

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women)

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

16–27 June 2014

Glossary of terms

We try to make our reports as clear as possible, but if you find terms that you do not know, please see the glossary in our 'Guide for writing inspection reports' on our website at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprison/about-our-inspections/>

Crown copyright 2014

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

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

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

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

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	43
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	59
Section 6. Appendices	65
Appendix I: Inspection team	65
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	67
Appendix III: Prison population profile	77
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	81

Introduction

HMP and YOI Peterborough is a unique prison in England and Wales as it is the only prison which holds both men and women on a single site. While this could have resulted in compromises that led to the needs of the smaller female population being subsumed by those of the larger male one, in this inspection of the female side, we once again found that this was generally not the case. However, the 318 women held presented a wide and complex range of needs, and this was a challenge to manage.

About one in four of the women were unsentenced and about one in six were serving sentences of six months or less. At the other end of the scale, the prison held 30 women serving indeterminate sentences for public protection or life sentences, and there were women in the prison serving every sort of sentence length in between. The women ranged in age from 18 to 70, 15% were foreign nationals, and about half told us they had children under the age of 18. Forty-four per cent had a problem with drugs when they arrived at the prison and 26% had a problem with alcohol. The number of disabled women, and those in prison for the first time, had significantly increased since the last inspection, and over half of the women in our survey reported having an emotional wellbeing or mental health problem, significantly more than at similar prisons or at the time of our last inspection. Nearly a third of women arrived feeling depressed or suicidal, and three-quarters reported having a problem of some sort on arrival. The vulnerability of this population mix was sharply and sadly brought home a month before the inspection with the self-inflicted death of a mentally ill woman who had been remanded in custody on a minor charge and died in segregation. It was therefore an achievement that the prison was generally safe for most women held.

Women reported negatively about courts and escorts. This was not surprising, as in common with other women's prisons they often had long waits in court cells and on vans before disembarkation at the prison, as the men were dealt with first. Women complained about verbal bullying from male prisoners being transported in the same vans as them and more than the comparator said they felt unsafe. The experience of the prison reception was reasonable, but despite the good use of peer mentors, more could have been done to reassure new arrivals. First night and early day's arrangements were good and efforts were made to settle women into the prison routine.

Most women felt safe and the atmosphere was calm and reassuringly low key. This was greatly helped by the design of the small units which facilitated a community feel to the living environment. Relationships between staff and prisoners were mainly respectful and strong which helped women feel safe. Nevertheless, more women than at the last inspection reported feeling victimised by other prisoners and by staff. The proportion of female staff was too low. Some elements of security were overly risk adverse, and use of strip-searching was greater than we have seen elsewhere in women's prisons. The governance of this and of the use of force needed to be improved to provide reassurance that interventions to manage behaviour were proportionate. In addition, while treatment of the women who were segregated was good, the numbers were high, and some very vulnerable women were being held there without the exceptional reasons to justify this. Some good support was offered to women who were vulnerable, but there was no specialist provision for those with a combination of complex needs and challenging behaviour. The purpose of the inpatient unit, where some women with mental health problems were held, was unclear and we thought many of these women ended up in the segregation unit for the want of a suitable alternative.

The general environment was very good, and outside areas were particularly attractive. There was a good focus on diversity issues and most outcomes in this regard were decent, although in our survey disabled and gay prisoners reported less favourably. The prison had been designated as a foreign national prisoner hub for women, and while this was still in its infancy, we were concerned that some women reported being compelled to transfer to the prison, even if this took them further away from families and friends. Nevertheless, support for foreign nationals was better than we see in many other prisons. Some of the young women we spoke to complained of being bored. Support for pregnant women and mothers and babies was particularly good, although as is often the case, we

were again concerned to see the mother and baby unit under-utilised. It is difficult to believe that the skilled staff in the unit could not have provided valuable support to more mothers if the unit could have been used in a more flexible way. Health care provision was mixed. While access to health care professionals was good, and most care appropriate, some elements of clinical management needed to be improved.

Time out of cell was good, although access to the outside areas during exercise was too limited. Some good progress had been made in developing the learning and skills provision offered, but too many women were engaged in mundane and meaningless wing-based work, and not all opportunities to accredit the more challenging work activities offered were taken. There was too little focus on activities to develop confidence and self-esteem, and achievements, particularly in key areas of English, mathematics, and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) were not good enough. These are key areas in preparing women for progression into higher level vocational qualifications and meaningful preparation for work on release, so are central to the rehabilitation process.

This was in contrast to the excellent resettlement services being offered. The Link, Outside Links and connection peer workers provided innovative support to women arriving at the prison in the form of custody planning; continuing support with resettlement services and critically, practical and grounded support on release. It provided a through the gate model of resettlement support which could be emulated by other local prisons. Support for women to maintain contact with their family and friends were very good, as was the specific provision for women who were vulnerable on release, including those who had been trafficked or abused. Resettlement work more generally was good, as were the offender management arrangements in place for more serious offenders.

Overall, Peterborough manages the women it holds well. The resettlement model at Peterborough is successful and could be copied by other prisons. The environment and good relationships between staff and prisoners create a safe prison, although a higher proportion of female staff is needed. It is let down by the poor quantity and quality of the activity it offers which, while improving, is still not good enough. Some security measures, such as the amount of strip-searching, are heavy handed and better provision is needed for the most complex and vulnerable women.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

October 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A category B local prison for male and female prisoners. Designated a young offender institution for female prisoners.

Prison status

Privately operated by Sodexo Justice Services

Region

East of England

Number held

318 female prisoners on 16 June 2014

Certified normal accommodation

333

Operational capacity

384

Date of last full inspection

2011

Brief history

The Ministry of Justice awarded Peterborough Prison Management Ltd a 25-year contract to run the HMP and YOI Peterborough when it opened in March 2005. Sodexo Justice Services is subcontracted to operate the prison.

Short description of residential units

The residential unit for women consisted of two houseblocks. Each had five self-contained wings with a servery, showers, baths and association areas. Wings consisted of purpose-built double cells or single cells, some of which had been adapted for two prisoners. There was a dedicated self-contained mother and baby unit with 12 rooms.

Houseblock 1

A1 – young adults (18-25 years)

B1 – integrated drug treatment system unit and first night centre for those requiring detoxification or stabilisation

C1 – transitional care unit for those with additional needs or at risk prisoners

D1 – for prisoners serving over five years and lifers

E1 – first night centre.

Houseblock 2

A2 – remand prisoners

B2 – sentenced prisoners

C2 – enhanced level prisoners

D2 – sentenced prisoners

E2 – foreign nationals.

Name of governor/director

Nick Leader

Escort contractor

Serco Wincanton

Health service provider

In-house

Cambridge and Peterborough Foundation Trust

Learning and skills providers

In-house

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Alan Turner

About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:

Safety	prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

- **outcomes for prisoners are good.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good.**
There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- **outcomes for prisoners are poor.**
There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

- A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:
- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
 - **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines
 - **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection, unless these have already been reviewed by a short follow-up inspection.

This report

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

¹ The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

S1 *Escort arrangements were not satisfactory. Reception was reasonable and first night and early days support were good. Most women said they felt safe. Care for women at risk was generally good but some processes needed to be improved. The prison did not meet the needs of women with very complex behavioural issues. Security was generally proportionate although strip-searching required better monitoring and some other aspects were overly risk adverse. The prison acknowledged positive behaviour, and adjudications were well managed. Not all use of force was proportionate. Segregation was good but too many were held there, some of whom were at risk of suicide or self-harm. Substance misuse services were generally good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*

S3 Women were negative about escorts. Many waited a long time in court; some spent an unacceptably long time in a cellular vehicle without a comfort break. Many journeys took place in vehicles shared with male prisoners, and some women reported verbal abuse. It was unnecessary to use handcuffs on women who were suitable for open conditions.

S4 Reception was clean, well equipped and attempts had been made to create a relaxed environment. However, more could have been done to make new arrivals feel at ease. Some work was made more difficult because of a shortage of female officers. Peer support was good and first night arrangements appropriate. The induction programme was comprehensive.

