working above her grade.
- 4.35 Twenty-four-hour medical cover across both prisons was managed by Forensic Medical Services (FMS). Two doctors equating to one WTE covered both sites during the day. One doctor was a retired general practitioner (GP) and the other was a retired prison senior medical officer but not a GP. The doctors worked Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 4.30pm. Out-

of-hours cover was through FMS. At the weekends, doctors were drawn from a regular pool of three, which provided some form of continuity, but during the evening they could be from anywhere.

- 4.36 A dentist and a dental nurse, funded by FMS, attended Moorland closed for two sessions a week and the dentist had another session for Moorland open every two weeks. There was no cover for when the dentist was away, although he did hold additional clinics to 'catch up' when required.
- 4.37 The MHIRT was funded by Doncaster and South Humberside Mental Health Trust. The team covered both sites. It was run by an H grade RMN team leader, supported by two G grade RMNs, one full and one part-time. A part-time support worker and part-time administrative worker completed the team. There were two psychiatrists, one forensic and one general, both providing one session a week. A clinical psychologist shared with two other prisons visited for one session usually every week. There was no occupational therapist.

Delivery of care

Primary care

Moorland closed

- 4.38 Prisoners' perception of healthcare was not good at either site. In Moorland closed, just 30% of respondents to our survey, against a comparator of 49%, thought the overall quality of healthcare was good or very good. In Moorland open, the figure was 48%, which was slightly better but still significantly worse than the comparator of 57%. Despite these results, the majority of nursing staff were committed to providing a good health service to prisoners. There were, however, difficulties in achieving their aims due to chronic staffing shortages and the reluctance of some to implement change.
- 4.39 With no discipline support to healthcare, nurses who should have been employed on clinical duties were escorting and chaperoning prisoners undergoing clinical treatment at both sites. Nurses supervised all clinics, including prisoners brought over from Moorland open for dental treatment. A nurse from Moorland open escorted them across and then supervised them while they were waiting for appointments. This was an unacceptable waste of precious nursing expertise.
- 4.40 Prisoners arriving at the prison were seen by a member of the healthcare team in reception, where a full medical assessment was undertaken. Those arriving with any history of chronic illnesses such as diabetes or asthma were added to one of the nurse-led clinic lists for a check up and decision about their future management. Any prisoner expressing concerns about his mental health was referred to the MHIRT. Prisoners were informed about clinics and how to access healthcare in general. They were offered immunisations appropriate to their age and health needs and appointments were made for them.
- 4.41 To access healthcare, prisoners completed an application form, copies of which could be found on all houseblocks. The forms were deposited in a locked dedicated healthcare box and collected by nurses each day. Night staff made the relevant appointments and returned these to the wings. We were told that prisoners did not always receive their appointments.

- 4.42 There was no nurse triage system. Doctors held clinics on the houseblocks on set days and there was a separate a clinic in healthcare for those prisoners from houseblock 5 where there was no treatment room. In the afternoons, doctors were available to review patients and carry out any administrative duties.
- 4.43 There was a good range of in-house nurse-led clinics. Nursing staff had been trained to run asthma, diabetes, chronic heart disease and sexual health clinics. Named nurses managed their own clinics and followed up patients regularly. The chronic disease register was paper-based.
- 4.44 A physiotherapist was available through healthcare and held weekly clinics in the department, where appropriate prisoners were referred on to the gym. In the three months before the inspection, 14 prisoners had been seen. The optician visited fortnightly and the chiropodist every six weeks. Waiting lists were reasonable and the service provided was considered good. Over a three-month period, the optician saw 48 patients and the chiropodist saw 19.
- 4.45 A genito-urinary medicine (GUM) consultant from Doncaster Royal Infirmary (DRI) held clinics in the prison and was assisted by one of the prison nurses who held a qualification in the management of patients with sexually transmitted diseases. Referrals were accepted from across the prison and from prisoners themselves. The nurse followed up prisoners locally and had established good links with the GUM clinic at the DRI. Unfortunately, her expertise was not available to prisoners at Moorland open. The consultant had seen 139 patients in the three months before this inspection. The same nurse was the prison link with the Health Protection Agency and attended various meetings, as well as being a member of the infection control advisory group.
- 4.46 There were good systems for managing prisoners with conditions relating to blood-borne viruses. Clinics were in place to monitor them regularly. Pre- and post-test HIV counselling was available to prisoners and a Hepatitis B super-accelerated course was in place. Smoking cessation courses were available. These were run by the pharmacist in the association room in in-patients, thus curtailing activity for in-patients. The success rate was reasonable and courses lasted between eight and 12 weeks.
- 4.47 Health promotion was very rudimentary. We understood that a health fair had been held this year and had been very successful in identifying some prisoners with high blood pressure. There was concern that continuing such events would be difficult given the staffing problems.
- 4.48 Medications were supplied remotely from Prime Care in Liverpool. Prescriptions were faxed through to the pharmacy and, provided this was done before 1pm, medicines were received the next day. The process of photocopying and faxing charts was laborious and time-consuming. There was limited evidence of up to date reference sources held at the prison.
- 4.49 There were problems acquiring stock. Very often, the pharmacy did not have certain items but did not inform the prison and medications simply did not arrive. Some medications were supplied as stock and were dual-labelled. Prisoners were able to purchase small quantities of pain relieving medication and other simple medications at cost price and this was recorded on their prescription and administration charts. Special sick supplies were recorded correctly but were not audited.
- 4.50 Following a risk assessment, most medications were supplied in possession for periods of up to 28 days. In possession medication was issued to prisoners from the houseblock treatment areas, which had dedicated treatment rooms. There was very limited opportunity for

confidential conversations with nursing staff unless prisoners went to the healthcare department.

- 4.51 Stock medicines used to supply patients were kept in locked metal cabinets in the houseblock treatment rooms. These were audited by pharmacy staff when requests for replacements were made. Some loose blisters were found in the cabinets. All medication for named patients was labelled in accordance with the Medicines Act and, where appropriate, had patient information leaflets. This was stored separately to stock.
- 4.52 The drugs and therapeutics committee met monthly chaired by the pharmacy specialist. The PCT was represented. All medicines policies were being reviewed but there was some resistance to change from some of the healthcare team. Some draft patient group directives (PGDs) were in place but had not been implemented due to lack of pharmacist input.
- 4.53 All dental treatment was carried out at Moorland closed. The dentist and the healthcare manager were concerned at the very long waiting list, particularly at Moorland closed. The waiting list was about six months long with 111 names on it. Prisoners with less than six months to serve were not placed on the waiting list if just a 'check up' was requested. Healthcare staff provided any out-of-hours treatment and any trauma was sent to the local hospital.
- 4.54 There was no dental triage, although the healthcare manager and the dentist had been trying to implement this. The dentist tried to complete all treatment in one session wherever possible and a full range of NHS treatments was available. However, there was no time for periodontal or preventative treatments where a high need had been identified. Equally, there was no time for oral health promotion and the dentist said that he had not been invited to join any of the health fairs. There were few non-attendances and reasons given were generally that prisoners had not received their appointment slips.
- 4.55 Once referred, external NHS out-patient appointments were organised by the AA. Appointments were restricted to one in the morning and one in the afternoon because of escort shortages. The appointments were generally well managed and were not cancelled too often. In the quarter from July to September 2005, three appointments out of a possible 82 had been cancelled.
- 4.56 We were told of plans to take an agreed number of prisoners requiring methadone maintenance. We had some concerns regarding the acquisition, storage and supply of such medication unless additional resources and holding facilities are agreed and in place.
- 4.57 Doctors carried out a full round of all prisoners in the segregation unit from Monday to Friday. This was now an unnecessary duty as nurses saw all prisoners in the unit every day.
- 4.58 Prisoners due to be released were seen the day before and given a letter for their GP. There was no system to help prisoners without a GP to find one. A seven-day supply of medication was given to the prisoner on his release.

Moorland open

- 4.59 The department was open from 7.30am until 5pm every weekday. There were extended opening hours until 8pm on two evenings a week to meet the needs of the outworkers. At weekends and bank holidays, the opening hours were 8am until 1pm.

- 4.60 One of the nurses saw new prisoners on the day of arrival and, assuming their clinical notes were available, a comprehensive health screening interview was conducted. As part of the induction programme, prisoners had a talk from one of the nurses for about 30 minutes. They were told about the opening times of the department, how to make appointments and that they should ensure they had simple analgesics and other homely medicines in their possession. They did not receive any written information.
- 4.61 Any prisoner wanting to see a GP had to attend the department between 7.45am and 8.15am to be seen by a nurse. Those who worked out could attend on a Monday or Wednesday evening or a Sunday morning. The nurses did not use triage algorithms to assess patients. In reality, most prisoners were referred to see the GP. The doctor saw a maximum of six patients a day. Prisoners attended the department to see him at 11am on weekdays but there were no individual appointment times.
- 4.62 The prisoners were able to purchase packs of Paracetamol, aspirin or ibuprofen from the healthcare centre. Prescribed medications were given as in possession medications, following a documented risk assessment, for a maximum of a month at a time. Prisoners were responsible for ordering repeat prescriptions. They came to the department to collect their medications and signed the prescription chart to confirm receipt. The prescriptions were ordered by faxing them to the off-site pharmacy. There were delays in receiving the medications ordered, which were first sent to Moorland closed before being delivered to Moorland open. Staff had access to an out-of-hours cupboard that held a range of medications, with a dual labelling system so that the medications could be given to patients and automatically reordered to replenish the used stock. However, staff admitted that on occasions other medications were required, so nurses put individual doses into bags to give to prisoners while waiting for their prescription to arrive. This was secondary dispensing.
- 4.63 The nurses maintained registers of patients with lifelong conditions such as ischaemic heart disease and diabetes. They held clinics to monitor the progress of such patients but these appeared to be run on an ad hoc basis and occurred only when both nurses were on duty together. They also provided Hepatitis B vaccinations and 'flu vaccines but not Meningitis C, despite the fact that the prison held men under the age of 24 years. There were no patient group directives so all vaccinations had to be prescribed to individual patients. Both nurses could take blood but neither had received training in pre- and post-test counselling for HIV testing. Any prisoner requiring this had to be taken to Moorland closed to see a nurse with the relevant training.
- 4.64 Prisoners applied to see a dentist. The waiting list was over six weeks and we were told that this was due to the dentist being absent for several weeks. Prisoners were taken to Moorland closed to see the dentist on a Wednesday afternoon. They were escorted by one of the nurses from Moorland open (see paragraph 4.39). We were told that if the waiting list for the dentist became exceptionally long, he would visit Moorland open and carry out a dental assessment clinic to prioritise the list but this was not a regular occurrence.
- 4.65 A smoking cessation clinic was run by the pharmacy technician. Prisoners needing to see an optician had their name added to a list. A joint appointment was made at a local opticians when there were four names on the list. This meant that the waiting list was not a true reflection of need. Prisoners were taken to the local hospital for genito-urinary medicine.
- 4.66 The MHIRT visited prisoners at Moorland open if requested by the nursing staff. MIND counsellors also saw clients in the healthcare centre on Tuesdays.

- 4.67 Staff told us of difficulties in arranging for prisoners to be transferred to Moorland closed for medical reasons. They usually had to involve the governor in charge of Moorland open in the arrangements, rather than liaising directly with healthcare colleagues.
- 4.68 Prisoners due to be discharged were seen by a nurse the day before and any medicines required were ordered a week in advance. The nurse weighed prisoners and gave them a letter containing details of any healthcare interventions for them to give to their GP. There was no system to help prisoners without a GP to find one and prisoners were not even given the number of NHS Direct.

In-patients

Moorland closed

- 4.69 There was a very limited regime for in-patients, due largely to the ruling that three staff had to be on duty before any prisoner could be unlocked. Patients did not benefit from the expertise of an occupational therapist and neither did we see any evidence of staff being proactive in the management of prisoners.
- 4.70 While staff were polite and friendly towards prisoners, we formed the opinion that some staff were resistant to change and reluctant to challenge management even if it was in the interests of the patient to do so. For example, the association room was used for non-healthcare activity such as education or smoking cessation courses. No one appeared to think this was an inappropriate use of healthcare facilities and staff who were responsible for supervising these classes, or that it was wrong to curtail in-patients' activity (see also paragraph 4.72).
- 4.71 We did not see any prisoner out of his room for a significant amount of time. When we did see prisoners unlocked, the level of interaction between prisoner and staff was again limited. Prisoners were unlocked from about 8.15am and were able to have showers, clean their cells and complete applications. If there was a mixture of adult and young adult prisoners, they were unlocked individually. Exercise was very limited and was usually taken in the afternoon. There were two dedicated gym sessions but very few prisoners took up this option. The library was available to patients once a week.
- 4.72 On Mondays and Thursdays, there were education classes for those prisoners throughout the prison who could not access mainstream classes as they had mental health problems. Despite the fact that they were accommodated on normal location, it appeared that it became a healthcare responsibility to accommodate such classes because the prisoners had mental health problems. When asked why prisoners were not allowed association or exercise when the classes were going on, the response was that it was because there was no discipline support and that was how it was always done.
- 4.73 GPs did a ward round every weekday morning, and other visitors included the chaplaincy and the Independent Monitoring Board. Healthcare staff were involved in self-harm monitoring reviews, which took place weekly in the in-patient area.

Mental health

- 4.74 There were no identifiable primary mental health service or day care facilities at either site. The lack of RMNs and registered nurse - learning disability (RNLD) in the nursing team was unacceptable and prisoners' mental health needs were suffering as a result. Some RGNs saw

themselves as general nurses only and did not feel they had a role to play in the care of mentally ill patients.

- 4.75 There was a significant need for low-level mental health support. Prisoners arriving could have many anxieties surrounding their stay and in particular about their families and their isolation from them. Fortunately, MIND provided a counselling service and were in the prison twice a week.
- 4.76 The community mental health service was a good story. The MHIRT worked from an extant operational policy and accepted referrals from across the prison, although not from the prisoners themselves as these were often inappropriate. They had a joint caseload of up to 30 patients at any one time and had established excellent relationships with prison and probation staff and external agencies such as court diversion services. The team assessed all referrals and cross-checked with CRs for any details of previous mental health issues. The patient was referred to one of the team the same day as the assessment. Psychiatric support and guidance was through the two visiting psychiatrists who each attended for one session every week. Appropriate entries in CRs and wing history files were made to achieve good communication between the team and houseblock staff.
- 4.77 The team was concerned that doctors were prescribing anti-psychotic drugs purely on the word of the prisoner and without reference to them or the pharmacist. As a result, there was no monitoring of the patient or the drug.
- 4.78 The inclusion of a support worker in the team was excellent and clearly paying dividends. He had established a drop in centre on the houseblocks and saw prisoners with concerns about family, finances and practical issues such as letter writing and contacting legal advisors. This was a notable area of good practice that should be encouraged in other prisons.
- 4.79 The team told us of plans to introduce a key worker scheme whereby identified officers on the houseblocks would keep a watching brief on prisoners thought to have mental health concerns with a view to referral to the team.
- 4.80 All prisoners seen by the team were subject to the care programme approach (CPA) and all had care plans. Those prisoners arriving in the prison were followed up and links were maintained with the external MHIRT if already on the CPA. On discharge, community teams were contacted to ensure a follow through of care. One of the main problems for the team was the difficulty in finding suitable support for prisoners being released as 'no fixed abode'. Much of their time was spent identifying local services so that they could register with community mental health teams outside the prison.
- 4.81 In common with other prisons, there were difficulties in accessing secure beds. In the year to date, eight patients had been transferred to secure beds. When the need was identified, the psychiatrist and the team contacted external agencies and facilitated assessment visits but it was a long time before some of these assessments took place. We understood that in some instances the transfer did not take place because there was not enough time between the transfer and release date for treatment to be given.
- 4.82 There was no structured mental health awareness training for prison staff. The team was prepared to deliver training for staff but had not yet managed to achieve this. Despite this, team members told us they felt that many houseblock staff were receptive to advice and indeed in some cases were positively proactive, working together with the team to the benefit of the patient.

Joint work with the NHS

- 4.83 Although the transfer of commissioning responsibility had passed to the PCT in April 2004, there appeared to be little improvement in the provision of services to prisoners. FMS were still providing healthcare. A new tendering process had recently been completed and an announcement about the future was expected imminently. Healthcare staff felt very much in the dark and there was an understandable anxiety regarding their future. The commissioning manager visited the prison regularly and a prison healthcare project initiation document identifying targets to be achieved by March 2006 was in place. The prison partnership board met quarterly and there were specialty sub-groups working independently but reporting to it.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 4.84 The CARAT service should be relocated from healthcare and the current office space returned to healthcare.
- 4.85 Stock in the dispensary should be removed if it ceases to be a dispensing pharmacy.
- 4.86 All the beds in healthcare should be removed from the certified normal accommodation.
- 4.87 Prisoners should not be located in healthcare without medical reason.
- 4.88 The crisis suite should not be located in healthcare and the management of it should not be a healthcare responsibility.
- 4.89 Healthcare rooms should not be used by other departments for meetings, education or course work to the detriment of in-patients.
- 4.90 Healthcare staff should not be supervising prisoners undergoing education in the department.
- 4.91 Healthcare staff should ensure prescription and administration charts are completed properly. Where medication has not been given, it should say why.
- 4.92 The practice of doctors doing daily rounds in the segregation unit should be stopped.
- 4.93 The in-patient regime should be reviewed to ensure patients are out of their rooms as much as possible within the core day and staff should be more proactive in engaging with prisoners.

Moorland open

- 4.94 Healthcare should be involved in the resettlement of prisoners; this should include providing prisoners with information on how to access primary care services on release and support in accessing the services if required.
- 4.95 There should be a defibrillator in the healthcare centre.
- 4.96 Agency nurses should not work in isolation.

- 4.97 Prisoners should be provided with written information about healthcare services.
- 4.98 A range of frequently used medications should be provided in one-day supplies to avoid the need for secondary dispensing.
- 4.99 Nurses should follow Nursing & Midwifery Council guidelines for the administration of medications. This includes ensuring that prescription only medications are legally prescribed for the patient prior to administration.
- 4.100 The drugs and therapeutics committee should develop patient group directives for a range of medications, including vaccinations.
- 4.101 Meningitis C vaccines should be offered to prisoners under the age of 24 years.

Both sites

- 4.102 A primary care mental health needs assessment should be conducted to ensure that:
- the requirement for primary mental health support is identified
 - the staffing levels/skills required to establish and maintain the service are in place
 - care pathways and protocols are introduced
 - registered mental nurses are employed exclusively to provide mental health care
 - effective joint working with the mental health in-reach team is established and maintained
- 4.103 Funding should be established to implement a clinical information technology system.
- 4.104 All clinical policies and protocols should be evidence-based, signed, dated and regularly reviewed.
- 4.105 Additional and appropriately qualified administrative assistance should be identified for both sites.
- 4.106 Discipline support should be identified for both sites to escort and supervise prisoners attending and waiting for healthcare treatment.
- 4.107 The healthcare manager should be removed from the orderly officer rota.
- 4.108 Monthly team meetings should include all healthcare staff and be obligatory.
- 4.109 Clinical supervision should be identified, and protected time allocated to facilitate it.
- 4.110 Doctors should be qualified general practitioners.
- 4.111 A programme of change management should be identified to assist staff to manage change within their area of concern.
- 4.112 Triage algorithms should be used to ensure consistency of nursing assessment.