S5 The prison was calm and safe during the inspection. The units were bright and open and had an informal atmosphere. Generally staff-prisoner relationships were very good, which underpinned safety. In our survey, most prisoners said they felt safe but more prisoners than at the last inspection said they had been victimised by staff and prisoners. The reasons for this needed to be better understood. Few serious assaults took place and most incidents were relatively minor. Anti-social behaviour was dealt with robustly. Drugs and problematic relationships were the main sources of conflicts. Some data on safety was inaccurate and risked presenting a misleading picture. Despite there being procedures in place to support victims, they had not been used for some time. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was well monitored, demotions were considered well and incentives encouraged positive behaviour.

S6 An apparent self-inflicted death had occurred in May 2014 and the full circumstances were being investigated; a mentally ill woman remanded in custody died in segregation. Levels of self-harm had decreased but were still high and a small number of women accounted for a large number of incidents. Few serious or near fatal incidents took place and investigations were completed to establish what lessons could be learned. Initial assessments were reasonable but some reviews only involved wing officers. Care plans could have benefited from the contributions of staff from other disciplines. A good range of counselling services was available. Daily support included some caring interactions from wing staff. The prison had a well supported team of Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide

confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) but they were rarely used in the segregation unit. Some women at risk were held in segregation.

- S7 No formal relationship had been established with the local adult safeguarding board. The transitional care unit held women who were at risk. The wing was calm and provided those who found it difficult to cope in other locations with respite. A range of care plans was in place. There were no specialist facilities for women with a combination of complex needs and challenging behaviour, which might have contributed to the frequent use of segregation.
- S8 Security was proportionate; analysis of security information was appropriate, but not always up to date. We were not assured that strip-searching, including occasions when it was conducted under force, was based on an individual risk assessment and governance was weak. The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was low but testing was not spread evenly throughout the month. The positive suspicion testing rate was too low at 14% and a third of requested tests had not been completed. We were told that illicit medicines were the most frequently misused drugs, which was supported by the positive MDT results and finds.
- S9 Adjudications procedures were well managed and were generally appropriate. We found that de-escalation techniques used in use of force incidents were not routinely recorded and we were not assured that force was appropriate. Special accommodation had not been used for some considerable time. Segregation was respectful and caring, but some women at risk of self-harm were held there without the exceptional circumstances to justify this having been recorded. Documentation appeared correct although the number of women held there was high; the lack of a complex needs unit might have contributed to this. All segregated prisoners had care plans. The regime was appropriate and efforts to reintegrate prisoners into the mainstream prison were good.
- S10 Substance misuse services were generally good. Prescribing was flexible. Dual diagnosis provision remained good. However, the work of the clinical and psychosocial teams was not sufficiently integrated. The prison had a good range of high intensity interventions for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems, but waiting lists for shorter groups were too long and too many women were released without receiving a planned intervention. Most women we spoke to were positive about the care they received.

Respect

S11 *Conditions were good and prisoners were positive about their living arrangements. Staff-prisoner relationships were respectful and staff knowledgeable about the women in their care. The prison focused on diversity and most outcomes were reasonable. Support for mothers and babies and pregnant women was good. Faith provision was well developed. Complaints were generally well managed. Legal services and bail support were inadequate. Health care services were reasonable overall. Food was reasonable and canteen arrangements were appropriate. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S12 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were good against this healthy prison test. We made 37 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 12 of the recommendations had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved, 16 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

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

- S13 Prisoners were positive about most residential arrangements. Living conditions and the overall design of the prison were good. Cells were clean but toilets were not fully screened. The external environment was good. Electronic kiosks, which enabled prisoners to complete certain administrative tasks themselves, encouraged women to take responsibility for many aspects of their own needs.
- S14 Staff-prisoner relationships were very good. Most prisoners said that staff treated them with respect and that they had someone to turn to if they had a problem. Prisoners had regular contact with officers who knew about the women in their care, including issues related to resettlement and their family and health.
- S15 Leadership of diversity was good and consultation arrangements with a variety of protected groups well developed. The diversity and inclusion meeting was productive. Other than race, the treatment of protected groups was not systematically analysed or monitored. Prisoner representatives helped drive diversity issues forward but lacked training and formal meetings. The ratio of female to male staff was far too low, although some action was being taken to address this, it was impacting in some key areas such as reception, use of force and offender management.
- S16 In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners' responses were largely comparable to white prisoners. The prison held a large number of foreign national women. We were told that some had been transferred to the prison involuntarily. Immigration enforcement officers did not have a permanent presence there, but support was otherwise good. Despite the lack of multidisciplinary care plans and women with disabilities being more negative in our survey than others, those with mobility problems told us they felt cared for. Older women were positive about their treatment by staff. Young adults were provided with some very good specific support. Gay and bisexual prisoners were more negative than heterosexual prisoners about key aspects of our survey. Pregnant women told us that they were well cared for. Support for women separated from their children was good. The mother and baby unit was very good. Mothers were never locked in their cells, and they could cook for their children. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the life of the prison and facilities were good as were preparations for Ramadan.
- S17 Complaint forms were freely available and responses were generally good, as was the management of the process. Most prisoners in our survey said it was easy to make a complaint. Legal books and Access to Justice computers, which prisoners could use to progress their cases, were available but the prison did not have a legal services officer or specific bail information services.
- S18 Health provision was variable. Well Woman services were very good but reception and secondary health screenings did not adequately assure us that all health risks were identified. However, women could see a GP shortly after arrival. Prisoners had reasonable access to the nurse triage clinic and GPs, including a female GP. Care for women with long-term conditions was developing. Maternity services were excellent. The purpose of the inpatient unit was unclear and more investment was needed in mental health training for staff. There was no organised therapeutic activity.
- S19 Women said it was difficult to obtain their prescribed medicines. The management of in-possession medication was appropriate. Waiting times for the dentist were short and women received an appropriate range of treatments. The range of mental health services was good but the process for accessing mental health services was not always clear.

- S20 The food was reasonable. Consultation with prisoners regarding food and canteen was good, and action was taken to address concerns. Some prisoners were confused about canteen arrangements on arrival and had to wait too long for their first order. Otherwise arrangements were reasonable.

Purposeful activity

- S21** *Prisoners received a reasonable amount of time out of their cells. Some good progress had been made in developing vocational training opportunities but the focus on education was not sufficient. Data was not being effectively used to drive up standards. There were sufficient activity places, but some prisoners were not purposefully employed. The allocation process now focused more appropriately on needs. Achievements in some key areas such as English and maths were low, and teaching needed to improve. Library services were adequate and the gym was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S22 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

- S23 Time out of cell for the majority of prisoners was good and some received over 10 hours a day. Association and exercise were rarely cancelled or curtailed. Our roll checks revealed 15% of women one morning and 11% one afternoon locked in their cells.
- S24 The prison had implemented a comprehensive strategy to develop prisoners' employability skills and support their resettlement needs. It had made a substantial investment in developing vocational training. However, the prison did not focus sufficiently on improving education so that it met the educational needs of all prisoners. The analysis of data was not sufficient to inform management in driving up standards. The quality of teaching and learning was variable and the observation system was not rigorous enough.
- S25 The prison had increased the number of activity spaces since the previous inspection, and there were almost enough for all prisoners. Too many wing-based workers were not fully employed. The vocational courses offered accreditation at low levels and some areas of work were not accredited. The development of English and maths in the workshops was insufficient. Prisoners did not have access to enough activities that enabled them to explore their creativity through different media. The prison did not offer qualifications that were appropriate for those for whom English was a second language and there was not enough English or maths provision. Pay did not discourage prisoners from attending education. The allocation process had been reviewed to ensure that prisoners were allocated to activities that met their resettlement needs.
- S26 The quality of teaching and learning was too variable and planning was not sufficient. In education, sessions were too long and did not provide enough variety to sustain prisoners' interest. Tutors did not promote equality and diversity. However, some managed mixed ability classes and behaviour well. In vocational training, supportive instructors developed a good rapport with learners.
- S27 Success rates required improvement. The number of prisoners gaining qualifications in English and maths was low. In education those taking information and communications technology and personal and social development courses achieved well in the previous two years, but success rates across many courses had since declined and were not sufficiently

good in the majority of English, English for speakers of other languages and maths courses. They were particularly low for those whose English was at the lowest level. According to the limited data available for vocational training courses, success rates required improvement. Overall, attendance and punctuality were good. However, too many prisoners were being removed from classes to attend appointments.

- S28 The prison had increased the number of hours that prisoners could use the library, but access at the weekend remained limited. The library supported a small number of prisoners who undertook distance learning courses. The loan service was prompt and the Storybook Mums scheme (in which prisoners record stories for their children) was used well.
- S29 Management of physical education was good. Induction was comprehensive and there was a good variety of activities. The range of courses had been expanded and prisoners' achievements were good. Healthy living was well promoted and overweight prisoners were provided with fitness support. No data was available to determine which prisoners used the gym.

Resettlement

S30 *Strategic management of resettlement was good. There were opportunities to develop the use of release on temporary licence (ROTL). Offender management arrangements were good and offender management and resettlement services were integrated. The Link and Outside Links initiatives were excellent and peer workers were well used. Work to support women on release was very good and the prison worked well to help prisoners maintain contact with their families and support those who had been victimised, abused or trafficked. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S31 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 26 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, three had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

- S32 Strategic management was generally good. Offender management and resettlement work was integrated. Peer workers were an integral part of resettlement at the prison, which was valued by prisoners. More use could have been made of ROTL for resettlement purposes.
- S33 Offender supervisors encouraged women to carry out planned activities, including attending offending behaviour programmes. The majority of risk management plans were adequate and all included action to manage prisoners' risks in custody and, where relevant, in the community. Offender assessment system documents and sentence plans were generally good. However, the prison needed to ensure targets were outcome focused and time-bound. Not all home detention curfew decisions were sufficiently prompt.
- S34 Initial public protection screening processes were robust and proportionate and women were informed when any restrictions were implemented. Multi-agency public protection arrangements were well understood and the prison had appropriate systems to identify, track and participate in the management of cases, including attending some external meetings. Allocation arrangements were good. Indeterminate sentence prisoners had good support.

- S35 The Link resettlement service and Outside Links facilities were excellent and provided resettlement support on arrival and through the gate. Prison peer 'connection' workers efficiently helped identify the needs of other prisoners. An immediate needs assessment, undertaken on induction and reviewed before discharge, enabled the resettlement team to address prisoners' needs promptly. There were plans to open a post-release support centre in Peterborough. Prisoners serving less than 12 months had custody plans. The prison's impressive range of partner agencies included many specialising in work with women at risk.
- S36 Staff provided women with some very good support to help them maintain contact with families and children. The prison had a family support worker and women's needs in relation to maintaining family ties were identified soon after their arrival. Primary carers had care plans, some courses were available, and there were excellent additional visiting opportunities. Visiting arrangements were good. The visits hall was pleasant and the atmosphere relaxed. The closed visits area was poor.
- S37 The prison provided women who had been abused, victimised or trafficked with very good support. Wing staff demonstrated a good understanding of the support needs of at risk women, and knew what help was available in the prison. Links with an excellent range of statutory and voluntary sector services meant women who were at risk could receive support when their staff either visited the prison or provided through-the-gate services.
- S38 Links with local accommodation providers were good and protocols for sharing information were being developed with local authorities. Most women were released into accommodation. All women being released were met by a representative from Outside Links, which delivered some impressive work, including support in accessing training, apprenticeships and employment opportunities.
- S39 Services to support women with health and substance misuse issues were generally good. The Money Advice Service and support to open bank accounts and address other debt issues were available, along with daily input from Jobcentre Plus.
- S40 The Thinking Skills Programme was available and family members and personal officers were invited to, and some had attended, post-programme reviews. No victim awareness courses were available, but we saw some examples of offender supervisors working with prisoners on a one-to-one basis.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S41 Concern: Strip-searching took place regularly, sometimes under restraint. In most cases we could find no records justifying the measure or providing management authorisation.
- Recommendation: Women prisoners should only be strip-searched when there is sufficient, up-to-date intelligence suggesting it is necessary, and where no alternative is available. Decisions to conduct strip-searching, particularly under restraint, should be carefully monitored.**
- S42 Concern: Too few female staff worked in the prison; less than a third of staff in contact with prisoners were female. This affected managers' ability in some key areas such as reception, use of force and offender management, to deliver the most positive outcomes possible.
- Recommendation: The proportion of women staff in contact roles with prisoners should be sufficient to ensure the most appropriate outcomes are achieved.**

S43 Concern: The number of activity places was broadly sufficient but the quality was variable. More vocational opportunities needed to be accredited, and wing-based workers better occupied to enhance their personal and employability skills. The range of personal and social skills opportunities, including arts, craft, music and creative media was not sufficient to help women develop their confidence and self-esteem.

Recommendation: The overall quality and range of activity places needs to be improved to ensure women are purposefully occupied and better prepared to avoid re-offending on release.

S44 Concern: There was a lack of clarity about the role of the inpatient unit and the type of therapeutic regime needed for women with the most complex needs. It was on the prisons certified normal accommodation (CAN) which meant that there was pressure to fill all the beds, regardless of whether there was a clinical need to do so. Mental health support was not sufficiently robust to ensure the needs of all the women held on the unit were met.

Recommendation: The inpatient unit should not be part of the prison's CNA, its role and nature as a clinical therapeutic environment should be clearly defined and, clinical and discipline staff should have up-to-date mental health training.

S45 Concern: Achievements in key education areas were not good enough. Success rates in mathematics had declined and achievement rates for learners undertaking entry level English and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) qualifications had also declined in the previous two years and were very low. Insufficient opportunities were offered in vocational areas to develop and embed these skills.

Recommendation: The development of essential skills such as English and mathematics, and English for speakers of other languages needs to be improved.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

I.1 *Women experienced long delays between appearing in court and arriving in prison. Many felt unsafe during transit and arrived at the prison too late. Escort arrangements were not based on individual risk assessments. The video link was underused.*

I.2 In our survey, prisoners felt less safe in vehicles than the comparator, and more than the comparator said they spent too long in them. Women regularly shared vehicles with male prisoners, and some reported verbal abuse. Others complained about the absence of seatbelts and being offered disposable urine bags instead of a comfort break. Many vans visited several destinations, including the adjacent men's prison, before arriving at the women's reception. Prisoners regularly waited 35 minutes to disembark after arriving at the prison, and one woman waited 1 hour and 50 minutes. Some women did not arrive in reception until seven or eight hours after they had appeared in court, suggesting long waiting times in court cells; several women each week arrived after 7pm.

I.3 Risk assessments for escort arrangements were not based on individual prisoners. Women were not told in advance that they were being transferred or escorted, even if they were going to hospital for an intimate examination. Most women who were suitable for open conditions had to wear handcuffs, which was inappropriate (see also section on security). Pregnant women were not routinely cuffed once inside a hospital.

I.4 Despite a local action plan to promote the use of video link to reduce court attendances, the facility was still underused, operating at less than 20% capacity.

Recommendations

I.5 **Women should be transported separately from male prisoners and the time between their last court appearance and their arrival in reception should be substantially reduced.**

I.6 **Except where there are significant security concerns, women should be told the date and time of their hospital appointments in advance.**

I.7 **Women should not routinely be required to wear mechanical restraints during escorts.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.8** *Reception was clean and attempts had been made to create a relaxed environment. Staff were professional, but more could have been done to help women feel at ease. Peer support was good and first night arrangements were appropriate. The induction programme was comprehensive.*
- I.9** Reception was clean and ordered, and efforts had been made to create a relaxed atmosphere in the waiting areas. Attractive notice boards contained appropriate information, including translated material. In our survey, responses about reception were mostly similar to comparator prisons.
- I.10** Reception staff were professional, but not particularly friendly, and more could have been done to help women, particularly those new to custody, feel at ease.
- I.11** Women with information about drug use or drug charges on their person escort record, however long ago or serious, were routinely strip-searched. We were not assured that this was always appropriate and record keeping was poor (see section on security).
- I.12** New arrivals met a trained prisoner peer workers (see section on reintegration planning) and were introduced to a Listener (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) in a comfortable, welcoming room. They received an excellent information booklet and help to register telephone numbers. Other peer workers ensured that new arrivals received refreshments and clothing.
- I.13** A woman officer interviewed all new arrivals in private. She asked questions about dependants, gave them an opportunity to ask questions and provided information about what would happen next.
- I.14** Too few of the reception officers were women and as a result, some first night interviews had to be suspended so that prisoner searches could take place, which extended waiting times in reception.
- I.15** Prisoners received toiletries and basic items, and could purchase a reception pack, but they had to choose between one containing tobacco, phone credit and snacks.
- I.16** Most new arrivals were located on wings E1 or B1, and were routinely observed every hour on their first night. Induction began the following morning when an officer interviewed women in private to identify particular concerns, and demonstrated how to use the electronic kiosk system, which consisted of information pods allowing prisoners to complete a range of tasks. Officers also delivered a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation to small groups of women. Women requiring detoxification did not begin the induction process until they were well enough.
- I.17** Women saw a wide variety of agencies during their induction, including an officer from the mother and baby unit who made referrals to the family support worker if appropriate. Prisoners on induction were locked up for much of the day until they were allocated to

activities, which could take some weeks. This was an unnecessary source of frustration (see section on time out of cell). Women stayed on the first night landings until staff felt they were ready to progress and women reported that the support available was good.