- 4.113 A pharmacist should visit the prison regularly to review medication and audit faxes with prescriptions.
- 4.114 Up to date reference sources should be available and out-of-date ones removed. The BNF for children is the most appropriate reference source for medication supplies to adolescents.
- 4.115 Nurses should not be used to escort prisoners from Moorland open to attend dental appointments.
- 4.116 The doctors should consult with the mental health in-reach team and pharmacy staff when prescribing anti-psychotic drugs.
- 4.117 The healthcare manager should have input to the provision of the pharmacy service and the service level agreement between the primary care trust and the provider.
- 4.118 If Methadone maintenance is to be introduced, the prison should ensure that proper provision is in place for the supply, storage and security of the drug.
- 4.119 Patient group directives should be introduced where possible.
- 4.120 There should be input to the drugs and therapeutics committee from the pharmacy supplier.
- 4.121 A dental therapist should be employed to undertake simple treatment and health promotion.

Housekeeping points

Moorland closed

- 4.122 An additional telephone line should be installed in the main treatment room.
- 4.123 Privacy screens should be provided in all areas where prisoners undergo physical examination.
- 4.124 All rooms used to interview or treat prisoners should have emergency bells installed in them.
- 4.125 The association room in healthcare should be redecorated and comfortable seating provided.
- 4.126 Old clinical records should be stored and managed appropriately.
- 4.127 A system of ensuring prisoners receive their appointments should be implemented.
- 4.128 Pharmacy staff should be involved in the supply of medication and providing information on the medication to patients.
- 4.129 New flooring should be provided in the dental surgery and additional electric sockets.
- 4.130 A new autoclave with integral printer should be provided, and two additional contra-angle and one additional straight hand pieces.

- 4.131 Clinical records for all prisoners receiving treatment should be available in the dental surgery, and details of treatment carried out entered into them.
- 4.132 An aluminium foil-lined tray beneath the amalgam mixer should be supplied.
- 4.133 Disposable tips for 3-in-1 syringes should be provided.
- 4.134 Matrix bands should be disposed of after each patient use.
- 4.135 Responsibility for the drainage of the compressor should be identified and pressure vessel certification for the compressor and autoclave checked.
- 4.136 Prisoners from Moorland open should be offered appointments every week.
- 4.137 Those prisoners from Moorland open who are able to access dental care in general/community dental practice should be encouraged to do so and assisted if necessary, as part of their resettlement programme.

Moorland open

- 4.138 Regular, documented checks should be made of all emergency equipment.
- 4.139 Infection control measures should be put in place.
- 4.140 Prisoners should be given appointment times for the GP, in line with practice in the community.

Good practice

- 4.141 *Including the mental health support worker in the mental health in-reach team was having a positive effect on services to prisoners.*

Section 5: Activities

Education and library provision

Expected outcomes:

Education provision meets the requirements of the Common Inspection Framework (separately inspected by Ofsted and ALI). Prisoners are encouraged and enabled to learn both during and after sentence, as part of training and sentence planning and have access to good library facilities.

5.1 The head of learning and skills was part of the senior management team and had overall responsibility for all prisoner learning and skills at both sites. City College, Manchester, provided a good range of education courses at both sites, while the prison operated a narrow range of vocational training. A clear strategy existed to integrate learning and skills across the prison. Teaching was generally satisfactory to good. Initial assessments of prisoners' needs were carried out satisfactorily, although the number of people waiting for numeracy and literacy support in the work areas was high. Education resources and equipment were generally satisfactory on both sites, although some classrooms were quite small. The libraries on both sites held a reasonable range of books, including legal material, recreational books and some for foreign national prisoners and those with learning difficulties. Six computers were available for those on educational courses. Access was limited for some prisoners and there was little time to browse.

Both sites

- 5.2 There head of learning and skills (HoLS) was a member of the prison senior management team and had a strategic role to play in the provision of learning and skills at both sites. Education was sub-contracted to City College, Manchester, while vocational training was carried out by prison staff. The annual contract for education services was for 37,090 teaching hours and 1,850 induction hours. At the last contract review, the teaching hours had been 97% compliant. A good range of courses was available alongside a number of resettlement and rehabilitation programmes provided by the education department. There was no evening or weekend provision. A small number of prisoners were engaged in higher level courses such as GCSE, A level and degree programmes provided through open learning.
- 5.3 The education provision focused mainly on literacy, numeracy, social and life skills and information technology. Other courses available included art, business studies, cookery, food hygiene, accountancy, computer courses, higher level maths and English. There was little English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) provision and no structured support for prisoners with dyslexia.
- 5.4 Of the 333 prisoners taking foundation courses, 233 were taking programmes in literacy and/or numeracy. The remainder were taking courses in life and social skills courses covering subjects such as alcohol awareness, parent craft, budgeting, preparation for work, and bullying and harassment. Prisoners studied literacy and numeracy up to level 2 and could progress to GCSE, A level and Open University courses where appropriate. Most prisoners attended education part time. Preparation for life and work were provided over the two sites. Moorland closed provided an outreach supported learning service to prisoners in the workshops and for

those who were unemployed; 122 were taking literacy and/or numeracy courses through open learning and by having individual meetings with tutors. Learning support was provided by a full-time coordinator, three literacy and numeracy specialists and eight learning support assistants.

- 5.5 Education and training were effectively managed, although systems to monitor the quality of learning had recently changed and were as yet unproven. There was good support from the college operations manager who was in regular contact with the education manager.
- 5.6 Initial advice and guidance to prisoners was satisfactory and prisoners were referred efficiently to educational courses. Prisoners were assessed for literacy and numeracy needs at induction but many, particularly in the work areas, were waiting for assistance in these subjects.
- 5.7 Standards of behaviour in sessions were particularly good and prisoner morale was high. Tutors and prison officers created a relaxed and respectful atmosphere in which prisoners were treated fairly and sensitively and encouraged to treat others politely. This was particularly noticeable in literacy and numeracy lessons, which prisoners may have been attending only to meet sentence plan requirements but obviously enjoyed and benefited from the sessions.
- 5.8 Prisoners received good support in literacy and numeracy from the 23 peer partners. Prisoners who achieved level 2 qualifications in literacy and numeracy could join the formal programme for peer partners. Ten prisoners were working towards the first unit of the adult learner support certificate at level 2. All literacy and numeracy classes observed were supported by peer tutors and prisoners told us that they valued the level of one-to-one support received, particularly at entry level. Prisoners who had specific needs were placed with others with diverse ability levels of literacy and numeracy.
- 5.9 Accommodation for literacy and numeracy courses was poor at Moorland closed. Rooms were cramped, with an average of nine prisoners plus peer partners attending classes. Tutors stored all learning resources in training rooms, further restricting limited space. Prisoners receiving support in workshops suffered from noise pollution from nearby workshops.
- 5.10 Thirty-three prisoners, including 15 young adults, were doing vocational training in construction areas. The range of activities in construction was insufficient, with only painting and decorating and the recently introduced electrical wiring programmes operational. Other craft workshops had been closed. The establishment was looking at other opportunities. All participating prisoners could access support for literacy and numeracy from the learning support team and this was delivered in the prison workshops. The prisoners in painting and decorating were doing the basic craft skills course with the opportunity to progress to the level 2 intermediate construction certificate. The domestic electrical installers certificate, level 2, was just being introduced.
- 5.11 Teaching and learning in vocational training were satisfactory and the development of practical skills was good. The teaching of all lessons observed was graded as satisfactory at least and the majority were graded as good. Tasks were well planned and tutors were supporting the prisoners' learning very well, including developing a good understanding of health and safety issues.
- 5.12 The workshop classrooms were too small and the painting and decorating classroom was also inappropriately used as a rest room and smoking area. The furniture quality was poor, with rickety tables and broken chairs. Teaching materials were inadequate and the only piece of equipment was a whiteboard in the electrical classroom. There was no use of IT to aid learning. Noise levels in the workshop were totally unacceptable. This was caused by constant hammering from the adjoining contract services production line that shared the building.

- 5.13 Staff had contributed to the self-assessment report produced in November 2005. This identified many but not all of the strengths and weaknesses highlighted here. Actions to address the weaknesses were not very far advanced.

Library

- 5.14 The library service was sub-contracted to East Doncaster Library Service. Both sites had their own libraries and the library manager was responsible for these as well as that at HMP Lindholme.

Moorland closed

- 5.15 At Moorland closed, there were two part-time librarians, a library prison officer and three library orderlies. The orderlies did not have the opportunity to gain qualifications in this area. The library contained 8076 books and had annual losses of 6.45%. Between December 2004 and November 2005, 7799 books had been issued. The library was open seven days a week and five evenings.
- 5.16 Prisoners had access to the library twice a week for about 15 to 20 minutes each session. Four books could be borrowed at any one time for a four-week period. Prisoners on educational courses had additional access and could take out additional books if required for their courses. The range of books, Prison Service orders and legal books was the same as at Moorland open (see paragraphs 5.21 and 5.22).
- 5.17 The library was situated alongside the main corridor with easy access for prisoners in the houseblocks. There was no mobile library but prisoners in healthcare had a dedicated session for visits. Healthcare and the segregation unit could also request books from the library and these were collected. The library sessions for the houseblocks were frequently cancelled due to staff shortages. Library staff attempted to make this time up at the weekends but this was not always possible.
- 5.18 The library had launched two new schemes to attract those with literacy needs to the library. One was the life skills reading group, which met once a week, and the other was the reading for fathers, which guided parents in how to help their children learn to read.

Moorland open

- 5.19 At Moorland open, a library assistant worked one session a week and three orderlies ran the library at all other sessions. This library contained 4310 books and had annual losses of 3.52%. Between December 2004 and November 2005, 3640 books had been issued. The library was open five days a week but with no weekend or evening provision.
- 5.20 Prisoners could access the library at any time during opening times but the lack of weekend provision meant that outworkers did not have direct access. The library orderlies took book orders from the outworkers on Saturdays and delivered books as requested but this still excluded those outworkers who worked on Saturdays.
- 5.21 Four books could be borrowed at any one time for a three-week period. There was a small selection of talking books, large print books, easy read books for adults, teenage books for young adults and a variety of books in different languages. There was also an ordering service for books in 52 languages and any other requests. There were no videos, DVDs for education

courses or music CDs. Six computers were available but could be accessed only by prisoners on educational courses.

- 5.22 The Prison Service orders had been updated. Hard copies were kept locked away and were available on request. There was an adequate range of legal books, with the most recent versions kept secure and available on request.
- 5.23 The library was situated alongside the main road with easy access for prisoners with mobility difficulties. There was no mobile library. Prisoners in the healthcare unit could request books from the library and these were collected for them.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 5.24 The accommodation for literacy and numeracy courses at Moorland closed should be improved, as should the accommodation and classroom facilities for painting and decorating and electrical installation courses.
- 5.25 The library should be given more priority to ensure that sessions are not cancelled and prisoners received adequate visits.
- 5.26 Prisoners should be given more time in a session to browse through the books and use the library for study.

Both sites

- 5.27 There should be a wider range of vocational training courses to ensure that the needs of prisoners are met.
- 5.28 There should be more effective quality assurance arrangements to ensure the quality of learning and skills is monitored and targets set for continuous improvement.
- 5.29 A mobile library system should be set up.
- 5.30 A selection of educational DVDs and music CDs should be offered.
- 5.31 Library orderlies should be enrolled on a qualification.

Work

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are engaged in safe work and are treated fairly. Work should prepare prisoners for employment on release and help to reduce offending.

- 5.32 The 13 industrial contract workshops at Moorland closed provided good work for many prisoners but there was no accreditation of work skills even though some of them had done so

in the past. The only work available at Moorland open was in cleaning, kitchens or horticulture. Some prisoners at Moorland closed working in horticulture were working towards a qualification but none of those in the gardens party at Moorland open. A similar situation existed with industrial cleaning and catering. Both sites offered recreational physical education and accredited courses in sport and exercise. The accredited courses were predominantly basic short courses for induction prisoners. Five orderlies were working in the physical education department at Moorland closed but only three had recently been registered for NVQ 1 in sport and recreation.

Moorland closed

- 5.33 Moorland closed had 13 production workshops covering tailoring, fork-lift truck driving, furniture repairs, injection moulding, wheelchair repairs, television repair, lighting assembly, cycle repairs, screen printing, Braille, production of breakfast packs and two contract services workshops.
- 5.34 Too little use was made of the workshop facilities to deliver accredited training. The production workshops offered good facilities and activities capable of being used to deliver a range of accredited training programmes. Prisoners were well engaged in 'purposeful activities' in the workshops, three of which had been put forward for regional awards. Cycle repair, Braille and fork-lift truck driving offered qualifications to a limited number of prisoners, with the latter achieving a pass rate of 98%. Some of the others had delivered accredited training in the past and the remainder, with the exception of breakfast packs, were planning to do so. Most of the staff had the appropriate qualifications, or were working towards them, to be able to offer accredited training.
- 5.35 Prisoners were paid £8 a week when doing accredited training, as compared to the production workshops that varied between less than the training rate to £14. However, the workshops had a budget for wages and the flexibility in how to use them was such that accredited training could be accommodated with little or no loss of earnings.
- 5.36 Seven of the 12 prisoners working in horticulture were working towards achieving a level 1 skills test qualification and were planning to achieve the minimum requirement of 12 skills tests for the full certificate. No prisoners had yet achieved all 12 of the new skills tests. Eight prisoners had previously achieved certificates under the old skill test qualifications.
- 5.37 Industrial cleaning at Moorland closed involved 27 prisoners, 16 of whom were doing related qualifications. Moorland closed offered a range of industrial cleaning programmes, with six prisoners on a cleaning food premises course, four on level 1 industrial cleaning, four on level 2 and two working towards their assessor awards. Good use was made of trained prisoners in the training of new recruits, with prisoner assessors frequently used to carry out training and assessment alongside a trained member of staff. Trained prisoner assessors were also used effectively to train prison officers in industrial cleaning. Some moved on to be team leaders and managed groups of trained cleaners, which provided real work experience. The three trained prisoner assessors acknowledged that this had improved their literacy and numeracy skills as well as developing their confidence in working with people and managing teams.
- 5.38 Instructors were trained according to the awarding body requirements for assessment but none were trained trainers and the range of teaching styles and methods was narrow. When a prisoner was practicing or being assessed, other learners sat around waiting showing signs of boredom; they were not encouraged to participate in any other learning activities. There was sometimes an over-reliance on using the prisoner assessors/trainers to train the new learners.

No observation of trainers took place by peers or any other members of the prison for quality improvement purposes.

- 5.39 Moorland closed had a vocational training kitchen, a main kitchen and a domestic kitchen. Eleven prisoners were on catering training programmes. Of these, nine were following a NVQ level 1 in food preparation and cooking, and food and drink service; two prisoners had recently progressed to a NVQ level 2 in food preparation and cooking. Prisoners (adults and young adults) were attending training for 28 hours a week.
- 5.40 The vocational training kitchen at Moorland closed had one full-time tutor, one part-time tutor and one instructional officer. It could enrol 20 prisoners at any one time. Enrolments were on a roll-on roll-off basis and the average length of a course was 12 months. Prisoners completed an additional NVQ level 1 in food and drink service as part of the overall training programme. Before starting the course, prisoners had already achieved a basic food hygiene certificate and a certificate in cleaning food areas.
- 5.41 Of the five orderlies working in the physical education (PE) department at Moorland closed, only three had very recently been registered for NVQ 1 in sport and recreation. None had completed any assessments even though they had been doing the job for over six months. There were missed opportunities for the accreditation of the skills they were demonstrating on a daily basis. There were, however, good facilities and resources for PE and a wide range of activities offered for recreational PE. Staff had suitable qualifications to offer a range of accredited courses. All PE staff were qualified as NVQ assessors and two also had teaching qualifications (see also section on physical education and health promotion).

Moorland open

- 5.42 There were no workshops at Moorland open. The only work available was in cleaning, kitchens and horticulture but there were few opportunities to achieve qualifications.
- 5.43 Fourteen prisoners were working on the gardens party but none of them were doing any qualification in horticulture. No prisoners were doing any qualifications in cleaning. Moorland open had suffered from long-term staffing issues for industrial cleaning. A member of staff had transferred from horticulture to industrial cleaning as an instructor. They inherited a trained team and were only participating in cleaning the prison. A part-time instructor was delivering some training but no assessment was being undertaken.
- 5.44 Moorland open had a vocational training kitchen and main kitchen but no prisoners were on a catering training programme. A tutor had just been recruited but had not yet started work.
- 5.45 Like Moorland closed, Moorland open offered recreational physical education and accredited courses in sport and exercise.

Both sites

- 5.46 The prison was aware of the lack of vocational and employment-related training courses and was working to improve the provision.

Recommendation

Both sites

- 5.47 The range of vocational training programmes should be increased to meet the needs of the population and identified skill shortages.

Physical education and health promotion

Expected outcomes:

Physical education and facilities meet the requirements of the common inspection framework used by Ofsted and the Adult Learning Inspectorate (separately inspected by ALI). Prisoners are also encouraged and enabled to take part in recreational PE, in safe and decent surroundings.

- 5.48 The physical education (PE) department was understaffed but delivering sufficient recreational PE sessions. Facilities were good at both sites and short induction courses were ongoing. Not enough vocational accredited courses were offered. The collection of data about recruitment, achievement and leavers was insufficient, and courses were not monitored for quality. Prisoners' access to the gym was not allocated fairly. Records of prisoners attending and frequency were not accurately maintained.

Moorland closed

- 5.49 In the past 11 months, 1011 awards had been achieved at Moorland closed. These were mostly emergency life support, manual handling and weight-lifting personal awards.

Moorland open

- 5.50 At Moorland open, all new prisoners completed their emergency life support and manual-handling certificate as part of their induction. Additionally in 2005, 15 prisoners had achieved their gym instructor's certificate and 14 the treatment of sports injuries certificate. Five of seven prisoners obtained their national pool lifeguard qualification off site. This potentially improved their future employment opportunities. One prisoner who obtained his gym instructor's certificate in 2005 was doing voluntary work three days a week at a fitness facility in Hull.

Both sites

- 5.51 Educational programmes at both sites were usually planned for the following year. However, there were no plans for 2006 at Moorland closed due to staff shortages. This had resulted in insufficient accreditation of courses for prisoners in the prison. There were few links with the education department. Initial assessment of prisoners was not used at Moorland closed to select prisoners for course suitability but this was checked at Moorland open. Selection onto courses was at the discretion of PE staff. In 2005, the NVQ level 2 teaching of fitness and exercise course had been delivered with a key skills communication course at the same time. Educational staff came to the PE department to deliver this element. There was no system for course reviews by prisoners. There was no system for internal lesson observation of accredited courses to judge the quality of teaching. Data collection was inadequate. Numbers

were kept of those who achieved awards but there was poor data on recruitment or retention and therefore achievement values were not meaningfully measured.

- 5.52 Other than the short courses run as part of induction, no accredited courses were being delivered (see section on work).
- 5.53 Facilities at both sites were good for the courses offered. Both sites had access to suitably equipped practical facilities and a teaching classroom with a range of teaching aids including provision for the use of information technology in course delivery. Both fitness areas were similar to commercial gyms with mainly fixed resistance equipment and a small range of cardiovascular stations.
- 5.54 At both sites, prisoners were involved in working with the special needs groups who came to the prison to use the sports facilities every week.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 5.55 Wing times to attend the gym should be on rotation to ensure equality.
- 5.56 More vocational accredited courses should be available for prisoners.
- 5.57 Data about recruitment, achievements and leavers should be better collected.
- 5.58 Courses should be quality monitored and quality improvement initiatives introduced.

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 the life of the establishment and contributes to the overall care, support and resettlement of prisoners.

- 5.59 There were not enough chaplains to provide services, pastoral support, groups and to contribute to relevant regime areas. There were some problems in providing religious services for the major faith communities led by the appropriate minister at the appropriate time. All new prisoners were seen on arrival and prisoners subject to self-harm action plans were given additional support. A few evening groups were being run.