Recommendation

- I.18 Prisoners should be able to purchase both tobacco and phone credit in reception.**

Safe and supportive relationships

Expected outcomes:

Safe and supportive relationships are encouraged. Everyone feels and is safe from victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, violence and assault or threats). Women are protected from victimisation through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime. Any sanctions on behaviour are applied fairly, transparently and consistently.

I.19 *The environment and relationships contributed to safety and most women said they felt safe. Care for those considered potential targets for bullying was generally good but some processes including the investigation and monitoring of antisocial behaviour needed improvement. The prison had a proactive focus on acknowledging positive behaviour.*

- I.20** Two officers, one of them senior, were responsible for the daily operation of safer custody strategies across both the women's and men's prisons but had no administrative support. They were based in the women's prison, which meant they had good access to women prisoners.
- I.21** The prison felt safe; its bright and open environment and an informal community-like atmosphere contributed to this. All new receptions were seen by safer custody staff and told of the help available. The Concern Line, enabling families and visitors to report concerns about prisoners, was well used. A female Listener attended the joint safer custody meeting, which covered both prisons.
- I.22** Generally staff-prisoner relationships were very positive and 86% of women in our survey said that they had a member of staff to turn to if they had a problem. Most prisoners reported feeling safe but more prisoners than at the previous inspection said they had been victimised by other prisoners and by staff. The reasons for this were unclear and the prison's survey to explore perceptions of safety carried out in December 2013 was unhelpful because it did not differentiate between the male and female populations. The prison needed to do more to understand the causes.
- I.23** Monthly violence reduction reports provided comparative data about violent incidents. On average three fights and seven assaults on prisoners or staff were recorded each month. Most incidents were relatively minor often involving the same women. There had been few serious assaults – seven over the past two years. Some key areas, such as stairwells, were not covered by CCTV. There were good links between safer custody officers and the security department.

- I.24** Antisocial behaviour was dealt with through adjudications and the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. Investigations were variable and although behaviour was monitored through antisocial behaviour intervention plans, they were largely superficial and more needed to be done to challenge some women about their behaviour.
- I.25** Drugs and problematic relationships were the main sources of conflict. Mediation was not firmly established as a way to help resolve conflicts.
- I.26** Some data on safety was inaccurate and risked presenting a misleading picture. Despite being told that procedures were in place to support victims, they had not been used for some time.
- I.27** The IEP scheme involved women and was well monitored, and women were positive about it in our survey. Women were issued with positive or negative behaviour slips, which could have been regarded as demeaning. However demotions were well considered and we were impressed with the incentives to encourage positive behaviour. This included some very tangible rewards, such as the opportunity to have a meal with their family or visitors in the prison.

Recommendations

- I.28** **A survey of women's perceptions of safety should be completed and analysed independently of the men's survey.**
- I.29** **The prison should improve the way it investigates, challenges and monitors prisoners' antisocial behaviour as well as increase its use of mediation and support plans for victims.**

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

I.30 *There had been a recent apparently self-inflicted death, which was still being investigated but no formal internal review of the woman's care had been completed. Good reviews of near miss incidents took place. Some assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management processes for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm needed improvement but the care provided was generally good.*

- I.31** The prison had experienced an apparent self-inflicted death in May 2014. The full circumstances were being investigated by the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO), but involved a mentally ill woman remanded in custody on a minor charge who died in segregation. A debrief took place following the death and immediate action was taken to reduce risks for other prisoners, but there had been no formal internal investigation into the decisions made regarding the woman's care. Action was taken to address PPO recommendations on restraints following a death from natural causes in October 2012.

- I.32** The number of self-harm incidences had decreased but was still high – on average 8% of the population self-harmed each month. A small number of women accounted for a large number of incidents. We saw examples of data being used to consider how practices could be improved. Few serious or near fatal incidents took place; however they had led to investigations from which lessons could be learned. The prison made little use of either the observation cell or strip-clothing – strip-clothing had been used once in the previous 18 months.
- I.33** ACCT initial assessments were reasonable, but some subsequent reviews involved only wing officers and did not always consider the initial concerns identified during the assessment. Care plans could have benefited from contributions from staff from other disciplines when they considered how best to support the prisoner; however, multidisciplinary input was better for those held in the health care centre. A good range of counselling services was available, but there was little evidence of them being considered when care plans were formulated.
- I.34** Daily support included some caring interactions from wing staff, but there was little evidence that, where appropriate, families were contacted to consider the support they could offer. Activity packs to help distract women from thoughts of self-harm were used frequently.
- I.35** New receptions were monitored hourly on their first night. Most prisoners had access to a well supported team of Listeners, including at reception, but the number of Listeners had been low and use of the scheme at night had been suspended for three weeks from 20 May to 9 June 2014. Listeners were rarely used in the segregation unit.

Recommendation

- I.36** **Following a death in custody the prison should conduct a formal internal review to consider what, if any, immediate lessons should be learned.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk) and women with complex needs

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.³

- I.37** *No formal relationship had been established with the local safeguarding adults board. Unit C1, the transitional care unit, provided some good care for at risk women but the needs of women with very complex behavioural issues were not met.*

- I.38** The prison had no formal relationship with the local authority adult safeguarding board, no safeguarding policy to consider how referrals could be made and no agreed protocols to safeguard adults at risk. The undated local managing complex and additional needs policy

³ We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

outlined staff's responsibilities, how concerns should be raised and the role of the transitional care unit C1.

- I.39** Unit C1 was used to care for at risk women, many of whom had previously been held in the health care centre and needed some support before moving to other wings. The unit was calm and provided those having difficulties coping in other locations with respite. Some staff working in the unit had received training from a prison clinical psychologist. A range of care plans was in place.
- I.40** Women needing support were discussed at monthly safer custody meetings, where members provided a strategic oversight of cases and agreed what help and support were required.
- I.41** The unit did not provide specialist facilities for women with a combination of complex needs and challenging behaviour, which might have contributed to the frequent use of segregation.
- I.42** The foreign nationals officer and the lead staff member for women who had been abused and victimised, provided women who had been trafficked with good support, including referral to the national referral mechanism (a process set up by the government to identify and support victims of trafficking in the UK).

Recommendations

- I.43** **The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes.**
- I.44** **Specialist facilities to manage women with both complex needs and challenging behaviour should be developed.**

Security

Expected outcomes:

Physical and procedural security measures are specific to the risks in a women's prison. Security and good order are underpinned by effective security intelligence and positive staff-prisoner relationships. Women are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

I.45 *Most security arrangements were proportionate, but some were excessively risk averse and strip-searching needed better governance. Security information was generally well managed, but there were some delays. The drug supply strategy was robust, but mandatory drug testing (MDT) procedures were not effective enough. Closed visits arrangements were punitive.*

- I.46** The overall approach to security was proportionate, but with some significant caveats. Prisoners moved around the site freely at specific times, staffing levels were not excessive, and restrictions on activities were reasonable. However, some processes were too risk averse, suggesting an insufficient understanding of the typical risk profile of women prisoners.
- I.47** Strip-searching took place regularly in reception, in segregation, for visits and during the use of force, but in most cases we found no records justifying the measure or outlining management authorisation (see main recommendation S41). Security arrangements for

escorts lacked proportionality and women judged suitable for open conditions had the same regime and privileges as those requiring closed conditions, undermining the principle that prisoners should be kept in the lowest security conditions consistent with the risk they presented.