Moorland closed

- 5.60 A Church of England service and non-communion Catholic service were held on Sundays and a Roman Catholic mass and Buddhist meditation on Tuesdays. Muslim prayers were held on Fridays but were led by prisoners on alternate weeks because there was only one Imam. The chaplaincy also ran the Alpha (introduction to Christianity) group once a week.

- 5.61 In our survey, adults and young adults at Moorland closed said that their beliefs were respected to the same degree as the comparator. Adults reported being significantly less able to speak to a minister in private compared to the comparator.

Moorland open

- 5.62 Some prisoners at Moorland open were eligible to attend religious services in the community on licence and two Sikh prisoners went out to services each week. However, many were not able to do this. There were weekly services in the open site for Church of England, Roman Catholic and Muslim prisoners.
- 5.63 Church of England services were held on Sundays and Muslim prayers every Friday. As in Moorland closed, prisoners led Muslim prayers every other week (see paragraph 5.60).
- 5.64 The chaplains attended Moorland open for one or two hours each day on a rota basis to see any new arrivals, respond to applications and provide pastoral support. Both adults and young adults at Moorland open reported that they could get access to a minister and felt that their beliefs were respected to the same degree as the comparator.
- 5.65 Four teaching groups were held at Moorland open, including a young adult pre-release group an introduction to Christianity group, Muslim teaching and a guitar group.

Both sites

- 5.66 The chaplaincy team for both sites was resourced for 3.5 full-time equivalent posts for chaplains and 15 additional hours for sessional ministers. There was a full-time Church of England chaplain and a full-time Ecumenical lay chaplain. The Muslim Imam worked for 20 hours each week and another Church of England chaplain worked for five hours a week. There was a vacancy for 20 hours a week for a Roman Catholic chaplain. Sessional ministers from the Free Church, a Catholic priest and a Buddhist teacher attended weekly. Ministers from other faiths were available on request.
- 5.67 Chaplains saw all new prisoners individually. They also visited all prisoners subject to self-harm support plans weekly and attended their review meetings. There were no visiting ministers, volunteers or links with local faith communities and there was no prison visitors scheme. There were not enough chaplains within the planned profile to provide services, pastoral support, groups and to contribute to relevant regime areas.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 5.68 All prisoners should be able to practice their religion fully.
- 5.69 The chaplaincy team should be resourced to be able to provide the necessary religious services and to contribute to prisoners' overall care, support and resettlement.

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in out of cell activities, and the establishment offers a timetable of regular and varied extra-mural activities.

5.70 Due to the different regimes at Moorland, prisoners spent a varied amount of time out of their cells. At Moorland closed, unemployed prisoners were spending unacceptably long periods locked up and unemployed young adults were restricted even further. At Moorland open, prisoners had keys to their rooms and so were never locked in. There was daily evening association at both sites, including at weekends. Prisoners at Moorland closed were allocated only half an hour a day in the fresh air during the week.

Moorland closed

- 5.71 Unemployed prisoners spent unacceptably long periods behind their doors. At two separate roll checks during the inspection, approximately 23% of prisoners were locked in their cells during the core day. This ranged from 38% of young adults and 19% of adults on houseblocks 1 and 3 to 6% of adult prisoners on houseblock 5.
- 5.72 Monitoring figures did not accurately reflect how much time prisoners were spending out of their cell. Association hours were being inflated weekly and the amount of time spent on exercise was being duplicated across all the regimes. In our survey, 7% of adult prisoners, significantly less than the comparator of 24%, reported spending 10 hours or more out of their cell during the week, and 1%, significantly less than the comparator of 14%, reported spending 10 or more hours out of their cell at the weekend. The same pattern was apparent in the young adult survey results, with 5%, significantly worse than the comparator of 9%, reporting spending 10 hours or more out of their cell during the week, and none, against a comparator of 4%, reported spending 10 hours or more out of their cell at the weekend.
- 5.73 Unemployed adult prisoners spent on average only three hours unlocked every day, while those who were employed spent 8.5 hours out cell on average. Young adults were restricted even further, with those who were employed spending on average 8.25 hours out of cell and those who were unemployed as little as 2.25 hours out of cell.
- 5.74 Scheduled association took place every evening and prisoners said it was rarely cancelled. Association was on a rota basis for the young adults, with prisoners attending association three times a week on average. For unemployed young adults, the lack of association severely restricted their time out of cell, with some prisoners stating that they had been locked up all day as they had not awoken for the 8am exercise slot.
- 5.75 Exercise in the fresh air was scheduled for half an hour during the week and an hour at weekends. Attendance was particularly poor: during the week, only 3% of adults and 5% of young adults went out to exercise, while at the weekend this number increased to 21% and 29% respectively. The exercise yards on the adult blocks were generally clean and tidy but contained no seating. The exercise yards on the young adult blocks were less clean, with rubbish littering the yards.

Moorland open

- 5.76 Moorland open's core day from morning roll check to the end of evening association was over 14 hours. Evening association took place daily in the house units. Prisoners were not allowed to associate with prisoners from different units.
- 5.77 Adult prisoners could associate freely, whereas young adults were not allowed to associate in each others' rooms and were expected to spend their time in the association areas in their house units.
- 5.78 Prisoners were obliged to return to their house units on return from work and were not offered adequate time to exercise outside. In our survey, 22% of adult prisoners, significantly worse than the comparator of 73%, reported going out to exercise three or more times a week.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 5.79 A full hour of exercise should be provided at both sites for those who wish to participate.
- 5.80 Published daily routines should be placed on each wing, alongside any rota system that is being used for association.
- 5.81 Out of cell activities should be improved, particularly for young adults.

Section 6: Good order

Security and rules

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through positive relationships between staff and prisoners based on mutual respect as well as attention to physical and procedural matters. Rules and routines are well-publicised, proportionate, fair and encourage responsible behaviour. Categorisation and allocation procedures are based on assessment of a young person's risks and needs; and are clearly explained, fairly applied and routinely reviewed.

6.1 Levels of safety across the two sites were acceptable. There were some indications that the levels of contraband within the prison had risen recently, and the cancellation of some targeted searches in Moorland closed was of concern. The daily and weekly stability reviews were comprehensive and allowed identified threats to security to be investigated and responded to. Categorisation was a well-run department that was systematic and organised. Decision-making appeared consistent and fair. Prisoners held in the segregation unit frequently 'queue jumped' for transfer those prisoners who applied through the proper procedures. The system for returning category D prisoners to category C was neither fair nor transparent.

Moorland closed

- 6.2 The number of dedicated security staff at Moorland closed had been reduced. The majority of searching and supervision of visits were undertaken by residential officers. The unit was managed by a principal officer and the remaining team comprised one full-time and one part-time senior officer, two officers and two operational support grades. This team focused on scrutinising intelligence and undertook target searches that resulted from intelligence.
- 6.3 The monthly security meeting discussed key prisoners, incidents related to escape threats or drugs, as well as information about each individual residential unit, public protection, physical and procedural security. A daily stability audit reviewed a wide range of security indicators. This was discussed at each operational morning meeting and collated into a weekly status report by the deputy governor. Any perceived increase in risk was subject to a further review of intelligence and action plan. A thousand security information reports had been received in the year to date and the trends in these were monitored. There was no similar monitoring of trends in areas such as assaults, search finds, drug use or other relevant events.
- 6.4 There was a dedicated telephone censor and skilled closed-circuit television operator in the visits room, both of whom provided consistently high levels of intelligence. Targeted searching was profiled for 28 sessions a week, although a quarter of these had been cancelled in the seven weeks before the inspection because staff had been redeployed. This was of some concern given the high quality of intelligence used for these searches. Routine searching was completed by staff on their own wing and at the rate required by the prison targets. However, given the other tasks being done by these officers at the same time, we had concerns about the quality of this routine searching.
- 6.5 Although the number was not high, assaults on prisoners were increasing slightly, as were security information reports for assaults, alcohol and drugs. Positive drugs tests were low but

such tests were rarely undertaken at weekends, which may have resulted in an inaccurately low figure. The change in these indicators had not resulted in general disorder or feelings of vulnerability. In our survey, 29% of adults and 23% of young adults, against respective comparators of 23% and 34%, said they had ever felt unsafe. Both groups reported lower levels of being victimised (16% and 21%) by another prisoner compared to their respective comparators of 19% and 24%.

- 6.6 The security department was also responsible for ensuring the procedures for managing restricted status young adults. This included searching, intelligence monitoring, managing cell moves and preparing monthly security reports. At the time of the inspection, seven young adults were subject to these procedures. There had been one incident of concerted indiscipline and four hostage-taking incidents in the 11 months before the inspection. These had been carefully investigated and appeared to have been incidents relating to prisoners' individual circumstances. However, it was of concern that they did not have their grievances addressed or risk levels identified by supervising staff on their houseblocks.
- 6.7 The reduction in dedicated security staff and procedures and management of intelligence could have left the prison vulnerable to prisoners' safety being compromised, although there was no significance evidence of this.
- 6.8 All prisoners were issued with copies of the prison rules, which they signed as part of their compact with the prison. Each houseblock had its own copy of houseblock rules that also contained more general information. Some of the information included was inaccurate, such as the association times on houseblocks 3 and 4 and access to religious services in most of the houseblock rules.

Moorland open

- 6.9 Moorland open was well ordered, with one senior officer working full time on the management of security. Residential staff undertook routine and targeted searching. There was a low level of abscond (47 in the year to date). One of the procedures to reduce absconds had been to hold those waiting for targeted drug test results at Moorland closed until the result was available. Although this had contributed to reducing absconding, we had some concerns about the impact of this procedure on the prisoners' categorisation and future progress.
- 6.10 Moorland open had a low level of positive drug tests, which was particularly encouraging given the 1700 releases on temporary licence each year.
- 6.11 There were 500 security information reports a year and this was increasing each year. Systems to develop the intelligence were good, with 75% of targeted drug tests being positive.

Categorisation

Moorland closed

- 6.12 The paperwork in the observation, classification and allocation (OCA) department was clear, systematic and fair. The department was mainly concerned with the re-categorisation from C to D and subsequent move to open conditions. The paperwork illustrated that borderline case prisoners would be put forward for a D category. There was also clear evidence of an appeals procedure and evidence that failure to re-categorise to D had been over-ruled on appeal through the request and complaints procedure.

- 6.13 The department was also concerned with transferring prisoners to other prisons that better suited their needs. Such transfers were almost always initiated by application by the prisoner. The OCA department did check sentence plans before agreeing to transfer and kept prisoners informed of progress. It did not, however, meet with the prisoner personally but used a tracking system for this and followed up at two-week intervals. The department had clearly developed good relationships with other prisons but staff felt that transfers were often delayed by the prisoner management unit.
- 6.14 Staff in the OCA department complained that it was common practice for governor grades to ask for a prisoner held in the segregation unit to be transferred as a priority. This was normally on a one-for-one swap and segregation unit staff confirmed that they did receive prisoners directly into the segregation unit from other prisons.
- 6.15 Long-term prisoners serving over four years did not generally have progressive moves written into their sentence plans as a matter of course. Staff explained that this was because a move to Moorland was viewed as progressive and the next step was then seen as re-categorisation to category D and a move to Moorland open.

Moorland open

- 6.16 Prisoners who were re-categorised from D to C and therefore returned to closed conditions could submit a complaint form. Through examination of these forms, we concluded that there was no clear policy in place. 'Security concerns' and 'deterioration in behaviour' were cited as reasons for returning a prisoner to closed conditions and in most cases no further explanation was offered. It was felt that the close proximity of Moorland closed perhaps encouraged the return of prisoners to category C status when in fact the prisoner could have been managed more effectively at Moorland open and his resettlement thereby continued without unnecessary interruption. (See recommendation 1.10)

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 6.17 Security information should be scrutinised in more detail and cross-referenced with a range of other events at Moorland closed to improve intelligence and allow security resources to be targeted more successfully.
- 6.18 The practise of transferring out segregated prisoners should cease, except in the most extreme circumstances. Prisoners placed on good order or discipline should be case-managed by segregation unit managers to enable return to normal location.
- 6.19 Long-term prisoners serving over four years should, as part of their sentence planning process, have the possibility of progressive moves examined. This should be based not only on security categorisation but also on other factors such as closeness to home and education possibilities.

Both sites

- 6.20 Mandatory and targeted drug testing should be undertaken at weekends as well as during the week.

Housekeeping point

Moorland closed

- 6.21 Information about houseblock rules and routines should be accurate.

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.

- 6.22 Adjudications were well conducted in appropriate facilities but the number of hearings was high at both sites. There was a regular moderators meeting, with quality assurance feedback, but limited use was made of available information on the comprehensive database. The levels of use of force and special accommodation were high and 20% of use of force records reviewed indicated that incidents had been provoked or mishandled by staff. One third of the managers authorising the use of special accommodation gave no reason for their decision, although the records of officers caring for prisoners were good. Management oversight was lacking. On average, 13 prisoners were segregated at any one time. The unit was well ordered and staff had a good knowledge of the prisoners but the regime and activities for prisoners spending longer periods on the unit were limited. The work of the unit was discussed in detail at the monthly security meeting.

Disciplinary procedures

Moorland closed

- 6.23 To date in 2005 (11 months), 1,578 adjudications had taken place, approximately two per prisoner per year.
- 6.24 Some charges might have been better dealt with informally or via the incentives system. We observed one adjudication for a prisoner with a good record and previous good relationships with staff who was formally charged for using a term of very mild abuse to an officer. Over 10 adjudications were normally heard each day. These took up most of the morning and tied up most of the segregation unit staff. Two adjudications rooms were available so that two adjudicators could work at the same time. Both rooms were well laid out, quiet and safe. From the records sampled and the observed adjudications, prisoners were spoken to respectfully and encouraged to participate and give their point of view. A number of hearings were adjourned to allow prisoners to obtain legal advice or witnesses.

- 6.25 Punishment levels were acceptable, with little use made of cellular confinement (5.6% of charged prisoners received cellular confinement). Twelve per cent of the charges were dismissed or not proceeded with. Thirty-seven percent of those charged were young adults, which was in proportion to the number in the population. Minor infringements of the rules by young adults could also be dealt with through minor reports conducted by trained principal officers. Minor reports were less formal and allowed staff to deal more quickly with less serious breaches of the rules. They were used about seven times a week on one houseblock and nine times on the other. This low use had been identified by adjudicators at the moderators meeting and plans were in place to increase minor reports in order to reduce the number of young adults facing full adjudications.
- 6.26 Adjudicators met bi-monthly to review their practice, maintain consistency, review appeals or difficult cases and receive feedback. The deputy governor reviewed a representative sample of hearings and presented a quality assurance report to each meeting. The high number of adjudications had been raised at this meeting but no strategy to address the problem had been implemented. Not enough use was made of the very good database of information about frequency of charges and punishments to monitor trends and measure progress in areas such as reducing inappropriate charges.

Moorland open

- 6.27 There had been about 500 adjudications in the first 11 months of 2005. Adjudications were used to deal with a lot of infringements of a relatively minor nature.

Use of force

Moorland closed

- 6.28 All 170 incidents of use of force to date in 2005 had taken place at Moorland closed. Two-thirds of these had involved young adults, which was twice as much as their proportion in the prison population.
- 6.29 The records of use of force were well maintained and complete. Some monitoring was in place by keeping a log of where incidents occurred and what force was used but this was not collated by managers and used to identify trends. Equally, there was no managerial oversight of the details of individual incidents to identify lessons to be learned.
- 6.30 We looked at 30 of the most recent incident records, 20% of which had resulted from incidents that appeared to have been inappropriately dealt with by officers who provoked prisoners or used force when there was no immediate risk to themselves or anyone else.
- 6.31 The special (unfurnished) cell had been used 42 times to date in 2005. A quarter of all prisoners subject to use of force were located in special accommodation. Very few were in strip conditions. One prisoner had been placed there because of self-harm concerns. There had been one use of a body belt. Observations of people in the special cell were made at least four times an hour and were well recorded, including details of efforts to de-escalate or support the prisoner. Authorisation of special accommodation by managers was poor, with the authorising governor giving no reason for this measure in a third of the forms. Officers working in the segregation unit reported that prisoners who were still fighting or failing to comply when they arrived in the segregation unit were generally placed in the special cell. It was not clear why they could not be placed in normal segregation unit cells.

- 6.32 The average time in the special cell was 3.5 hours, although 17 prisoners had spent over four hours there and the time spent in the cell was increasing. There was no routine monitoring of the trends in the use of special accommodation or management oversight of individual incidents to ensure that they were appropriate or justified.

Segregation unit

Moorland closed

- 6.33 The segregation unit had 22 single cells on two open landings. One cell was fitted with a camera to allow remote monitoring and there were two special (unfurnished) cells. Four cells contained bunk beds. The unit was clean but there was a lot of graffiti in the cells. There was no in cell electricity. The unit also contained a servery, a staff office and an adjudication room, with another adjudication room available in an adjacent block. The two large walled exercise yards were clean if somewhat stark. All segregated prisoners exercised alone.
- 6.34 The unit was well ordered and staff-prisoner relationships were relaxed but the regime was somewhat restrictive. A clear segregation unit policy included information about daily routines and instruction for fortnightly reviews. All segregated prisoners were required to collect their breakfast and evening meals from the servery. This ensured that they were up and dressed, and allowed staff to assess prisoners' well-being and demeanour. Lunchtime sandwiches were taken to the prisoners' cells by staff. Hot water for drinks was available with each meal and at the end of each evening shift. Prisoners had daily access to exercise but showers were permitted only every other day. Depending on the number of prisoners in the unit, access to the telephone and the unit's book collection was available every other day or every three days. The unit recognised each prisoner's incentives and earned privilege status. Although not all privileges were available, such as in cell television, access to higher levels of spending money and visits were allowed.
- 6.35 All prisoners were visited daily by a doctor, governor and chaplain. Unless there were specific individual security concerns, the chaplains visited each cell on their own allowing them to speak to prisoners in private. A member of the Independent Monitoring Board visited segregated prisoners weekly.
- 6.36 Staff knowledge of prisoners' needs and reasons for their segregation was good. However, apart from some in cell education, there was no provision for activities for those spending longer periods in the unit.
- 6.37 In the four months before the inspection, 111 prisoners had been segregated (62 usually for one day pending adjudication, 18 for their own protection, 16 subject to cellular confinement and 15 for good order). The average occupancy during the same period was 13, with approximately three people staying on the unit over 30 days each month. The most frequent reason for people spending long periods segregated was that they were waiting for a transfer to another prison. The unit was not routinely used for the care of self-harming prisoners.
- 6.38 The number of receptions to segregation and those spending over three months on the unit was reported to the security committee and segregation unit managers each month. The basic statistics were supported by a narrative report from the unit governor, including some limited review of changes over the previous month. These reports revealed a detailed knowledge of the circumstances of individual prisoners but the figures were not used to analyse trends and the average time spent in the unit for the different reasons was not monitored. Prisoners' segregation was authorised correctly and review meetings were held for those staying over 72

hours. However, these meeting concentrated on where and when they would move and neglected to address their support or regime while they remained in the unit.

Moorland open

- 6.39 Moorland open had a segregation unit fenced off from the rest of Moorland open. It had been decided not to use this facility but prisoners were occasionally removed directly from Moorland open to the closed segregation unit following, for example, acts of violence. There was no routine monitoring of how frequently this was done or what effect these decisions had on those prisoners' future progress through their sentence.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 6.40 Managers should record in detail the reasons behind their authorisation of the use of special accommodation, including why less intrusive measures are not appropriate.
- 6.41 There should be managerial scrutiny of each incident involving force or the special cell to ensure that actions are appropriate and justified and that lessons are learned.
- 6.42 Trends in the use of force and use of the special cell should be monitored over time so that strategies can be introduced to identify high-risk activities, areas and times, and to reduce these types of interventions.
- 6.43 Information about the occupancy of the segregation unit should be developed and monitored over time to assist managers in reducing time spent in the unit.
- 6.44 Some appropriate activity and support structures should be provided for prisoners who spend longer periods in the segregation unit.