- I.48** Four prisoners were appropriately subject to closed visits. Restrictions were reviewed monthly, but in practice, closed visits were imposed for a minimum period of three months, or six months if an item had been intercepted during visits. Women on closed visits were also banned from having property handed or sent in and their visits were limited to one hour, which was unnecessarily punitive.
- I.49** Security information was circulated around the prison promptly, but collation and analysis were often delayed, which could have had an impact on the effectiveness of target searches and suspicion drug tests. The analysis of patterns and trends was good and revealed that drugs, medication, threats and bullying were the biggest areas of concern. Target-setting at the well attended monthly tactical tasking group was appropriate.
- I.50** The prison had a detailed drug supply reduction plan. The positive random MDT rate for the six months to April 2014 was low at 3.7%. However, this might not have accurately reflected actual drug use because testing was not spread evenly throughout the month. The positive suspicion testing rate for the same period was too low at 14% and a third of requested tests had not been completed. Finds, MDT results and reports from staff and prisoners indicated medicines were the most frequently misused drugs. MDT testing facilities were good.

Recommendations

- I.51 Women considered suitable for open conditions should have access to a less restrictive regime.**
- I.52 The MDT programme should be adequately resourced so that the required level of testing can be undertaken without any gaps in provision.**

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

Disciplinary procedures are applied fairly and for good reason. Women understand why they are being disciplined and can appeal against any sanctions imposed on them.

- I.53** *Adjudications were well managed and appropriate. Force was used frequently and not always proportionately or as a last resort. Segregation was respectful and caring but the rate of segregation was very high and some women on open ACCT case management documents had been held there without justification.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.54** In our adjudications sample, prisoners could present their case and the gender balance of staff present was appropriate. Adjudicators could grant prisoners free telephone calls to legal advisers from the segregation unit, and were generous with remand time for legal letters. Paperwork was mostly correct, but we noted that some behaviour reports from wing officers were too subjective.

- I.55** The waiting room contained information about the adjudications process in a number of languages and the adjudication room was appropriate and equipped with a dual handset telephone for use with official interpreters.
- I.56** A range of data about the adjudication process was carefully considered at well attended quarterly adjudication standards meetings. Potential problems were identified and action taken. A review of punishment guidelines had taken place in the previous six months, and punishments more closely reflected the most problematic behaviour. Adjudications were monitored for adverse outcomes by ethnicity, but not for other protected groups. A number of adjudications were reviewed monthly by the controller and a peer review took place; lessons learned were shared at meetings.

The use of force

- I.57** The number of incidents involving force was high – 77 in the previous six months. Control and restraint (C&R) techniques had been used on 54 occasions. A sufficient number of staff had received training to use C&R.
- I.58** Factual reports of incidents were detailed, but the reasons for use of force, authorisation and any de-escalation techniques used, were not routinely recorded. Around one third of incidents involved planned C&R, but not all were recorded on video. In our sample, physical restraint techniques appeared appropriate, and nurses were present. However, too little verbal interaction between prisoners and staff took place and some supervising managers were abrupt and lacked patience. In some cases, we judged that force had not been used proportionately or as a last resort. A female C&R instructor had been appointed in the previous six months, which had improved the gender balance of teams, but they were often still skewed towards male staff. Special accommodation had not been used for some considerable time.
- I.59** The use of force committee now met regularly and was more productive than at our previous inspection, but a more rigorous analysis of incidents, including a review of video evidence, was still required to identify themes and concerns. Some data was inaccurate.

Recommendations

- I.60** **Force should only be used as a last resort and should be clearly authorised.**
- I.61** **All planned incidents should be recorded on video.**
- I.62** **Verbal de-escalation techniques should be used continuously throughout restraint processes.**

Segregation

- I.63** The segregation unit was clean and well presented and the atmosphere calm and ordered. Apart from a bench, the two small exercise yards were bare. Prisoners received clear information about the regime and spoke positively about the selected staff group, which had an appropriate gender balance.
- I.64** The rate of segregation was high; 105 different women had been held there in the previous six months. Although the segregation monitoring and review group met quarterly to consider a wide range of data, the analysis was not sufficient to explain this figure, which

required further investigation. We suspected that, at least in part, the high usage was explained by the absence of an alternative for women with complex needs and challenging behaviour (see section on safeguarding). Between January and March 2014, seven women had been held in the segregation unit on open ACCT case management documents, but in none of these cases did documents contain an explanation of any exceptional circumstances to justify this.

- I.65** Prisoners understood why they had been segregated and routine authorisation documentation was correct. All segregated prisoners had an individual care plan and many experienced some elements of a normal regime, even when serving a period of cellular confinement; for example attending communal worship and gym courses. Segregation reviews took place on time and reintegration planning was good.

Recommendations

- I.66** **The rate of segregation should be carefully analysed to ensure that segregation is not being used unnecessarily and that minority groups are not being disadvantaged.**
- I.67** **Women on an open ACCT case management document should only be held in segregation in exceptional circumstances, which should be documented and agreed by a senior manager, as part of a care-planned approach.**

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

Women with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.

I.68 *Overall substance misuse services were good although the recovery strategy needed to be reviewed. Clinical support remained good and women were positive about support they received, but integration between the clinical and psychosocial teams continued to be poor. The range of psychosocial support available was good but waiting lists for short groups were still too long and one-to-one sessions were limited.*

- I.69** Strategic substance misuse meetings had restarted in May 2014 after an eight month gap. The recovery strategy still did not consider women's specific needs, the needs assessment was out of date and there was still no robust action plan.
- I.70** Women with drug or alcohol dependence issues were located in the stabilisation unit (B1) and saw a GP in reception and again the following morning to ensure their prescribing was appropriate. Monitoring and support in B1 was good, but night time observations were not recorded on SystemOne, the electronic clinical information system. Administration of opiate substitution therapy (OST) was safe, but lacked privacy.
- I.71** During the inspection 18 (18%) of the 99 women on OST were on reducing doses, which was reasonable. Prisoners who developed an addiction in prison could receive substitution prescribing. Prescribing was flexible and prisoners were involved in treatment decisions.

- I.72** Dual diagnosis support for women with substance misuse and mental health issues remained very good. Waiting lists for smoking cessation were too long, but the provision was being extended.
- I.73** The GP, nurses and the psychosocial team completed separate treatment reviews with prisoners and reviews consequently lacked a cohesive recovery focus. This lack of integration was exacerbated by the teams being located far away from one another and having separate records. The small enthusiastic psychosocial team included specialist staff to deal with alcohol problems.
- I.74** The team supported 144 women. All new prisoners with substance misuse issues were assessed promptly. High prisoner turnover and limited resources had generated a harm reduction and discharge planning focus. Available support included one short awareness session a week, in-cell packs and Tackling Drugs Through Physical Education, Control of Violence for Angry and Impulsive Drinkers and Building Skills for Recovery courses. Waiting lists for the awareness sessions were too long and staff lacked the capacity to provide intensive one-to-one sessions.
- I.75** Prisoners were positive about the support the team offered and in our survey more than the comparator and compared with the previous inspection said the support was helpful.
- I.76** Support also included recovery peer supporters and a fortnightly Alcoholics Anonymous group. Take-up of compact-based drug testing was good and the facilities were satisfactory. However, the same table was used for completing paperwork and testing.

Recommendations

- I.77** **The recovery strategy should be updated annually to include specific women's issues and a detailed action plan with up-to-date performance measures informed by an annual needs analysis.**
- I.78** **Prisoners with substance-related problems should receive accessible, consistent and well-coordinated care from an integrated substance misuse service.**

Housekeeping points

- I.79** Night time observations on the stabilisation unit should be recorded on SystemOne.
- I.80** The facilities for administering opiate substitution therapy should be private.
- I.81** The compact-based drug testing facilities should have separate surfaces for testing and completing paperwork.