Moorland open

- 6.45 The use of Moorland closed segregation unit for prisoners from Moorland open should be subject to a formal procedure that includes consideration of the security classification and a system for close monitoring of the effects of these decisions.

Both sites

- 6.46 The number of adjudications for prisoners and young adults at both sites should be reduced by ensuring that minor infringements are dealt with using alternative responses.

Housekeeping points

Moorland closed

- 6.47 The adjudications database should be routinely scrutinised to provide monitoring of trends in types of adjudication charges and outcomes.

- 6.48 The segregation unit cells should be maintained free of graffiti.
- 6.49 Segregated prisoners should have access to showers every day.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

Incentives and earned privilege schemes are well-publicised, designed to improve behaviour and are applied fairly, transparently and consistently within and between establishments, with regular reviews.

6.50 Staff were clear about the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme but some prisoners did not understand how it worked. Links between IEP and sentence planning were weak. Movement between IEP levels was usually based on a pattern of behaviour but use of the basic level was relatively low. A formal IEP review board provided a level of objectivity and consistency but there was evidence that not all eligible cases were being referred to the board. At Moorland closed, prisoner confidence in the scheme was low. The arrangements for managing prisoners on basic level had improved but the regime remained poor, with structured interventions available only to young adults suspected of bullying.

Moorland closed

6.51 In our survey, only 29% of young adults and 49% of adults felt they had been treated fairly in their experience of the IEP scheme. Both results were significantly worse than the comparators. Prisoners could make written representations but were not invited to attend review boards. In November 2005, less than 2% of the population was on the basic regime.

Moorland open

6.52 In our survey, 62% of young adults and 73% of adults felt they had been treated fairly in their experience of the IEP scheme. Unlike those at Moorland closed, prisoners at Moorland open were invited to attend their review board. In November 2005, about 1% of the population was on the basic regime.

Both sites

6.53 The latest version of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had been published on 30 November 2005. All of the staff to whom we spoke were able to describe the details of the scheme and how it was applied in their part of the prison. Although the scheme was publicised on residential wings and covered in the prisoner induction programme, several prisoners we met had an incorrect understanding of the scheme, particularly relating to the various entitlements or the criteria for promotion and demotion. Despite a stated aim of encouraging prisoners to adhere to their sentence plan and address offending behaviour, links between the IEP policy and sentence planning were weak.

6.54 All new arrivals were placed on the standard level of the scheme unless they could prove that they had achieved enhanced level at their previous establishment. Movement between the levels was usually based on a pattern of behaviour over a period of time (normally three

months), although any prisoner suspected of bullying could be placed on the basic regime without warning. At the time of this inspection, 15 prisoners were on basic, eight of whom were suspected bullies. Given the high number of adjudications (see section on disciplinary procedures), it did not appear that the IEP scheme was being fully utilised to deal with difficult or inappropriate behaviour.

- 6.55 A 'differential regime review board' chaired by a principal officer considered all applications for promotion and demotion. These boards provided a degree of objectivity and consistency to the review process. However, the board did not routinely review the progress of all prisoners but mainly relied on prisoner applications for promotion to enhanced and personal officer referrals for demotion to basic. In our sample of wing history sheets, we found two that recorded a sustained pattern of poor behaviour that should have been referred to the board but had not been. While it was reasonable for staff to exercise some discretion in the management of the IEP scheme, prisoners and staff told us they sometimes found it hard to understand why cases were not referred to the board sooner.
- 6.56 Arrangements for the management of prisoners on basic level had improved significantly since our last inspection but the regime remained poor. Young adults were located on houseblock 4 and adult prisoners on houseblock 2 for periods of 21 and 28 days. While on basic, prisoners were entitled to two showers a week and telephone calls once or twice a week, which was less than that provided to segregated prisoners. A structured programme had been developed for young adults on basic because of bullying and this was a good initiative. No such interventions were available to other young adults or adult prisoners.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 6.57 Prisoners at Moorland closed should be given the opportunity to attend their incentives and earned privileges review boards.

Both sites

- 6.58 Links between the incentives and earned privileges and resettlement (sentence planning) policies should be strengthened.
- 6.59 Differential regime review boards should specifically consider compliance with sentence planning targets when deciding to promote or demote prisoners within the incentives and earned privileges scheme.
- 6.60 The possible correlation between high levels of adjudications and low use of basic level should be investigated to ensure that the incentives and earned privileges scheme is being used appropriately to manage poor behaviour.
- 6.61 The differential regime review board should have greater oversight of the progress of all prisoners to demonstrate fair and consistent application of the incentives and earned privileges scheme.
- 6.62 Prisoners should not be deprived of access to showers and telephones as part of the basic regime.

6.63 The basic regime should provide prisoners with sufficient opportunity and support, including structured interventions when appropriate, for them to demonstrate improvement in their behaviour.

Section 7: Services

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

7.1 The preparation and final presentation of food on both sites was good. Hygiene regulations were observed, kitchen workers were trained and servers were clean. Food was correctly stored and disposal was done appropriately. Protective clothing was worn in the kitchens and on the serveries. Prisoners on both sites complained about the quantity and quality of food but examination and tasting did not justify their complaints.

Both sites

- 7.2 The food on both sites was similar and came within the remit of one catering manager. The main differences were that Moorland open offered two hot meals a day, offered a served breakfast and had a dining room for use by all prisoners while Moorland closed had one hot meal, breakfast packs issued the night before use and in cell dining.
- 7.3 Food comments books were available on the houseblocks. Comments had been entered and these appeared to relate primarily to the quality of chips. The catering manager accepted these had been of poor quality, largely due to the potatoes used. They had spoken with a supplier and things had been improving in recent weeks.
- 7.4 Prisoners and staff were trained and observed the rules for preparation of halal food. Temperature probes were used on the serveries and, in all cases viewed, a separate probe was used for halal food.
- 7.5 The principal officer in charge of catering had carried out a food survey over the last three years. In the last two years, he had input from the psychology department and he appeared enthusiastic in incorporating prisoners' views. A halal option was offered every day and 'diversity weeks' had been held.
- 7.6 Prisoners did complain about the quality and quantity of food. The breakfast packs at Moorland closed were particularly cited as small and lunchtime sandwiches at Moorland closed came in for particular criticism. Overall, the criticism of the food did not appear justified and the evening meal in particular was well presented and appetising. There was perhaps some validity in the criticism of the sandwiches, although this was more related to the fact that they were served every day rather than the actual sandwiches themselves.
- 7.7 Food in the kitchen area was stored correctly and food was discarded properly. Staff and prisoners working in the kitchen and on the serveries wore the appropriate protective and hygienic clothing.

Recommendation

Moorland closed

- 7.8 Breakfast packs should be issued on the morning they are to be eaten.

Prison shop

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners can purchase a suitable range of goods at reasonable prices to meet their ethnic, cultural and gender needs, and can do so safely, from an effectively managed shop.

- 7.9 The prison shop provided a reliable and efficient service and the range of goods was acceptable. Prisoners were able to order items from the facilities list from a catalogue and this system worked reasonably well. The main deficiency in the system was that new receptions were not able to access the prison shop on entering the prison and may have had to wait up to two weeks to receive items ordered.

Both sites

- 7.10 Aramark was contracted to provide the prison shop. Both sites operated a bagging system. Prisoners were given a weekly canteen sheet, which they submitted on a set day and received their canteen a week later. There was no set procedure for prisoners who missed receiving their canteen sheets and it was possible that a prisoner could wait up to 13 days if they were out of the prison on 'canteen day'. In reality, this appeared to be rare because the population was fairly static. Prisoners also said that if they were out of Moorland closed on canteen day, officers would try to keep the sheet for them and drop it in to the prison shop contractor at a later date. At Moorland open, canteen was collected from reception by those who had been out of the prison in the day.
- 7.11 Prisoners arriving at both sites were not given the opportunity to use the prison shop. Instead, they were given a smoker's or a non-smoker's reception pack (see section on first days in custody). New arrivals who arrived at the prison the day after 'canteen day' could also have to wait 13 days before receiving items ordered from the prison shop.
- 7.12 The range of goods available from the prison shop was fairly extensive and did take account of black and minority ethnic prisoners. All prisoners to whom we spoke complained about the prices charged, although these did not appear to be significantly different to those charged by other prisons. The list of items available from the prison shop was published every three months. It was not displayed but a copy was available from the houseblocks when on request. The prison shop was raised at prisoner committees and requested items and price changes were discussed. Despite this, some prisoners complained that prices were increased without notice.
- 7.13 The contractor told prisoners how much they were allowed to spend in the prison shop each week. A prisoner could also ask a member of staff for the balance of his account and prisoners to whom we spoke confirmed that officers generally did do this. Prisoners could request a full print out of all account transactions but there was a charge for the service.

- 7.14 Prisoners could order items on the facilities list from a catalogue and those who had done this had no complaints about the actual service, although they raised concerns that they had to surrender old items when ordering replacements when there was a delay of up to several weeks in receiving the new goods.
- 7.15 Prisoners were allowed to order newspapers and magazines and this appeared to be a good service, although problems were encountered when prisoners moved houseblock or site.

Recommendation

Both sites

- 7.16 When ordering goods, prisoners should not have to surrender old goods until the new ones are received.

Section 8: Resettlement

Resettlement strategy

Expected outcomes:

Resettlement underpins the work of the whole establishment, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of the risk that prisoners pose and their needs so as to minimise the likelihood of reoffending on release.

8.1 A resettlement strategy was in place but it was of poor quality and did not reflect the work that was going on in the resettlement function. Regular resettlement committee meetings were held but these were not strategic and not all relevant departments attended.

Both sites

- 8.2 The resettlement strategy in place for both sites was being reviewed by the head of risk and offender management in order to reflect regional and national changes in the thinking about the resettlement of offenders and to reflect the structure of National Offender Management Service.
- 8.3 The current strategy was inadequate and did not reflect the resettlement services offered by the establishment. The content was extremely vague and non-specific. It did not focus on individual sectors of the population and action plans contained within it were not time-bound. Much of the content was inaccurate.
- 8.4 There had been no needs analysis of the population held at either site. A small piece of work on prisoners' geographical area of discharge had been completed in November 2005 but other key information on the population held was not known. The psychology department had been tasked to undertake a comprehensive analysis based on nine identified resettlement pathways.
- 8.5 The establishment had devised a flow chart system to link together all assessments conducted on a prisoner, which could then be used to inform the offender assessment system (OASys) document. This identified elements such as family links, health needs, substance misuse needs and employment skills, experience and expectations. Although not all of the elements identified had been successfully linked together, assessments completed on induction by healthcare and education were reviewed by OASys staff when compiling the first assessment. This flow chart seemed a sensible way to coordinate all the information every department had on an individual prisoner to best enhance his resettlement prospects.
- 8.6 A bi-monthly meeting of the resettlement committee was held and had recently transferred to the head of risk and offender management to chair. The strategy outlined a membership that included most relevant departments and agencies involved within the prison but in reality many departments did not attend regularly. No representative from reception and induction, healthcare or the head of learning and skills had attended the previous three meetings. The meetings also tended to review work completed by the departments and agencies attending and focused on dealing with day-to-day management issues. There was no meeting to take a strategic look at resettlement and no action plan to take forward new initiatives.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 8.7 Attendance at the resettlement committee should be improved to incorporate all relevant departments.
- 8.8 The resettlement committee should take a more strategic focus on resettlement and an action plan should be devised to plan the developmental work of the function.
- 8.9 The work to link all assessments of individual prisoners together to contribute to the completion of the OASys document should be completed.

Sentence and custody planning

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners have a sentence or training plan based upon an individual assessment of risks and needs, regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody. Prisoners, together with all relevant staff, are involved with drawing up and reviewing plans.

- 8.10 Both sites had a backlog of OASys assessments, some of which were for prisoners who had been at Moorland since June 2005. The quality of assessments was good but communication and links with other departments within the prison were not sufficiently effective.

Moorland closed

- 8.11 Sentence planning was managed in the newly named offender management unit (OMU). This unit housed a dedicated team of five prison officer OASys assessors, two OASys clerks and one senior officer who was an OASys supervisor. A total of 37 staff at Moorland closed had been trained in the OASys system. The dedicated assessment team had only recently become full strength and was conducting about 50 assessments a month.
- 8.12 In our survey, 70% of respondents at Moorland closed, against a comparator of 68%, said they had a sentence plan. There was a backlog of 96 OASys assessments.
- 8.13 All completed assessments were reviewed by a sentence planning board but prisoners were not invited to attend. In our survey, 70% of respondents, only slightly higher than the comparator of 68%, said they felt involved or very involved in the development of their sentence plan. Sentence planning boards comprised a principal officer, a senior officer, probation and education staff, who reviewed the document and the targets set.
- 8.14 The senior officer in the OMU at Moorland closed prepared a user-friendly summary of completed OASys assessments, condensing the often very lengthy assessments down to pertinent and salient points. This information was kept in the prisoner's sentence plan file but was not copied to other departments that may have benefited from this useful document.
- 8.15 A generic assessment panel board similar to that at Moorland open (see paragraph 8.18) had recently been stopped.

Moorland open

- 8.16 At Moorland open, no dedicated team was in place but two members of staff were detailed to work in the resettlement and sentence planning unit each weekday and one member of staff at weekends. These staff were often redirected to complete the number of ROTL assessments required to keep the system functioning. Seven staff were trained assessors and three supervisors, including the head of resettlement at Moorland open, were in post.
- 8.17 In our survey, 85% of respondents at Moorland open, against a comparator of only 66%, said they had a sentence plan. There was a backlog of 37 OASys assessments. All completed assessments were reviewed by a sentence planning board and prisoners were invited to attend. In our survey, 63% of respondents, significantly higher than the benchmark of 51%, said they felt involved or very involved in the development of their sentence plan. Boards at were chaired by the head of resettlement and attended by staff from probation, the OASys senior officer and representatives from the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare team. Boards were often scheduled so that prisoners working out in the community did not have to take the day off work to attend.
- 8.18 A generic assessment panel board had started approximately six months before the inspection for prisoners serving short sentences or with only a short time left to serve. This board, which comprised the head of resettlement, the education manager and staff from SOVA, reviewed all prisoners' cases three months before release and addressed any outstanding areas of risk or need.

Both sites

- 8.19 The prison had been resourced to complete only OASys reviews but was receiving a substantial number of prisoners who had not had an initial OASys assessment. Almost a third of all assessments completed in the three months before this inspection were initial assessments. This was partly due to the fact that Moorland received prisoners from HMP Doncaster, which was privately run and not yet on the OASys system, but also because many sending local establishments had not conducted the assessments on time.
- 8.20 The prison aimed to complete an OASys assessment on all newly received prisoners within 12 weeks of arrival. There was a backlog, some of which were for prisoners who had been at Moorland since June 2005. Some of these were for prisoners who had been at Moorland since June 2005. The establishment was also continuing to run the previous sentence planning system (ACRs/DCRs) for prisoners who were due for a sentence plan review but had only a short time left to serve. Which prisoners should continue on the old system and which should be transferred on to OASys was left up to the individual assessor's discretion as there was no official guidance.
- 8.21 All assessments conducted on prisoners at the induction stage were copied to sentence planning staff and reviewed before the prisoner was interviewed by the allocated assessor. This included education basic skills assessment results, contributions from healthcare where appropriate and a report of how the prisoner had participated in the anti-bullying induction course. Plans were in place to link more assessments together to inform the OASys assessment, including assessments of housing, family links and alcohol and drug misuse, but this was not yet in place.

- 8.22 OASys documents on both sites were of generally good quality and clearly identified where information had been gleaned from. However, not all assessors to whom we spoke were fully conversant with the offending behaviour programmes or developmental courses offered elsewhere within the prison system.
- 8.23 Residential staff were not routinely aware of an individual prisoner's targets or familiar with how to access the OASys document on the IT system. A briefing package had been developed by a trained assessor at Moorland closed and sent to the residential function but no formal awareness training had been completed.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 8.24 All prisoners should have their needs assessed and relevant targets set within 12 weeks of arrival.
- 8.25 All assessors should be made aware of all offending behaviour programmes available in the service and other training opportunities available outside Moorland.
- 8.26 All residential staff should receive awareness training on OASys.

Housekeeping points

Moorland closed

- 8.27 The generic assessment panel board should be re-instated.
- 8.28 The brief overview of pertinent information from a prisoner's OASys assessment should be made available to all relevant staff and departments.
- 8.29 Prisoners should be invited to attend their OASys board.

Life-sentenced prisoners

Expected outcomes:

Life-sentenced prisoners should receive equal treatment in terms of their treatment and the conditions in which they are held. These expectations refer to specific issues, which relate to the management of life-sentenced prisoners.

- 8.30 Young adult life-sentenced prisoners had structured initial interviews, a comprehensive life-sentenced focused induction and a very informative local guide. Life sentences were managed effectively by a trained and enthusiastic multidisciplinary team. Most life-sentenced prisoners had good quality annual reviews held on time but there had been some recent catching up. There were good links with life-sentenced prisoners' families.

Moorland closed

- 8.31 Forty-five young adults were serving a life sentence of detention or custody for life. They were in either the first or second stage of their sentence and were held at Moorland closed.
- 8.32 There was an additional induction programme for life-sentenced prisoners. It was held when there were sufficient prisoners who needed it and included talks by a member of the Parole Board or Life Sentence Review and Recall Section (LRRS) of the Home Office and an offender released on life licence. The course lasted about a fortnight and had been introduced in 2004. Prisoners who had arrived before that date all undertook the induction and told us that it was very helpful. One was able to recall many of the modules.
- 8.33 Those on the course were given a very comprehensive locally produced guide that explained the types of life sentence, tariffs, the stages of the sentence, the review process and what Moorland was able to offer in terms of offending behaviour programmes, education, purposeful activity and healthcare. It also listed the staff in the dedicated life-sentenced prisoner team. A lifer governor led the team, which included a liaison officer, lifer manager, a senior and two probation officers, six officers and a lifer clerk. All had been trained in life sentence work. A psychology team and a healthcare contact supported the team.
- 8.34 The lifer manager, a psychologist, probation officer and lifer officer interviewed all life-sentenced prisoners shortly after their arrival. This enabled a speedy assessment of the prisoner's immediate needs, allowing appropriate priority for assessment for programmes. Some arriving from a first stage prison had not yet had a full risk assessment conducted and the lifer team did this as a matter of urgency.
- 8.35 There were very good systems to ensure the effective management of life-sentenced prisoners. These included both manual and computerised systems for programming induction assessment, annual and progress reviews and parole board hearings. A computerised contact log was also kept so that staff could record and read any developments on life-sentenced prisoners. This helped the team to maintain continuity of management.
- 8.36 We examined a sample of seven life sentence plans. Most life-sentenced prisoners had good quality annual reviews held on time. There had been some backlogs earlier in the year and, possibly in the effort to catch up, some earlier reviews had no written contribution from a seconded probation officer. The more recent reviews were complete and of a good quality, with risk-focused targets set in all cases. Family members were not invited to attend reviews, although staff said that the family would be invited if there was an identified need.
- 8.37 We spoke to several life-sentenced prisoners, who generally felt that they were well supported. We found no support for the comment in our survey that 'most screws have a judgmental attitude towards murderers'. However, this may have been because life sentence work was specialised and other staff had not had training in this work.
- 8.38 Family days were held on average twice each year. Prisoners were invited to apply and, if successful, were allowed to bring two members of their family, including partners and children, to a day-long visit with a chance to see where the prisoner lived and worked. In the 18 months before our inspection, there had been three such days with between four and six prisoners on each. There were a number of letters from families to thank staff for this opportunity. This evidenced a culture of engagement with family members who were also encouraged to telephone staff about any concerns.