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *Living conditions were good. Cells were clean but some fixtures and fittings needed replacing. The external environment was very good. Prisoners were positive about most residential arrangements. Unit electronic kiosks encouraged personal responsibility.*
- 2.2** Prisoners were positive about most residential arrangements; residential units were well designed and very clean and could be supervised easily. Cells were well equipped and a good size but some cells designed for one were shared. All had privacy locks and prisoners could keep them clean. Some cells had no curtains, and only a few women in double cells had a lockable cabinet. Bedding was changed every week, and was in good condition, as were most mattresses.
- 2.3** Toilets were not fully screened, but all had a lid and officers routinely knocked on cell doors and obtained a response before opening the cell observation panel. Showers and baths were clean and well presented. Privacy was good – there were individual cubicles and 98% of women said they could shower every day. The external environment was also very good.
- 2.4** Unconvicted women were no longer required to share with convicted women. Telephones were not private but easily accessed. Electronic kiosks, consisting of information pods, allowed prisoners to complete some administrative tasks themselves, encouraging them to be independent. In our survey, prisoners were more positive about application processes than in comparator prisons and compared with our previous inspection.
- 2.5** New arrivals received sufficient clothing; underwear was new and a full range of bra sizes was available. Most clothing had been donated, but there was also some prison issue clothing. Newly convicted women were issued with a log number, which they could use to have their own clothes handed or sent in. Remand prisoners could use this facility repeatedly. Some pregnant women told us that they struggled to get clothing to fit them. Prisoners could also visit reception to obtain some of their stored property. Women could have their clothes washed at least weekly in wing laundries, more often depending on the specific needs of individual women.
- 2.6** Living conditions in the mother and baby unit were excellent (see section on equality and diversity).

Recommendations

- 2.7** **Women in shared cells should each have a lockable cabinet.**
- 2.8** **Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared.** (Repeated recommendation 2.7)

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Women are treated with respect by staff throughout the duration of their time in custody, and are encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions and decisions.

2.9 *Staff-prisoner relationships were very good. Prisoners felt that staff treated them respectfully and would listen to them if they had a problem.*

2.10 Staff-prisoner relationships were very good. Most prisoners in our survey (88%) said that staff treated them with respect and 86% said that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help if they had a problem. Some women in groups commented on there being fewer female officers than male officers; this was acknowledged by prison managers and there were plans to address this (see also sections on early days in custody, discipline, equality and diversity).

2.11 Monthly meetings between managers and prisoner representatives allowed women to raise a range of issues about prison life; outcomes were displayed in units. Senior managers, who led by example, were based in the units. Written records and our observations confirmed that prisoners had regular contact with officers who knew about the women in their care, including issues relating to resettlement and their family and health. Managers made quality checks of case notes.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic⁴ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation, age and being pregnant and giving birth.

2.12 *The strategic management of equality and consultation with protected groups was good. Only the treatment of black and minority ethnic prisoners was monitored and the identification of protected groups was poor. There were insufficient female officers. Black and minority ethnic prisoners were negative about some aspects of our survey, but we did not find evidence of direct discrimination. Some foreign national women had been transferred to the prison involuntarily. Provision for Gypsy, Romany and Traveller groups and older and young adults was good. Prisoners with a disability and gay and bisexual women were less satisfied with their treatment compared to other groups. Support for pregnant women and mothers with babies was very good.*

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

Strategic management

- 2.13** The strategic management of equality and diversity was good. The diversity and inclusion action team (DIAT) led by the director met every month. Meetings were productive and were attended by prisoner equality representatives.
- 2.14** The prison's decency manager and two foreign national managers oversaw the day-to-day management of diversity issues. A comprehensive and up-to-date policy covered all protected groups and was complemented by a relevant action plan. Forums for protected groups, led by prisoner representatives, were held regularly.
- 2.15** A range of reasonably good equality impact assessments had been conducted. Actions arising as a result of the assessments and the forums fed into the action plan, which was discussed at the DIAT meetings. The treatment of protected groups and their access to the prison regime was not monitored, except in the case of black and minority ethnic prisoners.
- 2.16** Diversity prisoner representatives were positive about their role and support from managers but did not meet regularly as a group. Not all representatives had received training or had job descriptions. Representatives confirmed that managers were committed to equal outcomes but they were frustrated at the slow pace of change.
- 2.17** Mechanisms for identifying members of protected groups were weak. Health care identified prisoners with a disability and reception staff identified pregnant women and primary carers. However, prisoners had no opportunity to declare in confidence if they were from a protected group.
- 2.18** In the six months before our inspection, prisoners reported 24 discrimination incidents. The quality of investigations was reasonably good and relevant parties were interviewed. Replies were prompt and polite but some lacked detail. The decency manager investigated the incidents and replies were signed off by the director; 10% were quality assured by the Sodexo Justice Services operations director.
- 2.19** Protected groups did not receive support from voluntary organisations based outside the prison. Too few female officers worked in the prison; less than a third of staff in contact with prisoners were female, and although the prison was taking steps to address this, it was affecting some outcomes (see main recommendation S42 and, sections on early days in custody and use of force).

Recommendations

- 2.20** **Equality monitoring should extend beyond race to ensure equality of treatment.**
(Repeated recommendation 4.5)
- 2.21** **Details of external support networks and how protected groups can contact them should be widely available.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.22** Prisoners should complete a confidential diversity questionnaire to determine their needs.

Protected characteristics

- 2.23** Seventeen per cent of prisoners were from black and minority ethnic groups. In our survey, their responses were largely comparable to white prisoners except in relation to reception, food, the shop and access to Listeners. We found no evidence of unfair treatment.
- 2.24** The prison only identified 10 Gypsy, Romany or Traveller prisoners compared to 10% in our survey sample. Despite potentially under-identifying this group, provision was good. Events were held twice a year to mark Traveller culture. One Traveller acted as a diversity representative and chaired a Traveller forum; one Listener was also a Traveller.
- 2.25** Fifty-one foreign national women were held in the prison, including a detainee held beyond the end of her custodial sentence. Plans were underway to establish Peterborough as an immigration enforcement hub for foreign national women. National Offender Management Service (NOMS) guidance stated that only those who wished to go to HMP and YOI Peterborough would be transferred and that there would be no forced transfers. However, we met several women who said they were not given a choice about being transferred. Immigration enforcement officers did not have a permanent presence in the prison. Instead officers from a local immigration team and the Home Office's criminal casework directorate attended the prison.
- 2.26** Most foreign nationals were held on a single wing in the prison. Two foreign national managers offered them good support and were very familiar with prisoners' immigration cases. Both managers had been seconded to work with immigration staff at an immigration removal centre (IRC) and were well versed in immigration processes. Voluntary organisation Hibiscus helped women to instruct legal representatives and resettle in their country of origin; it also supported victims of trafficking.
- 2.27** Telephone interpretation was used to communicate with those who could not speak English. We spoke to the immigration detainee through a telephone interpreter who confirmed that she felt safe but felt her health needs were not being met. The regime under which she was held had not changed since she became a detainee and it was unclear why she was held in prison rather than an IRC.
- 2.28** The prison identified 89 women with disabilities; we felt this underestimated the number as 33% in our survey sample reported having a disability. Women with disabilities were more negative than others about some safety issues. Emergency evacuation plans were held in wing offices but there were no multidisciplinary care plans. Reasonable adjustments had been made for some women; for example two prisoners with mobility problems had paid carers and said they were well cared for by staff.
- 2.29** Sixty-one women were aged 50 or older; the oldest was 76. Older prisoners' responses to our survey were comparable or better than those under 50. All the older women in our survey said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem; none said that they currently felt unsafe. Older women could attend regular consultation forums, arts and crafts and library sessions.
- 2.30** There were 25 young adults and one wing was dedicated to women under the age of 25. Those we spoke to were positive about the support they received from staff on the wing. Six young women were working towards a Duke of Edinburgh award, and some were released on temporary licence to work in the community. Young women could participate in a project involving visits to schools in Peterborough to talk about their experiences in prison. Three young offender days had been held and, overall, provision for this group was good.