- 8.39 No prisoners were waiting to move from Moorland, although one had agreed to a move being deferred so that staff who were familiar with his progress and development could prepare his report.

Moorland open

- 8.40 There were no life-sentenced prisoners at Moorland open.

Recommendation

Moorland closed

- 8.41 Life-sentenced prisoners should be encouraged to invite family members or a friend to review boards.

Good practice

- 8.42 *Inviting contributions from the Parole Board, the Life Sentence Review and Recall Section, and life-licensees gave a wide range and balanced induction to life-sentenced prisoners, allowing them to understand their stage in their sentence.*
- 8.43 *Contact logs meant that all staff dealing with life-sentenced prisoners were able to maintain continuity of management.*

Offending behaviour programmes

Expected outcomes:

Effective programmes are available to address the identified risks and needs of prisoners, to allow timely progression through sentence.

- 8.44 At Moorland closed, there was a big disparity between the number of referrals to offending behaviour programmes and the actual number available. Long-term prisoners had to wait long periods, particularly to attend enhanced thinking skills, and felt this disadvantaged them in terms of parole. The relationship between offending behaviour programmes, sentence planning and incentives and earned privileges did not appear to be understood by front line staff, who tended to see the three as discrete systems. At Moorland open, there was adequate availability of places on enhanced thinking skills courses to satisfy demand.

Moorland closed

- 8.45 The psychology department was aiming to complete a needs assessment of the population, which it hoped to complete at the end of January 2006. Psychology was not actually responsible for offending behaviour programmes (OBPs), which were managed by the resettlement manager. It produced statistics of referrals against availability at Moorland closed. At the time of the inspection, 300 had been identified as needing enhanced thinking skills (ETS) against a yearly provision of 72. Controlling anger and learning to manage it (CALM) had an identified need of 63 against a provision of 24. Prisoners addressing substance-related

offending (P-ASRO), on the other hand, was under-subscribed, having 56 with an identified need against a provision of 88. Only three lifers were able to attend ETS at any one time.

- 8.46 In addition to CALM, ETS and P-ASRO, prisoners could attend programmes aimed at offending behaviour through the education department. Outside this, there were no interventions for prisoners who refused to engage and it was claimed that they were dealt with through the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) system. This was not supported by interviews with prisoners. One prisoner vehemently refused to attend any OBP because 'robbing was what he did'. Contrary to what was claimed, he was an enhanced prisoner working on the hotplate.
- 8.47 The P-ASRO course did not accept prisoners with alcohol-only related problems.
- 8.48 Residential prison officers did not appear to understand the importance of OBPs in the strategic tackling of offending and failed to see its relationship to sentence planning and IEP. Staff felt that IEP was the means of controlling prisoners in houseblocks and that OBPs were something that needed to be done in the pursuit of D categorisation, home detention curfew, release on temporary licence or parole. Having said that, OBP awareness training had been attended by 220 staff out of a total of 605.
- 8.49 All courses were accredited and all staff delivering the courses had been properly trained. The principal officer in charge of OBPs was clearly highly motivated and committed to the efficacy of the courses and ETS in particular. He was building strong links with the psychology department and their input into the course was therefore expanding.

Moorland open

- 8.50 At Moorland open, 36 ETS places were available and the demand was met. This was because the majority of prisoners transferred to Moorland open had done ETS. Where demand did outstrip supply, the prison had an arrangement with Rotherham Probation Service for prisoners to attend their ETS course.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 8.51 The number of enhanced thinking skills courses at Moorland closed should be increased and a local target for waiting time should be established.
- 8.52 There should be provision for alcohol awareness offending behaviour programmes.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are supported to return to the community in safety and dignity, using community and family links and appropriate licence and curfew arrangements to meet their practical needs and maximise the prospects for avoiding reoffending on release.

8.53 Practice at Moorland open was well developed, with specially designed arrangements for those who had less time to serve and were not able to spend time working outside the establishment. Services at Moorland closed were in place to ensure that prisoners could access assistance with housing, employment and careers advice.

Moorland closed

8.54 At Moorland closed, resettlement staff were located together in the main administration building, which facilitated close working ties.

Moorland open

8.55 Following the change of focus at Moorland open from being an open prison to a resettlement establishment earlier in the year, arrangements for eligible prisoners to participate in voluntary and paid employment outside the establishment had grown considerably.

8.56 The aims underlying the work of the resettlement unit at Moorland open were described to us as:

- To build up a working habit
- To secure a job in the prisoner's home area
- To build up some financial security
- To build up an employment CV

8.57 At the time of the inspection, 29 prisoners were engaged in some form of unsalaried community work for which prison earnings were paid. This was described as the 'task force'. Successful participation in the task force was normally a pre-requisite for progress on to paid work in the community.

8.58 Thirty-nine prisoners were working for civilian employers. Work had to be found within 75 miles of the establishment and prisoners could use their own vehicles to travel to and from work. Many prisoners were able to find work in their home area and to retain the job after release.

8.59 The resettlement team operated out of large offices in a converted prison workshop area. There was a regular evening opportunity each week for prisoners who worked outside the establishment to meet resettlement staff.

8.60 For those prisoners who arrived at Moorland open with less than three months left to serve and who were therefore not able to take advantage of the working out arrangements, a 'generic assessment panel' (GAP) met to consider the individual's resettlement needs in terms of employment and housing.

Both sites

8.61 In both sites, housing advice was provided by Shelter, and SOVA offered employment advice.

- 8.62 The full-time Shelter housing advice worker had a brief slot on the induction programme and prioritised prisoners by date of release. Prisoners who were four months from release were contacted and the service offered was advertised by posters around the prison. Around 50 cases were being worked on at any one time. Links had been made with local authorities in the immediate area but prisoners returning to live all over the country had also been assisted. Advice on tenancy matters and rent arrears issues as well as future plans was available. It was clear that the role was one of providing housing advice rather than seeking to provide addresses to live. The establishment was not using trained prisoners to assist with this work and relied on the energy of the sole housing worker.
- 8.63 SOVA provided the part-time employment, training and education coordinator. She assisted in drawing up prisoner action plans, particularly with those assessed as being far from 'job ready'. Job centre appointments were made for prisoners on request and referrals to careers guidance specialists or to colleges could also be made.
- 8.64 Additionally, the Nordanglia training services identified prisoners for the five-week gateway to release programme, which helped prepare prisoners with release plans and preparation for work. There was recognition that different groups of prisoner presented different need profiles and these were catered for.

Recommendation

Both sites

- 8.65 Suitably skilled and trained prisoners should be used to assist in the provision of housing and other resettlement advice.

Public protection

Expected outcomes:

Arrangements are in place to assess and manage the risks presented to the public by prisoners during sentence and after release. Clear systems operate to ensure that all affected prisoners are fully informed of the arrangements, the implications for them individually and the avenues available to them for challenge.

- 8.66 The public protection strategy needed to be developed to include public protection in the core work of all departments rather than being seen as the exclusive role of a small number of specialist staff. Systems were in place to identify prisoners known to pose particular risks and quick risk assessments were completed to decide on risk management strategies. Communication with external agencies was good.

Both sites

- 8.67 The prison's public protection strategy was being developed as new aspects of public protection systems were developed. The senior probation officer acted as the public protection coordinator for both sites as well as undertaking all of her other managerial duties. The number

of prisoners subject to risk management measures and the strategic development required in this area had become such that more time needed to be dedicated to these tasks.

- 8.68 All prisoners' records were reviewed by an administrative officer to identify those who fell within a list of risk indicators. These included harassment act, crime and disorder act, prolific and persistent offenders and those convicted of sexual offences. All such prisoners were subject to immediate risk assessment, which was completed by a probation officer within 10 days of their reception. These reports were used by the public protection coordinator to allocate one of four levels of risk management and monitoring. The allocation of monitoring levels was made known to relevant departments, although the risk reports were not available to all staff on the prison computer system.
- 8.69 Information gathered on reception and the risk assessment was routinely shared with the community social service and probation services. Updated information and further notifications were routinely sent out to community agencies six months before the release of these prisoners.
- 8.70 The monthly public protection committee meeting included probation, sentence management and security staff. The committee was responsible for managing strategic developments as well as reviewing the risk assessments on new prisoners. Risk assessments were also listed for review periodically and the committee undertook these reviews to see if the level of monitoring should be changed.
- 8.71 The prison did submit reports to multi-agency public protection (MAPP) meetings in the community for any prisoners who were due to be released and designated to be on the highest level of risk. There were 58 registered prolific or persistent offenders, 17 prisoners subject to the harassment act, 83 who posed a risk to children and 79 who had been identified as high risk by the OASys. There were 67 prisoners who were subject to MAPP proceedings. Some prisoners were on more than one of these lists. There was no central register of all prisoners subject to the various risk management restrictions but this was planned in the light of a recent appointment of a new administrative officer.
- 8.72 Individual prisoners' paper and computer records had indicators to highlight risk issues but limited use was made of the computer network to make information available to all staff. Rather, specific information was provided to specific departments for specific purposes. There was little evidence that the information was used across the prison to inform day-to-day decisions about prisoners such as labour allocation or to inform personal officer observations. There was insufficient awareness of public protection issues throughout the prison or involvement of staff across the estate in the management of risk.

Recommendations

Both sites

- 8.73 The management of risk and public protection issues should be incorporated into the decisions about prisoners at all levels rather than being seen as the work of a small number of specialist staff.
- 8.74 There should be a comprehensive central public protection register of prisoners, which includes all aspects of risk and public protection measures, and this should be available to all staff.

- 8.75 The public protection coordinator should be allocated sufficient time to develop strategy as well as managing individual prisoners' risk management.

Substance use

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with substance-related needs are identified at reception and receive effective support and treatment throughout their stay in custody, including pre-release planning. All prisoners are safe from exposure to and the effects of substance use while in the establishment.

8.76 The establishment's drug strategy lacked coordination and did not include alcohol. Additional expertise, resources and support were required before prisoners on methadone maintenance programmes could be accepted. While the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare service did not have a waiting list for one-to-one intervention, group work for adults and motivational courses for young people were not available. Prisoners completing the P-ASRO (prisoners addressing substance-related offending) programme did not have access to structured aftercare support, and we questioned its suitability for adults with severe dependency problems. Young people gave positive course feedback. The role of voluntary drug testing at Moorland closed required review and mandatory drug testing targets were not consistently met. Comprehensive security measures were in place at Moorland open but responses by young people to questions in our survey about drug availability and drug-related victimisation were above the comparators.

Both sites

- 8.77 The head of residence was the senior manager responsible for the drug strategy. Her deputy had recently taken over as drug strategy coordinator but had limited time to devote to this role. At Moorland closed, the task of coordinating voluntary and mandatory drug testing had just been passed from a principal to a senior officer but again without the allocation of dedicated time. At Moorland open, these roles were split between security and residential officers. In the absence of a dedicated drug strategy manager, the different strands of the strategy seemed disjointed and lacked overall integration and we fully supported the establishment's application for such a post.
- 8.78 Monthly drug strategy meetings were attended by relevant departments and service providers and included community representation from a local drug intervention programme (DIP). Moorland open was under-represented.
- 8.79 A needs analysis conducted for both sites earlier this year excluded alcohol, and the establishment had not developed an alcohol strategy.
- 8.80 The policy document had recently been reviewed but lacked a detailed action plan with targets and performance measures. Clinical management and joint working protocols between the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service and healthcare were not yet in place.
- 8.81 Prisoners and young people arriving at Moorland had already completed detoxification. Opiate users could commence naltrexone treatment (an opiate blocker) before release and the CARAT service liaised with community DIPs to ensure continuation prescribing.

- 8.82 Moorland was due to pilot the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) in 2006 and to accept small numbers of prisoners on methadone maintenance. Additional resources, expertise and support were required before this initiative could be introduced safely.
- 8.83 CARAT staff were employed by Lifeline and consisted of a senior practitioner, 4.5 workers for Moorland closed and 1.5 workers for Moorland open. The cluster manager was based at a neighbouring establishment. Administrative support of 20 hours a week was insufficient and the team at Moorland closed were housed in different offices, which made communication difficult. Difficulties in accessing prisoners who were at work had been addressed by arranging special visits but interviewing space was limited. The current CARAT service contract did not include evening sessions, which was a particular issue at Moorland open where many prisoners worked outside the establishment during the day.
- 8.84 New arrivals were seen on a one-to-one basis during induction and the service was on target to meet its initial assessment key performance target (KPT) of 150. The target of completing 42 comprehensive substance misuse assessments was not achieved due to most prisoners arriving with open case files.
- 8.85 The CARAT team carried a caseload of 179 clients at Moorland closed and 28 at Moorland open. There was no waiting list for one-to-one work but the service was not resourced to provide group work intervention around harm reduction and relapse prevention for adults or motivational courses for young people. A facilitated peer support group had stopped. The CARAT contract excluded alcohol, and the only services available for prisoners with alcohol-related problems were Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) self-help groups and an alcohol awareness course run by the education department. Young people made up a third of CARAT contacts and the lack of alcohol intervention for them was of particular concern.
- 8.86 The worker at Moorland open was well integrated with other departments and contributed to sentence planning boards but this was not the case at Moorland closed.
- 8.87 All prisoners came from areas covered by drug intervention programmes. Local teams were engaged in discussions to arrange post-release methadone prescribing.
- 8.88 CARAT clients with mental health as well as substance-related problems could be referred to the mental health in-reach service, and the charities MIND and CRUISE offered weekly sessions, although demand exceeded resources. A dedicated counselling service to help prisoners deal with issues such as past sexual abuse was not available.
- 8.89 Prisoners could attend AA meetings and those at Moorland closed could also attend Narcotics Anonymous self-help meetings. Auricular acupuncture was available when officer time allowed.
- 8.90 In April 2004, the P-ASRO (prisoners addressing substance-related offending) programme had been introduced at Moorland closed, and the establishment was currently running course 13. So far, the annual target of 88 starts had been achieved but a shortage of facilitators meant this was unlikely to be the case this year. Completion rates exceeded the KPT of 58. The 20-session low to medium intensity programme was open to prisoners with at least six months to serve. Pre-programme assessments showed that many adults required a higher level of intensity and six prisoners had been referred to drug treatment programmes at other establishments in the previous two months. A P-ASRO course run specifically for young people attracted positive feedback. In our survey, 54% of young people, against a comparator of 34%, said the drug/alcohol programme would help them on release.

- 8.91 Participants completing the current course were concerned about ongoing support. The CARAT team included 0.5 of a P-ASRO throughcare worker to provide follow-up work on targets and treatment needs but there was no structured post-course support, and peer support had not been explored.
- 8.92 All P-ASRO participants had signed up to voluntary drug testing (VDT). At Moorland closed, where the scheme operated independent of a prisoner's location, 259 prisoners were on compacts. A wing on houseblock 1 operated as a VDT unit for adults with 54 places but residing on this unit did not attract additional support and its purpose was unclear. All prisoners on houseblock 5 were required to sign up to a separate compact linked to their enhanced status. Young people could sign up to VDT and 75 tests had been conducted in the last month but neither of their houseblocks (3 and 4) were dedicated VDT units. Houseblock staff took the samples, which were collected and tested by two dedicated officers. Inconsistent practice meant that the required testing frequency was not achieved.
- 8.93 A system of compliance testing had been introduced at Moorland open and all prisoners and young people were expected to sign the compliance testing compact. Facility licences depended on negative test results and release on temporary licence was suspended for 28 days if a prisoner tested positive. A third positive test made the prisoner liable to be moved to closed conditions but these decisions were made in liaison with the CARAT worker.
- 8.94 The year-to-date rate of positive mandatory drug tests (MDT) at Moorland open was 12.5%, which was not particularly high compared to other open establishments. In our survey, however, 6% of young people, against a comparator of 1%, reported drug-related victimisation and 35%, against a comparator of 22%, thought it was easy to get illegal drugs. Testing was coordinated by the security principal officer and undertaken by reception officers. The target of testing 10% of the population was met. Suspicion tests resulted in a 75% rate of positives, which indicated a good level of intelligence. Half of all security information reports were drug-related.
- 8.95 The establishment had started testing for buprenorphine (subutex) 18 months ago. MDT results and finds pointed towards opiates, buprenorphine and cannabis as the main drugs of choice, although anabolic steroids had also been detected.
- 8.96 At Moorland closed, the random year-to-date MDT rate was only 4% but testing targets had not been met consistently and we were told that 'MDT is the first thing that gets dropped'. During the past six months, 74 suspicion tests had been carried out with a below 50% rate of positive returns. The majority of MDT positives related to opiates.

Recommendations

Moorland closed

- 8.97 CARAT service workers should contribute to sentence planning at Moorland closed.
- 8.98 The establishment should ensure that mandatory drug testing targets are consistently met at Moorland closed.

Both sites

- 8.99 A dedicated drug strategy manager should be appointed to coordinate the different strands of the strategy and to ensure its consistent implementation.
- 8.100 The establishment should develop an alcohol strategy and services based on the needs of its population, particularly those of young people.
- 8.101 The drug strategy should contain detailed action plans, targets and performance measures.
- 8.102 The establishment should have the appropriate resources, expertise, support and policies in place before accepting prisoners on methadone maintenance programmes.
- 8.103 In light of prisoners' work schedules, especially on Moorland open, the provision of CARAT service evening sessions should be explored.
- 8.104 The CARAT service should be resourced to offer a range of group work modules to meet the need of adults and young people across the two sites.
- 8.105 The establishment should provide adequate accommodation for the CARAT team as well as more administrative and IT support.
- 8.106 The establishment should provide adequate access to a dedicated counselling service.
- 8.107 Structured aftercare support should be provided to prisoners completing the P-ASRO programme, and a peer support scheme should be developed.
- 8.108 The voluntary drug testing (VDT) scheme should be reviewed and the role of the VDT unit clarified. The review should take the needs of young people into account.

Section 9: Recommendations and good practice

The following is a listing of recommendations and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report.

Main recommendations

To the Governor

- 9.1 A coherent and distinct foreign nationals policy should be developed and implemented across the prison. (HP48)
- 9.2 Opportunities should be taken across the prison to accredit work skills to improve opportunities for employment. (HP49)
- 9.3 There should be more vocational employment-related training to meet resettlement needs at Moorland open. (HP50)
- 9.4 The resettlement strategy should be re-written and based on an up to date needs analysis of the population. The distinct needs of the various sectors of the prison population should be identified and addressed. (HP51)
- 9.5 A health needs and staff skills analysis should be conducted to identify and inform recruitment of sufficient staff with the appropriate skills and competencies. Emphasis on the recruitment of psychiatric and learning disability nurses should be a priority. (HP52)

Recommendations

To the Governor

Courts, escorts and transfers

Moorland closed

- 9.6 Reception procedures at Moorland closed should be reviewed to minimise the delay to other prisoners on escorting vehicles. (1.9)

Moorland open

- 9.7 A clear protocol for transferring prisoners from Moorland open to Moorland closed should be established and made available to prisoners. (1.10)

First days in custody

Moorland closed

- 9.8 Notices and information should be on display in the holding rooms at Moorland closed. There should be items available to help keep prisoners occupied while held there. (1.32)
- 9.9 Prisoners at Moorland closed should not be held in reception for excessive periods. (1.33)
- 9.10 All prisoners should be unlocked on their first evening at Moorland. (1.34)
- 9.11 The information channel on the in-cell television should be used to communicate key information to all newly arrived prisoners. (1.35)

Moorland open

- 9.12 Formal first night arrangements should be introduced for prisoners at Moorland open. (1.36)
- 9.13 The curriculum of the preparation for work course offered to all prisoners at Moorland open should be flexible to meet individual requirements. (1.37)

Both sites

- 9.14 All reception, first night and induction staff should be given guidance on how prisoners who cannot read or write, who are new to custody or who cannot speak English should be managed. (1.38)
- 9.15 All information provided to prisoners in reception and on induction should be available in audio format and in languages other than English. (1.39)
- 9.16 All prisoners should be able to access the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival. (1.40)
- 9.17 All assessments conducted on a prisoner at the reception stage should be done in private offering the prisoner ample opportunity to raise any concerns or fears he may have. (1.41)
- 9.18 Prisoner Insiders should be used to provide information to newly arrived prisoners. (1.42)
- 9.19 All prisoners should be able to make a private telephone call on their first night. (1.43)
- 9.20 Prisoners spending their first night at either site should be instantly identifiable to all staff. (1.44)

Residential units

Moorland closed

- 9.21 Cells designed for single occupation should not be shared. While they are shared, effective lavatory screening should be provided. (2.21)
- 9.22 Showers on units 1-4 at Moorland closed should be provided with screening. (2.22)

Moorland open

- 9.23 Young adults at Moorland open should be subject to the same rules about accessing lavatories at night as adult prisoners. (2.23)
- 9.24 Showers at Moorland open should be provided with screening. (2.24)

Both sites

- 9.25 Cell furniture should be maintained and new or repaired items should be reinstated promptly. (2.25)
- 9.26 All cells and rooms should be decorated to a satisfactory standard. (2.26)
- 9.27 Cells should have notice boards. (2.27)
- 9.28 The official offensive displays policy should be enforced across the prison. (2.28)

Staff-prisoner relationships

Both sites

- 9.29 Management expectations about appropriate behaviour and use of language should be made known to staff and monitored. (2.34)
- 9.30 Prisoners should participate in sentence planning boards and incentives and earned privileges reviews and be used as Insiders and employment and resettlement advisors. (2.35)

Personal officers

Both sites

- 9.31 The personal officer policy should contain a clearer description of what is required of a personal officer and be supported by appropriate training or written guidance to assist staff in undertaking the role. (2.41)
- 9.32 The personal officer scheme should be integrated with the sentence planning process. (2.42)
- 9.33 The quality of wing history sheet entries should be improved and should reflect face-to-face contact with the prisoner. (2.43)

Bullying

Moorland closed

- 9.34 Cameras should be installed in the walkway at Moorland closed. (3.12)

- 9.35 Prisoner violence reduction representatives should receive formal training before being appointed. (3.13)

Moorland open

- 9.36 Prisoners suspected of bullying at Moorland open should not be immediately transferred back to closed conditions without being given a chance to change their behaviour. (3.14)

Both sites

- 9.37 Both sites should develop their own anti-bullying strategy or sub-strategies as the current practice is not entirely transferable. (3.15)
- 9.38 Additional resources should be provided to ensure that prisoners are not waiting excessive periods to start the anti-bullying course. (3.16)
- 9.39 The violence reduction senior officer (VRSO) should be made aware of all information relevant to bullying. (3.17)
- 9.40 The VRSO and shadow VRSO should meet regularly. (3.18)
- 9.41 Interventions should be introduced for all prisoners identified as bullies. (3.19)
- 9.42 A reporting helpline number should be published for families and friends to report bullying. (3.20)
- 9.43 A victim support protocol should be developed to standardise the support provided to prisoners who have been bullied and should take account of the specific needs of both sites. (3.21)
- 9.44 Staff should receive anti-bullying training. (3.22)

Self-harm and suicide

Moorland closed

- 9.45 A mental health in-reach nurse should routinely attend suicide prevention management team meetings. (3.38)

Moorland open

- 9.46 Prisoner access to Listeners at Moorland open should be at least as easy as for those at Moorland closed. (3.40)

Both sites

- 9.47 All prisoners should be able to speak to the Samaritans at all times. (3.41)
- 9.48 The programme for training in suicide and self-harm prevention should cover all staff who deal with prisoners, and include how to access/use ligature knives and use of inundation points. (3.42)

Race relations

Both sites

- 9.49 Programmes or guidance should be available to prison and probation staff to enable them to challenge racist offenders confidently and appropriately. (3.56)
- 9.50 All staff should be trained in cultural, racial and diversity issues. (3.57)
- 9.51 Prisoners should receive a written response advising them of the outcome of any investigation into a racist incident complaint. (3.58)
- 9.52 The race relations management team should investigate the reasons lying behind the poorer survey responses from black and minority ethnic prisoners referring to their experience of staff treatment, staff respect and victimisation. (3.59)

Foreign nationals

Both sites

- 9.53 There should be a foreign nationals coordinator responsible for both sites who is conversant with the needs of foreign national prisoners. (3.65)

Family and friends

Moorland closed

- 9.54 The standard and safety of the visitors' car park at Moorland closed should be improved. (3.78)
- 9.55 The entry and search area for visitors at Moorland closed should be redesigned to provide adequate space and privacy. (3.79)
- 9.56 Prisoners and their professional visitors should be able to conduct meetings and interviews in private. (3.80)
- 9.57 The level of staffing in the visitors' centre should be sufficient to meet demand. (3.81)

Both sites

- 9.58 All prisoners should have daily access to telephones. (3.82)
- 9.59 Prisoners should be able to telephone their family and friends at times that can be arranged in advance and are likely to be convenient to the recipient of the call. If restrictions have to be placed on the time prisoners can access telephones, staff should provide supervision to ensure fair access. (3.83)
- 9.60 The potential need for additional or extended visits sessions at both sites should be reviewed at least annually to ensure that all prisoners who wish to are able to receive visits. (3.84)

Applications and complaints

Moorland closed

- 9.61 Staff answering complaints should always be identified. (3.93)
- 9.62 Analysis of complaints should be developed in order to improve responses to prisoners and inform relevant departments. (3.94)

Legal rights

Moorland closed

- 9.63 Provision of legal services at Moorland closed should meet prisoners' needs and be monitored in relation to the demand and response time. (3.103)

Healthcare

Moorland closed

- 9.64 The CARAT service should be relocated from healthcare and the current office space returned to healthcare. (4.84)
- 9.65 Stock in the dispensary should be removed if it ceases to be a dispensing pharmacy. (4.85)
- 9.66 All the beds in healthcare should be removed from the certified normal accommodation. (4.86)
- 9.67 Prisoners should not be located in healthcare without medical reason. (4.87)
- 9.68 The crisis suite should not be located in healthcare and the management of it should not be a healthcare responsibility. (4.88)
- 9.69 Healthcare rooms should not be used by other departments for meetings, education or course work to the detriment of in-patients. (4.89)
- 9.70 Healthcare staff should not be supervising prisoners undergoing education in the department. (4.90)
- 9.71 Healthcare staff should ensure prescription and administration charts are completed properly. Where medication has not been given, it should say why. (4.91)
- 9.72 The practice of doctors doing daily rounds in the segregation unit should be stopped. (4.92)
- 9.73 The in-patient regime should be reviewed to ensure patients are out of their rooms as much as possible within the core day and staff should be more proactive in engaging with prisoners. (4.93)

Moorland open

- 9.74 Healthcare should be involved in the resettlement of prisoners; this should include providing prisoners with information on how to access primary care services on release and support in accessing the services if required. (4.94)
- 9.75 There should be a defibrillator in the healthcare centre. (4.95)
- 9.76 Agency nurses should not work in isolation. (4.96)
- 9.77 Prisoners should be provided with written information about healthcare services. (4.97)
- 9.78 A range of frequently used medications should be provided in one-day supplies to avoid the need for secondary dispensing. (4.98)
- 9.79 Nurses should follow Nursing & Midwifery Council guidelines for the administration of medications. This includes ensuring that prescription only medications are legally prescribed for the patient prior to administration. (4.99)
- 9.80 The drugs and therapeutics committee should develop patient group directives for a range of medications, including vaccinations. (4.100)
- 9.81 Meningitis C vaccines should be offered to prisoners under the age of 24 years. (4.101)

Both sites

- 9.82 A primary care mental health needs assessment should be conducted to ensure that:
- the requirement for primary mental health support is identified
 - the staffing levels/skills required to establish and maintain the service are in place
 - care pathways and protocols are introduced
 - registered mental nurses are employed exclusively to provide mental health care
 - effective joint working with the mental health in-reach team is established and maintained (4.102)
- 9.83 Funding should be established to implement a clinical information technology system. (4.103)
- 9.84 All clinical policies and protocols should be evidence-based, signed, dated and regularly reviewed. (4.104)
- 9.85 Additional and appropriately qualified administrative assistance should be identified for both sites. (4.105)
- 9.86 Discipline support should be identified for both sites to escort and supervise prisoners attending and waiting for healthcare treatment. (4.106)
- 9.87 The healthcare manager should be removed from the orderly officer rota. (4.107)

- 9.88 Monthly team meetings should include all healthcare staff and be obligatory. (4.108)
- 9.89 Clinical supervision should be identified, and protected time allocated to facilitate it. (4.109)
- 9.90 Doctors should be qualified general practitioners. (4.110)
- 9.91 A programme of change management should be identified to assist staff to manage change within their area of concern. (4.111)
- 9.92 Triage algorithms should be used to ensure consistency of nursing assessment. (4.112)
- 9.93 A pharmacist should visit the prison regularly to review medication and audit faxes with prescriptions. (4.113)
- 9.94 Up to date reference sources should be available and out-of-date ones removed. The BNF for children is the most appropriate reference source for medication supplies to adolescents. (4.114)
- 9.95 Nurses should not be used to escort prisoners from Moorland open to attend dental appointments. (4.115)
- 9.96 The doctors should consult with the mental health in-reach team and pharmacy staff when prescribing anti-psychotic drugs. (4.116)
- 9.97 The healthcare manager should have input to the provision of the pharmacy service and the service level agreement between the primary care trust and the provider. (4.117)
- 9.98 If Methadone maintenance is to be introduced, the prison should ensure that proper provision is in place for the supply, storage and security of the drug. (4.118)
- 9.99 Patient group directives should be introduced where possible. (4.119)
- 9.100 There should be input to the drugs and therapeutics committee from the pharmacy supplier. (4.120)
- 9.101 A dental therapist should be employed to undertake simple treatment and health promotion. (4.121)

Education and library provision

Moorland closed

- 9.102 The accommodation for literacy and numeracy courses at Moorland closed should be improved, as should the accommodation and classroom facilities for painting and decorating and electrical installation courses. (5.24)
- 9.103 The library should be given more priority to ensure that sessions are not cancelled and prisoners received adequate visits. (5.25)
- 9.104 Prisoners should be given more time in a session to browse through the books and use the library for study. (5.26)

Both sites

- 9.105 There should be a wider range of vocational training courses to ensure that the needs of prisoners are met. (5.27)
- 9.106 There should be more effective quality assurance arrangements to ensure the quality of learning and skills is monitored and targets set for continuous improvement. (5.28)
- 9.107 A mobile library system should be set up. (5.29)
- 9.108 A selection of educational DVDs and music CDs should be offered. (5.30)
- 9.109 Library orderlies should be enrolled on a qualification. (5.31)

Work

Both sites

- 9.110 The range of vocational training programmes should be increased to meet the needs of the population and identified skill shortages. (5.47)

Physical education and health promotion

Both sites

- 9.111 Wing times to attend the gym should be on rotation to ensure equality. (5.55)
- 9.112 More vocational accredited courses should be available for prisoners. (5.56)
- 9.113 Data about recruitment, achievements and leavers should be better collected. (5.57)
- 9.114 Courses should be quality monitored and quality improvement initiatives introduced. (5.58)

Faith and religious activity

Both sites

- 9.115 All prisoners should be able to practice their religion fully. (5.68)
- 9.116 The chaplaincy team should be resourced to be able to provide the necessary religious services and to contribute to prisoners' overall care, support and resettlement. (5.69)

Time out of cell

Both sites

- 9.117 A full hour of exercise should be provided at both sites for those who wish to participate. (5.79)

- 9.118 Published daily routines should be placed on each wing, alongside any rota system that is being used for association. (5.80)
- 9.119 Out of cell activities should be improved, particularly for young adults. (5.81)

Security and rules

Moorland closed

- 9.120 Security information should be scrutinised in more detail and cross-referenced with a range of other events at Moorland closed to improve intelligence and allow security resources to be targeted more successfully. (6.17)
- 9.121 The practise of transferring out segregated prisoners should cease, except in the most extreme circumstances. Prisoners placed on good order or discipline should be case-managed by segregation unit managers to enable return to normal location. (6.18)
- 9.122 Long-term prisoners serving over four years should, as part of their sentence planning process, have the possibility of progressive moves examined. This should be based not only on security categorisation but also on other factors such as closeness to home and education possibilities. (6.19)

Both sites

- 9.123 Mandatory and targeted drug testing should be undertaken at weekends as well as during the week. (6.20)

Discipline

Moorland closed

- 9.124 Managers should record in detail the reasons behind their authorisation of the use of special accommodation, including why less intrusive measures are not appropriate. (6.40)
- 9.125 There should be managerial scrutiny of each incident involving force or the special cell to ensure that actions are appropriate and justified and that lessons are learned. (6.41)
- 9.126 Trends in the use of force and use of the special cell should be monitored over time so that strategies can be introduced to identify high-risk activities, areas and times, and to reduce these types of interventions. (6.42)
- 9.127 Information about the occupancy of the segregation unit should be developed and monitored over time to assist managers in reducing time spent in the unit. (6.43)
- 9.128 Some appropriate activity and support structures should be provided for prisoners who spend longer periods in the segregation unit. (6.44)

Moorland open

- 9.129 The use of Moorland closed segregation unit for prisoners from Moorland open should be subject to a formal procedure that includes consideration of the security classification and a system for close monitoring of the effects of these decisions. (6.45)

Both sites

- 9.130 The number of adjudications for prisoners and young adults at both sites should be reduced by ensuring that minor infringements are dealt with using alternative responses. (6.46)

Incentives and earned privileges

Moorland closed

- 9.131 Prisoners at Moorland closed should be given the opportunity to attend their incentives and earned privileges review boards. (6.57)

Both sites

- 9.132 Links between the incentives and earned privileges and resettlement (sentence planning) policies should be strengthened. (6.58)
- 9.133 Differential regime review boards should specifically consider compliance with sentence planning targets when deciding to promote or demote prisoners within the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (6.59)
- 9.134 The possible correlation between high levels of adjudications and low use of basic level should be investigated to ensure that the incentives and earned privileges scheme is being used appropriately to manage poor behaviour. (6.60)
- 9.135 The differential regime review board should have greater oversight of the progress of all prisoners to demonstrate fair and consistent application of the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (6.61)
- 9.136 Prisoners should not be deprived of access to showers and telephones as part of the basic regime. (6.62)
- 9.137 The basic regime should provide prisoners with sufficient opportunity and support, including structured interventions when appropriate, for them to demonstrate improvement in their behaviour. (6.63)

Catering

Moorland closed

- 9.138 Breakfast packs should be issued on the morning they are to be eaten. (7.8)

Prison shop

Both sites

- 9.139 When ordering goods, prisoners should not have to surrender old goods until the new ones are received. (7.16)

Resettlement strategy

Both sites

- 9.140 Attendance at the resettlement committee should be improved to incorporate all relevant departments. (8.7)
- 9.141 The resettlement committee should take a more strategic focus on resettlement and an action plan should be devised to plan the developmental work of the function. (8.8)
- 9.142 The work to link all assessments of individual prisoners together to contribute to the completion of the OASys document should be completed. (8.9)

Sentence and custody planning

Both sites

- 9.143 All prisoners should have their needs assessed and relevant targets set within 12 weeks of arrival. (8.24)
- 9.144 All assessors should be made aware of all offending behaviour programmes available in the service and other training opportunities available outside Moorland. (8.25)
- 9.145 All residential staff should receive awareness training on OASys. (8.26)

Life-sentenced prisoners

Moorland closed

- 9.146 Life-sentenced prisoners should be encouraged to invite family members or a friend to review boards. (8.41)

Offending behaviour programmes

Moorland closed

- 9.147 The number of enhanced thinking skills courses at Moorland closed should be increased and a local target for waiting time should be established. (8.51)
- 9.148 There should be provision for alcohol awareness offending behaviour programmes. (8.52)

Reintegration planning

Both sites

- 9.149 Suitably skilled and trained prisoners should be used to assist in the provision of housing and other resettlement advice. (8.65)

Public protection

Moorland closed

- 9.150 The management of risk and public protection issues should be incorporated into the decisions about prisoners at all levels rather than being seen as the work of a small number of specialist staff. (8.73)
- 9.151 There should be a comprehensive central public protection register of prisoners, which includes all aspects of risk and public protection measures, and this should be available to all staff. (8.74)
- 9.152 The public protection coordinator should be allocated sufficient time to develop strategy as well as managing individual prisoners' risk management. (8.75)

Substance use

Moorland closed

- 9.153 CARAT service workers should contribute to sentence planning at Moorland closed. (8.97)
- 9.154 The establishment should ensure that mandatory drug testing targets are consistently met at Moorland closed. (8.98)

Both sites

- 9.155 A dedicated drug strategy manager should be appointed to coordinate the different strands of the strategy and to ensure its consistent implementation. (8.99)
- 9.156 The establishment should develop an alcohol strategy and services based on the needs of its population, particularly those of young people. (8.100)
- 9.157 The drug strategy should contain detailed action plans, targets and performance measures. (8.101)
- 9.158 The establishment should have the appropriate resources, expertise, support and policies in place before accepting prisoners on methadone maintenance programmes. (8.102)
- 9.159 In light of prisoners' work schedules, especially on Moorland open, the provision of CARAT service evening sessions should be explored. (8.103)

- 9.160 The CARAT service should be resourced to offer a range of group work modules to meet the need of adults and young people across the two sites. (8.104)
- 9.161 The establishment should provide adequate accommodation for the CARAT team as well as more administrative and IT support. (8.105)
- 9.162 The establishment should provide adequate access to a dedicated counselling service. (8.106)
- 9.163 Structured aftercare support should be provided to prisoners completing the P-ASRO programme, and a peer support scheme should be developed. (8.107)
- 9.164 The voluntary drug testing (VDT) scheme should be reviewed and the role of the VDT unit clarified. The review should take the needs of young people into account. (8.108)

Housekeeping points

First days in custody

Moorland open

- 9.165 Information available to prisoners during induction should be up to date and accurate. (1.45)
- 9.166 Research should be carried out in to how effective prisoners find the information provided during induction. (1.46)

Self-harm and suicide

Moorland closed

- 9.167 There should be a protocol for the use of the safer cells. (3.39)

Both sites

- 9.168 A record of the discussions at the meetings with Listeners' should be kept. (3.43)
- 9.169 Anonymised statistics from Listeners should be provided to suicide prevention management team. (3.44)

Race relations

Both sites

- 9.170 The race relations action plan should be updated to separate completed projects from current work and to set specific target dates for action points. (3.60)

Family and friends

Moorland closed

- 9.171 Visitors should be able to purchase refreshments in the main visits hall irrespective of their time of arrival. (3.85)

Healthcare

Moorland closed

- 9.172 An additional telephone line should be installed in the main treatment room. (4.122)
- 9.173 Privacy screens should be provided in all areas where prisoners undergo physical examination. (4.123)
- 9.174 All rooms used to interview or treat prisoners should have emergency bells installed in them. (4.124)
- 9.175 The association room in healthcare should be redecorated and comfortable seating provided. (4.125)
- 9.176 Old clinical records should be stored and managed appropriately. (4.126)
- 9.177 A system of ensuring prisoners receive their appointments should be implemented. (4.127)
- 9.178 Pharmacy staff should be involved in the supply of medication and providing information on the medication to patients. (4.128)
- 9.179 New flooring should be provided in the dental surgery and additional electric sockets. (4.129)
- 9.180 A new autoclave with integral printer should be provided, and two additional contra-angle and one additional straight hand pieces. (4.130)
- 9.181 Clinical records for all prisoners receiving treatment should be available in the dental surgery, and details of treatment carried out entered into them. (4.131)
- 9.182 An aluminium foil-lined tray beneath the amalgam mixer should be supplied. (4.132)
- 9.183 Disposable tips for 3-in-1 syringes should be provided. (4.133)
- 9.184 Matrix bands should be disposed of after each patient use. (4.134)
- 9.185 Responsibility for the drainage of the compressor should be identified and pressure vessel certification for the compressor and autoclave checked. (4.135)
- 9.186 Prisoners from Moorland open should be offered appointments every week. (4.136)
- 9.187 Those prisoners from Moorland open who are able to access dental care in general/community dental practice should be encouraged to do so and assisted if necessary, as part of their resettlement programme. (4.137)