- 2.31** In our survey 96 women identified themselves as gay or bisexual; the prison only identified 24. Although P-Nomis (the Prison Service IT system) recorded prisoners' sexual orientation this detail was missing for 99 women. Gay or bisexual women were more negative than others about some aspects of safety and respect. There were no outside support services for this group.
- 2.32** The decency policy listed prohibited behaviours such as kissing. Prisoners complained that the policy was inconsistently applied. Gay and bisexual women were generally positive about how they were treated but complained about not knowing where the boundaries around behaviour lay. They were frustrated that they couldn't show any affection for their partners. One woman told us, 'We can be gay but not act on it.' Women in a lasting relationship could apply to be held on the same wing but not in the same cell.
- 2.33** The five pregnant women told us that staff were caring and supportive and most were located on one unit where there were high levels of informal support.
- 2.34** All women were seen during induction by a mother and baby unit (MBU) officer, and received help to apply for a place if appropriate. Pregnant women received good care from the midwifery team at the local hospital, which also provided specialist support for women who experienced a miscarriage or still birth, or who chose to terminate their pregnancy.
- 2.35** All pregnant women had care plans and the names of pregnant prisoners were effectively communicated around the prison. Where appropriate, care plans contained arrangements for the separation of mother and child, including emotional support. Delivery plans often involved a birthing partner, but co-parents or supporters were rarely able to attend ante-natal appointments because the dates and times were not disclosed to prisoners in advance. Most pregnant women were offered a place in CI.
- 2.36** Eight applications for the mother and baby unit (MBU) were being considered. The prison reported that some social services departments took too long to process applications. The admissions board had an independent chair and focused on the best interests of the child. There had been seven boards in the six months to the end of May 2014, and all applications had been successful.
- 2.37** The MBU was excellent – it was spacious and well equipped. The unit was only 50% occupied. Mothers were not locked in their cells at any time and the prison provided fresh ingredients so that women could cook for their children. Staff wore polo shirts instead of the usual shirt and tie.
- 2.38** MBU officers received specialist training including in paediatric first aid. Women appreciated the child care available, which included babies going on community visits. Mothers could have visits in the MBU so that visitors could interact with the child in its usual environment.
- 2.39** Lone male officers were often in charge of the unit at night. The women we met were not concerned about this, but it was inappropriate, especially when the officer was not a dedicated MBU officer and had not received any specific training.

Recommendation

- 2.40 Lone male officers should not be left on the MBU at night.**

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

All women are able to practise their religion fully and in safety. The chaplaincy plays a full part in prison life and contributes to women's overall care, support and resettlement.

2.41 *Faith provision was good despite the temporary lack of some chaplains. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the life of the prison and links with outside faith groups were well developed. In our survey prisoners were positive about faith provision. Preparations for Ramadan were good.*

2.42 Faith provision was good for most prisoners. The chaplaincy, led by a managing chaplain, comprised the equivalent of 5.2 full-time staff. Buddhist, Jewish, Hindu and Mormon chaplains were not in post during our inspection but were to start shortly.

2.43 Two multi-faith spaces – a large chapel and a smaller multi-faith room – were well maintained and suitable. There were appropriate washing facilities.

2.44 The team was well integrated into the life of the prison and attended a wide range of meetings across departments. A member of the team visited the segregation unit and health care department every day and, when invited, attended assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case reviews for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm. Outside speakers, ministers from various denominations, official prison visitors and approximately 35 volunteers from local faith communities attended the prison.

2.45 Women with babies attended communal services and the Muslim chaplain confirmed that preparations for Ramadan were good. In our survey women were more positive about faith provision than at comparator prisons.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

2.46 *Complaints procedures were generally effective and most replies helpful.*

2.47 Complaints boxes and regularly replenished complaint forms were accessible on all wings. Complaints were processed efficiently and most were allocated to senior managers, although we saw one complaint alleging staff bullying that inappropriately received a response from a wing officer. Response times were monitored and most replies were prompt, polite and addressed the issue raised, but some did not. In our survey most prisoners said it was easy to make a complaint. Most complaints related to residential units and health care. Complaints data were analysed well and quality assurance processes were in place.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Women are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or remand, both on arrival and release. Women are supported by the prison staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

2.48 *Some aspects of the prison's legal and bail services were inadequate.*

2.49 There were good legal visits facilities and legal visitors were satisfied with the arrangements, although some visitors and prisoners had previously complained about delays. The video link facility was underused. There was no longer a bail or legal services officer. Prisoners had good access to legal books in the library, and Access to Justice computers, which prisoners could use to further their cases, were available. Some literature was available but in our survey fewer prisoners than the comparator reported that it was easy to get bail information (54% compared with 61%).

Recommendation

2.50 **The legal services provided should meet the needs of the population.**

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.51 *Governance arrangements were generally good but health screening was weak. Access to the nurse and GP was prompt and effective. Long-term conditions were not managed systematically. There were long waiting times for the optician and chiropodist. The prison was unclear about the role of the inpatient unit, which needed to better focus on women with severe mental health needs. There were delays in getting women their medication. Dental waiting lists were short. Mental health services were generally good.*

Governance arrangements

2.52 Health services were provided by Sodexo Justice Services and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust. A Cambridgeshire partnership board met quarterly and included representation from both the director and the head of health care.

2.53 A health needs assessment dated April 2014 had identified key areas requiring attention. They included: long-term health conditions; take-up of hepatitis B vaccinations; sexual health screening; and access to primary mental health services.

- 2.54** The primary health care organisational structure had recently changed so it was too early to see the impact on service delivery. Staff vacancies were being adequately covered.
- 2.55** Clinical incidents – a total of 78 during 2013 – were reported appropriately. Because data were aggregated for the whole prison (male and female) it was difficult to identify themes specific to the women’s prison; however, data showed an upward trend in incidents relating to medication, both in supply and administration.
- 2.56** There was an appropriate governance meeting structure with good representation from different health providers. Health care staff were reasonably well represented at wider prison meetings.
- 2.57** Nursing staff received regular clinical supervision and essential training needs were identified and scheduled; a monthly shutdown facilitated joint nursing training. Nurses routinely attended use of force incidents, but it was not clear whether they all understood their safeguarding role during the incidents.
- 2.58** Women could complain using the main prison system. Responses from health care staff were prompt but some failed to provide adequate explanations or offer appropriate apologies. A service user forum enabled women to contribute to improving health care but follow-on actions were not clearly identified.
- 2.59** Electronic clinical information system SystmOne and paper clinical records were used; the electronic records were the main system for recording but some documents were only filed on the paper record, which meant there were gaps.
- 2.60** Care planning, including outreach plans, was not robust enough to support women with complex needs. The prison had an older women’s clinic for the over 50s but no designated lead staff member and women with disabilities were under-identified (see section on equality and diversity).
- 2.61** Sexual health in-reach services had been withdrawn; women now had to go to the local hospital. Health care staff had no formal training in working with women involved in sex work. Blood borne virus screening and immunisation were underdeveloped. The visiting Well Woman service provided excellent community-equivalent screening and advice; mammography was not routinely offered, despite there being 88 women over the age of 50.
- 2.62** Health promotion was limited, but health staff were represented at the prison health promotion action group. Plans to introduce health trainers were being developed. Women waited too long for access to smoking cessation clinics.
- 2.63** Emergency arrangements were reasonable and the prison had a suitable prison protocol for health and custodial staff. Resuscitation kits were kept in several locations, but checklists were not all up to date. Approximately one third of prison staff had been trained in resuscitation skills in the previous year.

Recommendations

- 2.64 Women should be able to make a confidential complaint directly to health providers, including verbal complaints.**
- 2.65 One clinical electronic record should reflect all care women receive without routine duplication or separate use of a paper record.**

- 2.66 The care needs of older women and those with disabilities should be identified and shared care plans developed to inform care on the wings, alongside clinical care; they should include access to community physiotherapy and occupational therapy services.**

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.67** In our survey more women said it was easy to see the doctor than at comparator prisons. More women were positive about the overall quality of services than at the previous inspection (47% compared with 35%).
- 2.68** A health care support worker screened women on arrival for immediate risks and needs; women identified to have specific issues, such as substance misuse problems or requiring prescribed medicines were seen by a GP. Secondary health assessments were not always completed or were delayed for several days.
- 2.69** The nurse triage system provided women with reasonable access to a nurse. Women could see a GP within two days for routine appointments and on the same day for urgent issues. They could ask to see the female GP, but several staff and prisoners we spoke to were not aware that a female GP was available.
- 2.70** Some early work was being done to identify and follow-up women with long-term conditions but the number of women affected and their needs had not been identified. Nurse triage appointments combined with following-up women with long-term conditions did not always lead to prisoners' continuing health needs being met promptly or systematically.
- 2.71** The range of primary care services was suitable overall but women waited too long for the optician and chiropody appointments; these services were being re-tendered.
- 2.72** Maternity care was excellent and women could see a community midwife every week or when needed. Links with the local maternity unit meant that women felt supported during their pregnancy. There were plans to provide women with access to a 'Doula' (lay birth attendant) service.
- 2.73** The inpatient unit remained part of the prison's certified normal accommodation (CNA) and some admissions were not for clinical reasons. Ten of the 15 beds were occupied during the inspection. The majority of women had mental health needs, but a few women were there due to a risk of serious self-harm. The role of the unit was unclear and mental health support was not sufficiently robust to ensure women with complex and acute needs were cared for appropriately. Clinical and custodial staff had not all received formal mental health training, there was no formal organised therapeutic activity and time out of cell was limited.
- 2.74** Women arriving with existing health care appointments were not being routinely followed-up. External hospital appointments were well managed with some excellent joint work with the local hospital to ensure women had appropriate access to secondary care.