Moorland open

- 9.188 Regular, documented checks should be made of all emergency equipment. (4.138)
- 9.189 Infection control measures should be put in place. (4.139)
- 9.190 Prisoners should be given appointment times for the GP, in line with practice in the community. (4.140)

Security and rules

Moorland closed

- 9.191 Information about houseblock rules and routines should be accurate. (6.21)

Discipline

Moorland closed

- 9.192 The adjudications database should be routinely scrutinised to provide monitoring of trends in types of adjudication charges and outcomes. (6.47)
- 9.193 The segregation unit cells should be maintained free of graffiti. (6.48)
- 9.194 Segregated prisoners should have access to showers every day. (6.49)

Sentence and custody planning

Moorland closed

- 9.195 The generic assessment panel board should be re-instated. (8.27)
- 9.196 The brief overview of pertinent information from a prisoner's OASys assessment should be made available to all relevant staff and departments. (8.28)
- 9.197 Prisoners should be invited to attend their OASys board. (8.29)

Good Practice

Bullying

- 9.198 *All prisoners attended a week-long anti-bullying course at the end of the induction programme. Since the introduction of this course, the incidence of bullying had been reduced by 62%. (3.23)*

Healthcare

- 9.199 *Including the mental health support worker in the mental health in-reach team was having a positive effect on services to prisoners. (4.141)*

Life-sentenced prisoners

- 9.200 *Inviting contributions from the Parole Board, the Life Sentence Review and Recall Section, and life-licensees gave a wide range and balanced induction to life-sentenced prisoners, allowing them to understand their stage in their sentence. (8.42)*
- 9.201 *Contact logs meant that all staff dealing with life-sentenced prisoners were able to maintain continuity of management. (8.43)*

Appendix 1

Inspection team

Nigel Newcomen	Deputy Chief Inspector
Francis Masserick	Team Leader
Janine Harrison	Inspector
John Simpson	Inspector
Gabrielle Lee	Inspector
Brett Robinson	Inspector
Julia Fossi	Researcher
Elizabeth Tysoe	Healthcare inspector
Bridget McEvilly	Healthcare inspector
Siggi Engelen	Drugs inspector
Stephanie Twidale	Dental inspector
Angela Kikugawa	Guest inspector
Adult Learning Inspectorate staff	

Appendix 2

Moorland closed

Young adults

Population breakdown by:

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	312	99.68
Convicted but unsentenced	0	0
Remand	0	0
Civil prisoners	1	.32
Detainees (single power status)	0	0
Detainees (dual power status)	0	0
Total	313	100

(ii) Sentence	Number of sentenced prisoners	%
Less than 6 months	0	0
6 months to less than 12 months	4	1.28
12 months to less than 2 years	19	6.07
2 years to less than 4 years	89	28.43
4 years to less than 10 years	148	47.28
10 years and over (not life)	8	2.56
Life	45	14.38
Total	313	100

(iii) Length of stay	Sentenced prisoners		Unsentenced prisoners	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	42	13.42		
1 month to 3 months	55	17.57		
3 months to 6 months	58	18.53		

6 months to 1 year	77	24.6		
1 year to 2 years	62	19.81		
2 years to 4 years	19	6.07		
4 years or more	0	0		
Total	313	100		

(iv) Main offence	Number of prisoners	%
Violence against the person	86	27.48
Sexual offences	4	1.28
Burglary	40	12.78
Robbery	71	22.68
Theft & handling	4	1.28
Fraud and forgery	1	.32
Drugs offences	57	18.21
Other offences	37	11.82
Civil offences	1	.32
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	12	3.83
Total	313	100

(v) Age	Number of prisoners	%
18 years	62	15.62
19 years	105	26.45
20 years	132	33.25
21 years	98	24.68
Total	397	100

(vi) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Within 50 miles of the prison	221	70.61
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	52	16.61
Over 100 miles from the prison	26	8.31

Overseas	0	0
NFA	14	4.47
Total	313	100

(vii) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British	308	98.40
Foreign nationals	5	1.60
Total	313	100

(viii) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White</i>		
British	221	70.93
Irish	1	.32
Other White	11	3.51
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and Black Caribbean	8	2.55
White and Black African	0	0
White and Asian	1	.32
Other Mixed	4	1.28
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	1	.32
Pakistani	7	2.24
Bangladeshi	0	0
Other Asian	11	3.51
<i>Black or Black British</i>		
Caribbean	20	6.39
African	8	2.56
Other Black	17	5.43

<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese	0	0
Other ethnic group	2	.64
Total	313	100

(ix) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	75	23.96
Roman Catholic	52	16.61
Other Christian denominations	6	1.92
Muslim	44	14.06
Sikh	0	0
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	16	5.11
Jewish	0	0
Other	4	2.24
No religion	113	36.1
Total	313	100

Adult prisoners

Population breakdown by:

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	450	100
Convicted but unsentenced	0	0
Remand	0	0
Civil prisoners	0	0
Detainees (single power status)	0	0

Detainees (dual power status)	0	0
Total	450	100

(ii) Sentence	Number of sentenced prisoners	%
Less than 6 months	2	.44
6 months to less than 12 months	8	1.78
12 months to less than 2 years	30	6.67
2 years to less than 4 years	141	31.33
4 years to less than 10 years	260	57.78
10 years and over (not life)	9	2
Life	0	0
Total	450	100

(iii) Length of stay	Sentenced prisoners		Unsentenced prisoners	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	80	17.78	0	0
1 month to 3 months	125	27.78	0	0
3 months to 6 months	90	20	0	0
6 months to 1 year	87	19.33	0	0
1 year to 2 years	60	13.33	0	0
2 years to 4 years	8	1.78	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	450	100	0	0

(iv) Main offence	Number of prisoners	%
Violence against the person	95	21.11
Sexual offences	4	.89
Burglary	91	20.22
Robbery	96	21.33
Theft & handling	10	2.22
Fraud and forgery	3	.67
Drugs offences	71	15.78
Other offences	50	11.11
Civil offences	0	0
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	30	6.67
Total	450	100

(v) Age	Number of prisoners	%
18 years to 20 years	284	37.22
21 years to 29 years	321	42.07
30 years to 39 years	115	15.07
40 years to 49 years	33	4.33
50 years to 59 years	8	1.05
60 years to 69 years	2	.26
70 plus years	0	0
Please state maximum age	65	-
Total	763	100

(vi) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Within 50 miles of the prison	335	74.44
Between 50 and 100 miles of the prison	77	17.11
Over 100 miles from the prison	20	4.44
Overseas	2	.44
NFA	16	3.57
Total	450	100

(vii) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British	421	93.56
Foreign nationals	29	6.44
Total	450	100

(viii) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White</i>		
British	369	82
Irish	1	.22
Other White	10	2.22
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and Black Caribbean	2	.44
White and Black African	1	.22
White and Asian	1	.22

Other Mixed	7	1.57
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	2	.44
Pakistani	10	2.22
Bangladeshi	1	.22
Other Asian	13	2.89
<i>Black or Black British</i>		
Caribbean	15	3.33
African	10	2.22
Other Black	8	1.79
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese	0	0
Other ethnic group	0	0
Total	450	100

(ix) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Baptist	0	0
Church of England	150	33.33
Roman Catholic	60	13.33
Other Christian denominations	5	1.11
Muslim	37	8.22

Sikh	0	0
Hindu	0	0
Buddhist	5	1.11
Jewish	0	0
Other	6	.68
No religion	190	42.22
Total	450	100

Moorland open

Young adults

Population breakdown by:

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	53	100
Convicted but unsentenced		
Remand		
Civil prisoners		
Detainees (single power status)		
Detainees (dual power status)		
Total	53	100

(ii) Sentence	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 6 months	5	9.43
6 months to less than 12 months	12	22.64
12 months to less than 2 years	17	32.09

2 years to less than 4 years	11	20.75
4 years to less than 10 years	8	15.09
10 years and over (not life)		
Life		
Total	53	100

(iii) Length of Stay	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 1 month	19	35.85
1 month to 3 months	20	37.74
3 months to 6 months	39	16.98
6 months to 1 year	23	5.66
1 year to 2 years	2	3.77
2 years to 4 years		
4 years or more		
Total	53	100

(iv) Main offence	Number of prisoners	%
Violence against the person	16	30.19
Sexual offences		
Burglary	2	3.77
Robbery	4	7.55
Theft & handling	4	7.55
Fraud and forgery	1	1.89
Drugs offences	5	9.43

Other offences	19	35.85
Civil offences		
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	2	3.77
Total	53	100

(v) Age	Number of prisoners	%
18 years	4	7.55
19 years	20	37.74
20 years	27	50.94
21 years	2	3.77
Please state maximum age	(22)	
Total	53	100

(vi) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Cambridgeshire	3	5.66
Derbyshire	6	11.32
Durham	1	1.89
Hampshire	1	1.89
Lancashire	2	3.77
Leicestershire	4	7.55
Middlesex	1	1.89
North Yorkshire	1	1.89
Northamptonshire	4	7.55
Nottinghamshire	6	11.32

South Yorkshire	5	9.43
West Midlands	8	15.09
West Yorkshire	7	13.21
Worcestershire	2	3.77
Overseas		
NFA	2	3.77
Total	53	100

(vii) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British	52	98.11
Foreign nationals	1	1.89
Total	53	100

(viii) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White</i>		
British	44	83.02
Irish		
Other White		
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and Black Caribbean		
White and Black African		
White and Asian		
Other Mixed		

<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	1	1.89
Pakistani	3	5.66
Bangladeshi		
Other Asian	2	3.77
<i>Black or Black British</i>		
Caribbean		
African	2	3.77
Other Black	1	1.89
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese		
Other ethnic group		
Total	53	100

(ix) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Baptist		
Church of England	11	20.75
Roman Catholic	6	11.32
Other Christian denominations	1	1.89
Muslim	7	13.21
Sikh		

Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other	1	1.89
No religion	27	50.94
Total	53	100

Adult prisoners

(i) Status	Number of prisoners	%
Sentenced	182	100
Convicted but unsentenced		
Remand		
Civil prisoners		
Detainees (single power status)		
Detainees (dual power status)		
Total	182	100

(ii) Sentence	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 6 months	5	2.75
6 months to less than 12 months	5	2.75
12 months to less than 2 years	15	8.24
2 years to less than 4 years	55	30.22
4 years to less than 10 years	88	48.35

10 years and over (not life)	14	7.69
Life		
Total	182	100

(iii) Length of stay	Number of prisoners	%
Less than 1 month	40	21.98
1 month to 3 months	59	32.42
3 months to 6 months	41	22.53
6 months to 1 year	31	17.03
1 year to 2 years	11	6.04
2 years to 4 years		
4 years or more		
Total	182	100

(iv) Main offence	Number of prisoners	%
Violence against the person	41	22.53
Sexual offences		
Burglary	25	13.74
Robbery	17	9.34
Theft & handling	7	3.85
Fraud and forgery	13	7.14
Drugs offences	56	30.77
Other offences	23	12.63
Civil offences		

Offence not recorded/holding warrant		
Total	182	100

(v) Age	Number of prisoners	%
21 years to 29 years	72	39.56
30 years to 39 years	71	39.01
40 years to 49 years	28	15.38
50 years to 59 years	10	5.49
60 years to 69 years	1	0.56
70 plus years		
Please state maximum age	(63)	
Total	182	100

(vi) Home address	Number of prisoners	%
Cheshire	1	0.56
Cleveland	3	1.65
Clwyd	1	0.56
Derbyshire	4	2.22
East Yorkshire	16	8.79
Essex	1	0.56
Humberside	2	1.09
Lancashire	5	2.75
Leicestershire	2	1.09
Lincolnshire	13	7.14

London	1	0.56
Manchester	10	5.49
Merseyside	1	0.56
North Yorkshire	14	7.69
Nottinghamshire	6	3.30
South Yorkshire	61	33.52
Tyne & Wear	4	2.22
West Midlands	2	1.09
West Yorkshire	26	14.28
Warwickshire	3	1.65
Wiltshire	1	0.56
Overseas		
NFA	5	2.73
Total	182	100

(vii) Nationality	Number of prisoners	%
British	175	96.15
Foreign nationals	7	3.85
Total	182	100

(viii) Ethnicity	Number of prisoners	%
<i>White</i>		
British	138	75.82
Irish		

Other White	3	1.65
<i>Mixed</i>		
White and Black Caribbean	4	2.22
White and Black African	1	0.56
White and Asian		
Other Mixed		
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>		
Indian	6	3.30
Pakistani	9	4.95
Bangladeshi		
Other Asian	4	2.22
<i>Black or Black British</i>		
Caribbean	10	5.49
African	4	2.22
Other Black	2	1.09
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		
Chinese		
Other ethnic group	1	0.56
Total	182	100

(ix) Religion	Number of prisoners	%
Baptist		
Church of England	74	40.66
Roman Catholic	29	15.93

Other Christian denominations	3	1.65
Muslim	19	10.44
Sikh	3	1.65
Hindu	1	0.56
Buddhist	3	1.65
Jewish		
Other		
No religion	50	27.47
Total	182	100

Appendix 3 : Summary of questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

HMP/YOI Moorland (Closed)

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

Choosing the sample size

The baseline for the sample size was calculated using a robust statistical formula provided by a Home Office statistician. Essentially, the formula indicates the sample size that is required and the extent to which the findings from a sample of that size reflect the experiences of the whole population.

At the time of the survey on the 14th November 2005 the adult prisoner population at HMP/YOI Moorland was 452. The baseline sample size was 114. Overall, this represented 25% of the adult prisoner population.

The Young Offender population was 318. The baseline sample size was 90, representing 28% of the Young Offender population.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a LIDS prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a LIDS list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Six adult and five Young Offender respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, two adult respondents were interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;

- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- to seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.

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

Response rates

In total, 103 adult respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 23% of the adult prison population. The response rate was 90%. In addition to the six adult respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, five questionnaires were not returned.

75 Young Offender respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 24% of the Young Offender prison population. The response rate was 83%. In addition to the five respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, ten questionnaires were not returned.

Comparisons

The following document details the results from the survey. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis. All data from each establishment has been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Presented alongside the adult results from this survey, are the benchmark figures for all prisoners surveyed in trainer prisons. This benchmark is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in twenty three trainer prisons since April 2003.

The Young Offender results are presented alongside the benchmark figures for all prisoners in Young Offender Institutes. This benchmark is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in eighteen Young Offender Institutes since April 2003.

In addition, two further comparative documents are attached. Statistically significant differences between the responses of adult white prisoners and adults from a black and minority ethnic group are shown in the first document and differences between white Young Offenders and black and ethnic minority Young Offenders are presented in the second.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance merely indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by grey shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by a black background and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading.

HMP/YOI Moorland Open

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

Choosing the sample size

The baseline for the sample size was calculated using a robust statistical formula provided by a Home Office statistician. Essentially, the formula indicates the sample size that is required

and the extent to which the findings from a sample of that size reflect the experiences of the whole population.

At the time of the survey on the 14th November 2005 the adult prisoner population at HMP/YOI Moorland Open was 174. The baseline sample size was 86. Overall, this represented 49% of the adult prisoner population.

The Young Offender population was 55. The baseline sample size was 55, representing the whole of the Young Offender population.

Selecting the sample

Respondents were randomly selected from a LIDS prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a LIDS list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled.

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

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. In total, one young adult was interviewed.

Methodology

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

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

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

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

Response rates

In total, 55 adult respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 32% of the adult prison population. The response rate for the adult population was 64%. In addition to the one adult respondent who refused to complete a questionnaire, 30 questionnaires were not returned.

44 Young Offender respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 80% of the Young Offender prison population. The response rate for the young offender population was 80%. Eleven questionnaires were not returned.

Comparisons

The following document details the results from the survey. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis. All data from each establishment has been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Presented alongside the adult results from this survey, are the benchmark figures for all prisoners surveyed in open prisons. This benchmark is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in ten open prisons since April 2003.

The Young Offender results are presented alongside the benchmark figures for all prisoners in Young Offender Institutes. This benchmark is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in eighteen Young Offender Institutes since April 2003.

In addition, two further comparative documents are attached. Statistically significant differences between the responses of adult white prisoners and adults from a black and minority ethnic group are shown in the first document and differences between white Young Offenders and black and ethnic minority Young Offenders are presented in the second.

In all the above documents, statistically significant differences are highlighted. Statistical significance merely indicates whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by grey shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by a black background and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading.



Prisoner Survey Responses Closed Moorland 2005

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

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons benchmark	Adult prisoners Closed Moorland	Trainer Prisons Benchmark
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons benchmark		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the trainer prisons benchmark		

SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

		Adult prisoners Closed Moorland	Trainer Prisons Benchmark
1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	103	1978
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0	1
3	Are you sentenced?	100	100
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	54	62
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	32	28
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	4	8
7	Are you a foreign national?	6	11
8	Is English your first language?	97	93
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	18	22
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	28	26
11	Do you have any children?	54	58

SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

		Adult prisoners Closed Moorland	Trainer Prisons Benchmark
12a	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the cleanliness of the van? (very good/good)	42	48
12b	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	66	61
12c	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	17	18
12d	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the attention paid to your health needs?	32	33
12e	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	14	13
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	3	12
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67	71
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	77	89
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	10	19
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85	90

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons benchmark	Adult prisoners Closed Moorland	Trainer Prisons Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the trainer prisons benchmark		

SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction

17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	54	52
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	16	19
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	88	87
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	68	75
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60	74
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	91	69
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	54	51
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	53	44
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	31	52
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	39	44
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	34	38
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	75	75
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	53	46
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	50	49
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	58	76
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	20	35
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	10	26
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86	87
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	64	72
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	56	59

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody

27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	42	62
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	60	73
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	43	52
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	62	70
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	40	48
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	32	33
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	57	68
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95	95
28c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	85	87

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons benchmark	Adult prisoners Closed Moorland	Trainer Prisons Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the trainer prisons benchmark		

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)

28d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	71	79
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	40	51
28f	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	72	73
28g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	18	40
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	42	40
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14	40
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35	42
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	86	85
32b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	91	90
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	52	53
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	24	22
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	54	49
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	28	21
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	26	37
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	12	13
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	37	52
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	41	46
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	42	56
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	49	57
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	3	5
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	13	14
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	57	56
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	56	62
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	47	67
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	64	75
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78	79

SECTION 5: Safety

44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	29	23
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	16	19
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8	10
47b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	5

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons benchmark	Adult prisoners Closed Moorland	Trainer Prisons Benchmark
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons benchmark		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the trainer prisons benchmark		

SECTION 5: Safety (continued)

47c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	1	1
47d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	4
47e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	1	1
47f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	2
47g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	6	3
47h	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	4	4
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	19	18
49a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	8	10
49b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	4	2
49c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	0
49d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	4	4
49e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	0	2
49f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	3	2
49g	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	4	3
50	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	8	10

SECTION 6: Healthcare

52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	30	49
53a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	37	45
53b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	46	63
53c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	17	34
53d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	19	26
53e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	34	49
54	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22	25
55a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	6	10
55b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	10	7

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity

57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	46	35
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	47	37
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	55	49
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	41	36
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	37	34

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the trainer prisons benchmark	Adult prisoners Closed Moorland	Trainer Prisons Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the trainer prisons benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the trainer prisons benchmark		

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)

58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	37	56
59	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	29	66
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	51	54
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	27	49
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	7	24
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	1	14
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	93	76
65	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	15	23

SECTION 8: Resettlement

67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	19	35
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	25	51
69	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	70	68
70	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	48	46
71	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	35	31
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	34	22
73	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	48	27
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	76	75
75a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	46	49
75b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	50	52
75c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	36	40
75d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	47	51
75e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	40	40
75f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	48	48
75g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	43	45
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	55	58



Prisoner Survey Responses Closed YOI Moorland

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

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	Young Offenders Closed Moorland	YOI Benchmark
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	75	1334
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	95	88
3	Are you sentenced?	100	76
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	51	22
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	25	35
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	8	18
7	Are you a foreign national?	6	10
8	Is English your first language?	93	93
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	24	28
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	4	12
11	Do you have any children?	24	24

SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

12a	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the cleanliness of the van? (very good/good)	36	32
12b	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	73	60
12c	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	8	11
12d	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the attention paid to your health needs?	39	32
12e	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	15	11
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	10	8
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	70	67
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	80	83
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	21	19
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	90	86

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	Young Offenders Closed Moorland	YOI Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction

17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	52	58
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	17	19
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	88	88
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	77	69
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66	62
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	93	77
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	59	51
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	57	48
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	43	33
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	49	67
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	40	39
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	80	80
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	55	51
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	56	47
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	55	68
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	29	23
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	14	18
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89	78
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	83	68
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	62	56

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody

27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	26	34
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	51	63
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	40	43
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	60	67
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	32	39
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	31	37
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	46	56
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	40	48
28c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	88	85

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	Young Offenders Closed Moorland	YOI Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)

28d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	33	58
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32	42
28f	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	66	58
28g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	24	40
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33	43
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	17	23
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50	43
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	65	79
32b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	68	84
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	47	47
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	7	22
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	49	44
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	14	21
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	17	33
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	8	12
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	28	28
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	14	30
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	29	35
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	42	49
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	7	13
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	13	19
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	51	46
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	55	56
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	52	51
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72	68
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66	67
SECTION 5: Safety			
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	23	34
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	21	24
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	7	15
47b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11	11

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	Young Offenders Closed Moorland	YOI Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 5: Safety (continued)

47c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	2
47d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	4
47e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	4
47f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3	4
47g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	6	7
47h	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	4	8
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	20	22
49a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	12	13
49b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	3	6
49c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	1
49d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	3	4
49e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	0	1
49f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	7	5
49g	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	10	5
50	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	10	10

SECTION 6: Healthcare

52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	29	44
53a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	29	43
53b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	41	56
53c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	20	21
53d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	9	12
53e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	23	33
54	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	15	22
55a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	6	15
55b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	8	16

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity

57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	43	36
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	43	36
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	61	48
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	52	31
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	54	34

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	Young Offenders Closed Moorland	YOI Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)

58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	28	23
59	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	31	40
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	42	47
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	24	39
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	5	9
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	0	4
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	33	32
65	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	13	21

SECTION 8: Resettlement

67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	9	29
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	27	39
69	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	75	41
70	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	46	29
71	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	43	39
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38	32
73	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	51	38
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	74	65
75a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	41	48
75b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	40	52
75c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	26	35
75d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	29	45
75e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	29	42
75f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	31	43
75g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	26	39
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	75	46



Prisoner Survey Responses HMP Moorland Open 2005

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

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the open prisons benchmark	HMP Moorland	Open Prisons Benchmark
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the open prisons benchmark		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the open prisons benchmark		

SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	55	750
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0	1
3	Are you sentenced?	100	100
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	47	55
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	49	45
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	11	13
7	Are you a foreign national?	8	10
8	Is English your first language?	97	93
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	15	22
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	9	11
11	Do you have any children?	59	59

SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

12a	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the cleanliness of the van? (very good/good)	50	52
12b	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	65	60
12c	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	23	23
12d	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the attention paid to your health needs?	37	32
12e	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	12	15
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	4	7
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79	72
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	96	92
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	23	21
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	98	94

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the open prisons benchmark	HMP Moorland	Open Prisons Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the open prisons benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the open prisons benchmark		

SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction

17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	41	41
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	25	13
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	89	81
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	88	75
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	85	75
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	92	65
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	71	58
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	52	46
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	58	62
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	33	32
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	48	41
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	67	70
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	62	55
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	59	53
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	75	78
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	29	41
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	22	27
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	96	86
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	98	86
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	80	60

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody

27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	57	58
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	67	65
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	42	50
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	56	60
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	36	42
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	30	34
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	71	76
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100	99
28c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87	92

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the open prisons benchmark	HMP Moorland	Open Prisons Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the open prisons benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the open prisons benchmark		

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)

28d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	88	71
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	21	24
28f	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	75	77
28g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	52	46
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	32	28
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	48	50
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	44	45
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	79	81
32b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	94	87
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	50	57
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	32	22
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	45	54
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	29	21
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	37	35
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	2	7
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	54	51
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	57	47
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	83	71
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	73	69
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	0	1
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	6	2
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	53	54
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	58	60
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	58	72
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	75	71
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	68	72
SECTION 5: Safety			
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	8	17
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	8	10
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6	5
47b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2	2

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the open prisons benchmark	HMP Moorland	Open Prisons Benchmark
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the open prisons benchmark		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the open prisons benchmark		

SECTION 5: Safety (continued)

47c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	1
47d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2	2
47e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	1
47f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	1
47g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	2	2
47h	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	2	1
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	4	17
49a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	2	10
49b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	0	1
49c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	0
49d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0	3
49e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	2	1
49f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	2	3
49g	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	0	4
50	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	0	6

SECTION 6: Healthcare

52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	48	57
53a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	42	58
53b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	65	63
53c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	9	26
53d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	30	21
53e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	47	49
54	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35	50
55a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	2	2
55b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	2	3

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity

57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	37	39
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	46	46
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	66	55
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	41	41
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	34	31

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the open prisons benchmark	HMP Moorland	Open Prisons Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the open prisons benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the open prisons benchmark		
SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)			
58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48	58
59	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	88	70
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	62	52
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	22	73
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	56	54
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	54	45
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	80	78
65	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	23	20
SECTION 8: Resettlement			
67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	13	31
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	37	49
69	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	85	66
70	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	63	51
71	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	34	22
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	29	14
73	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	47	50
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	85	86
75a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	88	70
75b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	86	59
75c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	62	48
75d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	69	57
75e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	74	55
75f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	66	51
75g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	69	50
76a	Have you been provided with information on: ROTL (temporary release	73	62
76b	Have you been provided with information on: Facility Licence (outside work, education)	69	55
76c	Have you been provided with information on: Resettlement Licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	61	52

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the open prisons benchmark	HMP Moorland	Open Prisons Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the open prisons benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the open prisons benchmark		
SECTION 8: Resettlement (continued)			
76d	Have you been provided with information on: Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	79	68
77a	Have you had access to: ROTL (temporary release)	72	47
77b	Have you had access to: Facility Licence (outside work, education)	50	39
77c	Have you had access to: Resettlement Licence (other outside activities such as arranging accommodation, work, family visits)	44	35
77d	Have you had access to: Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	66	53
78a	Please answer the following questions on resettlement: Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	21	22
78b	Please answer the following questions on resettlement: Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom etc)	27	24
78c	Please answer the following questions on resettlement: Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	75	81
78d	Please answer the following questions on resettlement: Have you been on a preparation for release course?	21	16
78e	Please answer the following questions on resettlement: Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	72	62
78f	Please answer the following questions on resettlement: Is this prison near your home area or intended release address?	63	41



Prisoner Survey Responses HMYOI Moorland Open 2005

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

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	HMYOI Moorland Open	YOI Benchmark
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 1: General Information (not tested for significance)

		HMYOI Moorland Open	YOI Benchmark
1	Number of completed questionnaires returned	44	1334
2	Are you under 21 years of age?	98	88
3	Are you sentenced?	100	76
4	Is your sentence more than four years?	7	22
5	Do you have less than six months to serve?	81	35
6	Have you been in this prison less than a month?	23	18
7	Are you a foreign national?	10	10
8	Is English your first language?	95	93
9	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (including all those who did not tick White British, White Irish or White other categories)	16	28
10	Have you been in prison more than five times?	2	12
11	Do you have any children?	26	24

SECTION 2: Transfers and Escorts

		HMYOI Moorland Open	YOI Benchmark
12a	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the cleanliness of the van? (very good/good)	38	32
12b	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was your personal safety during the journey? (very good/good)	47	60
12c	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the comfort of the van? (very good/good)	24	11
12d	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the attention paid to your health needs?	38	32
12e	We want to know about the most recent journey you have made either to or from court or between establishments. How was the frequency of comfort breaks? (very good/good)	9	11
13	Did you spend more than four hours in the van?	2	8
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71	67
15a	Did you know where you were going when you left court or when transferred from another establishment?	89	83
15b	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about what would happen to you?	19	19
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	93	86

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	HMYOI Moorland Open	YOI Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction

17	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	51	58
18	Did you receive any help/support from any member of staff in dealing with these problems within the first 24 hours?	17	19
19a	Please answer the following question about reception: were you seen by a member of healthcare staff?	89	88
19b	Please answer the following question about reception: when you were searched, was this carried out in a sensitive and understanding way?	75	69
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67	62
21a	Did you receive a reception pack on your day of arrival?	98	77
21b	Did you receive information about what was going to happen here on your day of arrival?	73	51
21c	Did you receive information about support for feeling depressed or suicidal on your day of arrival?	53	48
21d	Did you have the opportunity to have a shower on your day of arrival?	35	33
21e	Did you get the opportunity to have a free telephone call on your day of arrival?	26	67
21f	Did you get information about routine requests on your day of arrival?	46	39
21g	Did you get something to eat on your day of arrival?	80	80
21h	Did you get information about visits on your day of arrival?	62	51
22a	Did you have access to the chaplain/priest within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	34	47
22b	Did you have access to someone from healthcare within the first 24 hours?	69	68
22c	Did you have access to a Listener/Samaritans within the first 24 hours of you arriving at this prison?	26	23
22d	Did you have access to the prison shop/canteen within the first 24 hours?	28	18
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88	78
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	90	68
25	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	82	56

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody

27a	Can you get access to legal reference books?	35	34
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	59	63
27c	Can you get access to information about leave to appeal?	42	43
27d	Can you get access to legal visits?	52	67
27e	Can you get access to help with legal costs?	28	39
27f	Can you get access to bail information?	33	37
28a	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	79	56
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98	48
28c	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	43	85

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	HMYOI Moorland Open	YOI Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 4: Legal Rights and Respectful Custody (continued)

28d	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	81	58
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	12	42
28f	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	69	58
28g	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	43	40
29	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	20	43
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	56	23
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	74	43
32a	Is it easy/very easy to get a complaints form?	83	79
32b	Is it easy/very easy to get an application form?	85	84
33a	Do you feel applications are sorted out fairly?	46	47
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	26	22
33c	Do you feel applications are sorted out promptly?	46	44
33d	Do you feel complaints are sorted out promptly?	28	21
33e	Are you given information about how to make an appeal?	30	33
34	Have you ever been made to or encouraged to withdraw a complaint since you have been in this prison?	11	12
35	Do you know how to apply to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman?	31	28
36	Is it easy/very easy to contact the Independent Monitoring Board (BOV)?	25	30
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	20	35
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	62	49
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C & R)?	2	13
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	6	19
40a	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	43	46
40b	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53	56
41	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	53	51
42a	Do you have a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	74	68
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64	67
SECTION 5: Safety			
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	26	34
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	15	24
47a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12	15
47b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By prisoners)	9	11

Key to tables

Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	HMYOI Moorland Open	YOI Benchmark
Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 5: Safety (continued)

47c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2	2
47d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2	4
47e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2	4
47f	Have you ever had your canteen/property taken since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6	4
47g	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By prisoners)	8	7
47h	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (by prisoners)	9	8
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	26	22
49a	Have you had insulting remarks made about you, your family or friends since you have been here? (By staff)	15	13
49b	Have you been hit, kicked or assaulted since you have been here? (By staff)	0	6
49c	Have you been sexually abused since you have been here? (By staff)	0	1
49d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	7	4
49e	Have you been victimised because of drugs since you have been here? (By staff)	6	1
49f	Have you ever been victimised because you were new here? (By staff)	7	5
49g	Have you ever been victimised because you were from a different part of the country than others since you have been here? (By staff)	2	5
50	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	8	10

SECTION 6: Healthcare

52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	65	44
53a	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the doctor is good/very good?	49	43
53b	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the nurse is good/very good?	70	56
53c	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dentist is good/very good?	10	21
53d	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the optician is good/very good?	8	12
53e	Do you think the quality of healthcare from the dispensing staff/pharmacist is good/very good?	20	33
54	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35	22
55a	Do you think you will have a problem with drugs when you leave this prison?	6	15
55b	Do you think you will have a problem with alcohol when you leave this prison?	9	16

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity

57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	27	36
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	42	36
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	67	48
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	36	31
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	40	34

Key to tables

	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the YOI benchmark	HMYOI Moorland Open	YOI Benchmark
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the YOI benchmark		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the 2005 survey and the YOI benchmark		

SECTION 7: Purposeful Activity (continued)

58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	46	23
59	Can you get access to a newspaper every day?	85	40
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	83	47
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	26	39
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	39	9
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	64	4
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	93	32
65	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	20	21

SECTION 8: Resettlement

67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	39	29
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	56	39
69	Do you have a custody/sentence plan?	75	41
70	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your sentence plan?	47	29
71	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	30	39
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	46	32
73	Did you have a visit in the first week that you were here?	48	38
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	83	65
75a	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding a job on release?	83	48
75b	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with finding accommodation on release?	82	52
75c	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with your finances in preparation for release?	54	35
75d	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with claiming benefits on release?	64	45
75e	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with arranging a place at college/continuing education on release?	69	42
75f	Do you know who to contact within this prison to get help with external drugs courses etc	55	43
75g	Do you know who to contact, within this prison, to get help with continuity of healthcare on release?	61	39
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	29	46



Key Question Responses (Ethnicity) Closed Moorland 2005

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

Key to tables

		Adult BME prisoners	Adult White prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the responses from White prisoners		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the responses from White prisoners		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the responses from BME prisoners and those from White prisoners		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	18	83
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72	67
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88	83
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	44	64
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80	87
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	71	64
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	59	61
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89	96
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37	41
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	5	16
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	23	39
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	11	27
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	39	43
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44	49
39a	In the last 6 months have you been physically restrained?	0	4
39b	In the last 6 months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	23	11
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	56	83
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	29	28
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	5	18
47d	Have you been victimised by another prisoner because of your race or ethnic origin?	0	0
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	35	16
49d	Have you been victimised by a member of staff because of your race or ethnic origin?	25	0
52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	23	33
57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	53	44
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	50	46
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	72	51
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	56	38
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	53	33
58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39	36
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	72	45
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	28	28
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	11	6
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	0	1
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	87	94

67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	11	21
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	17	27
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	39	34
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	65	79
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	69	53



Key Question Responses (Ethnicity) Closed YOI Moorland 2005

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

Key to tables

		BME Young Offenders	White Young Offenders
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the responses from White prisoners		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the responses from White prisoners		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the responses from BME prisoners and those from White prisoners		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	18	57
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72	68
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	83	93
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	53	71
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	94	88
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	88	83
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	56	48
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	35	41
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37	29
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	17	16
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	28	58
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	5	7
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	29	29
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	37	44
39a	In the last 6 months have you been physically restrained?	0	8
39b	In the last 6 months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	12	13
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	69	65
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	22	22
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	17	21
47d	Have you been victimised by another prisoner because of your race or ethnic origin?	11	0
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	17	20
49d	Have you been victimised by a member of staff because of your race or ethnic origin?	5	2
52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	29	29
57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	45	43
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	35	46
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	65	60
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	71	46
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	56	53
58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42	24
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	50	40
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	39	20
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	5	6
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	0	0
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	28	35

67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	11	9
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	33	25
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	33	41
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	58	80
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	71	77



Key Question Responses (Ethnicity) HMP Moorland Open 2005

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

Key to tables

		BME prisoners	White prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the responses from White prisoners		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the responses from White prisoners		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the responses from BME prisoners and those from White prisoners		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	8	46
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64	82
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88	100
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64	86
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88	98
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	88	100
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	50	70
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100	100
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	41	14
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	64	45
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	64	41
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	41	30
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	76	84
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50	77
39a	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C and R)?	0	0
39b	In the last six months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	0	7
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	59	70
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	0	9
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	0	9
47d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0	2
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	0	4
49d	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0	0
52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	36	50
57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	41	36
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	59	44
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	76	64
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	64	36
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	27	35
58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	64	45

Race Comparison

	Number of completed questionnaires returned	8	46
60	On average, do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	76	59
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	24	21
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	64	55
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	76	50
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	86	79
67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	12	14
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	36	38
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24	30
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	76	87
77a	Have you had access to: ROTL (temporary release)	64	73
77b	Have you had access to: Facility Licence (outside work, education)	27	54
77c	Have you had access to: Resettlement Licence (other outside activities such as arranging accomodation, work, family visits)	27	48
77d	Have you had access to: Earned Community Visits (Town visits)	64	68
78e	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	76	71



Key Question Responses (Ethnicity) HMYOI Moorland Open 2005

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

Key to tables

		BME prisoners	White prisoners
	Any numbers highlighted in green are significantly better than the responses from White prisoners		
	Any numbers highlighted in blue are significantly worse than the responses from White prisoners		
	Numbers which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference between the responses from BME prisoners and those from White prisoners		
	Number of completed questionnaires returned	7	37
14	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	44	76
15c	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	68	98
20	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	44	72
23	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	89	88
24	Did you go on an induction course within the first week?	100	88
27b	Can you get access to communication with your solicitor or legal representative?	44	64
28b	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89	100
28e	Please answer the following question about the wing/unit you are currently on: is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25	10
30	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	33	61
31	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	56	78
33b	Do you feel complaints are sorted out fairly?	33	24
37	Are you on the enhanced (top) level of the IEP scheme?	33	20
38	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44	66
39a	In the last 6 months have you been physically restrained?	14	0
39b	In the last 6 months have you spent a night in the segregation unit?	0	7
42b	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	67	64
44	Have you ever felt unsafe in this prison?	44	23
46	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by another prisoner?	11	14
47d	Have you been victimised by another prisoner because of your race or ethnic origin?	11	0
48	Have you been victimised (insulted or assaulted) by a member of staff?	44	22
49d	Have you been victimised by a member of staff because of your race or ethnic origin?	44	0
52	Do you think the overall quality of the healthcare is good/very good?	33	72
57a	Do you feel your job will help you on release?	0	32
57b	Do you feel your vocational or skills training will help you on release?	14	47
57c	Do you feel your education (including basic skills) will help you on release?	56	68
57d	Do you feel your offending behaviour programmes will help you on release?	11	42
57e	Do you feel your drug or alcohol programmes will help you on release?	33	41
58	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	44	47
60	On average, do you go to the gym at least twice a week?	89	82
61	On average, do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	33	25
62	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	11	44
63	On average, do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekend day?(This includes hours at education, at work etc)	56	65
64	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	100	91

67	Did you first meet your personal officer in the first week?	33	42
68	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	50	57
72	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	44	47
74	Does this prison give you the opportunity to have the visits you are entitled to? (e.g. number and length of visit)	67	86
76	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?	44	26