Recommendation

- 2.75 Health screening on arrival and in the first 72 hours for all women should clearly identify risks and ensure appropriate follow-up of identified needs, including the management of women with long-term conditions.**

Good practice

- 2.76** *Collaborative working between the prison and the local hospital ensured women had prompt access to secondary health care.*

Pharmacy

- 2.77** Medication was dispensed by an external pharmacy and distributed via the pharmacy room. The pharmacist spent 16 hours a week in the prison and ran a medication clinic.
- 2.78** Medicines were issued from the pharmacy or the two wing treatment rooms. They were supplied to patients, either in-possession as named patient medication or supervised from stock. Several named patient medicines had been returned to the stock. A number of women reported delays in getting their prescribed medications.
- 2.79** Medicines were not stored in the treatment rooms but were transported through the prison in lockable trolleys. The trolleys were overfull and it was difficult for the nurse to manage administration safely.
- 2.80** Risk assessments determined whether women could have their medicine in possession. The outcome was recorded on SystmOne and coloured stamps were used to show the in-possession status on the paper chart. Charts were available to the doctor at the time of prescribing. The in-possession process was safely managed.
- 2.81** Patient group directions (PGDs), which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine, covered medicines such as antibiotics, thrush treatments and nicotine patches; however, there was no 'over the counter' policy to provide treatment such as simple pain relief without a prescription. Women could buy ibuprofen from the canteen list; single doses of paracetamol could be given under the authority of a PGD but the authorising document was not always present in the treatment rooms and nurses were unfamiliar with what they could offer. Women with sleeping difficulties could not be given the first line treatment of lavender oil without a prescription as outlined in the prison formulary (medications used to inform prescribing).
- 2.82** A regular medicines management meeting took place, which had appropriate representation, including from prescribers.

Recommendations

- 2.83** **Women should be able to access all of their prescribed medicines in a timely way.**
- 2.84** **The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named-patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock only if unavoidable.** (Repeated recommendation 5.36)

Housekeeping point

- 2.85** Nurses should consistently be able to provide a range of simple pain relief and treatment for minor ailments including paracetamol.

Dentistry

- 2.86** Access to the dentist was very prompt and most women could get a routine appointment within a few days. The longest waiting time during our visit was four days. Urgent treatment was provided and women said that they found the care good. The dentist recorded consultations on SystmOne.
- 2.87** The dental suite was suitably equipped and looked clean, but records did not indicate when it had last been cleaned; the room was sometimes used for other clinics. No infection control audit had been completed in the last year.
- 2.88** Clean and contaminated equipment were located separately; however this did not comply with national guidance. Equipment was appropriate, tested and serviced and complied with local rules, and a national risk assessment for X-ray equipment was up to date.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.89** A stepped care model offered an appropriate range of services from self-help through to complex interventions for serious and enduring problems.
- 2.90** A newly appointed team leader led a multi-professional team, including community psychiatric nurses (CPNs), a substance misuse practitioner, and regular input from two psychologists including the clinical lead psychologist. A locum psychiatrist provided medical input and a consultant psychiatrist appointment had been made. The team's total caseload was 47; 19 women were involved in the care programme approach (CPA) (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness).
- 2.91** Access to the service was initiated through reception screening supplemented by a continuing alert referral system triggered by custodial or generic health care staff. Allocations were reviewed on a daily basis and women assigned a nominated case worker. The mental health team met regularly with primary health and substance use staff. However, women did not always receive care that reflected effective collaborative working between primary and mental health services.
- 2.92** Most women referred to the service were seen within 48 hours and urgent referrals were seen on the same day. Longstanding difficulties in identifying prisoners with potential mental health problems at initial screening remained a risk and the process for accessing mental health services was not always clear, which occasionally led to delays in women receiving specialist advice and treatment.
- 2.93** Record keeping on SystmOne was consistently of a high standard. CPA documents and risk assessments were completed robustly and information was appropriately shared with relevant stakeholders. We observed a number of examples of effective clinical interventions and sound input into ACCT processes.
- 2.94** The team also provided routine input into the inpatient and segregation units (see section on delivery of care (physical health)).
- 2.95** In the previous 12 months, 17 women had been assessed and transferred to hospital under the Mental Health Act and in the previous six months, no transfers had been delayed for longer than three weeks following the assessment outcome. Approximately a quarter of all prison staff had received up-to-date mental health training.

Recommendation

- 2.96 Collaborative working between the mental health team and the primary care provider should be prioritised and input into the inpatient unit strengthened.**

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.97** *The food was reasonable. Consultation with prisoners was good and clear action taken to address concerns.*

- 2.98** In our survey 31% of women said the food was good or very good against a comparator of 26%. The food we sampled was reasonable, and menus were varied. The kitchen was clean and well equipped and wing serveries were clean and suitable. Women selected meals in advance using the kiosk system, and for most of the week lunch and dinner consisted of hot meals. Baguettes were provided for lunch twice a week and in the evenings at weekends. Fruit and salad was provided every day, as were vegan and halal options. Meal times were reasonable, and women ate communally on the wings. Women could fill flasks with hot water before being locked up in the evening, and those on the enhanced level wing had kettles.

- 2.99** Food was cooked on the male side of the prison so women could not get involved in preparing it but they did work in the serveries. Regular food surveys were undertaken, and there were monthly catering consultative meetings, both of which generated action points, which the catering manager promptly addressed.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.100** *Some newly arrived women had to wait too long to receive their first order. Otherwise arrangements were reasonable. Black and minority ethnic women were less satisfied with the range of products, which required further investigation. Consultation was good.*

- 2.101** Women ordered products through the electronic kiosk system. However, some were confused about canteen arrangements on arrival; they could place orders immediately but had to fill out a new reception canteen form instead of using the kiosks. Some prisoners were not aware of this, which meant they had to wait too long for their first order. Otherwise arrangements were reasonable. Purchases could be made every day and were delivered once a week. In addition, women could submit monthly catalogue orders.

2.102 In our survey 48% of women said the shop sold a sufficiently wide range of products to meet their needs. However, only 25% of black and minority ethnic prisoners said the same, which required further investigation. The list of items available from a range of wholesalers was broad. Prices were reasonable and were reviewed every six months. There was no administration charge for orders from catalogues which was better than we normally see. Prisoners were consulted regularly at monthly wing meetings, and minutes showed that action points had been addressed promptly.

Housekeeping point

2.103 Canteen ordering arrangements should be explained in detail to newly arrived prisoners.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

Women are able, and expected, to engage in activity⁵ that is likely to benefit them.

3.1 *Time out of cell for most women was good. We found approximately 13% of women locked in their cells during our roll checks. Daily exercise opportunities were too short.*

3.2 Most women could spend a good amount of time out of their cells each day – over 10 hours during the week. A daily routine was published; it was usually adhered to and association and exercise were rarely curtailed.

3.3 Our random roll checks found 15% of women locked in their cells on one morning and 11% on one afternoon, which was better than at our previous inspection. However, more women could have been unlocked.

3.4 The daily routine allowed only 30 minutes' daily exercise after breakfast. In summer, women from four of the 10 wings received an additional 30 minutes' daily exercise. Exercise yards were very clean and attractive, with benches and flowerbeds. Evening association was well supervised and the atmosphere calm.

Recommendation

3.5 All women prisoners should have the opportunity to spend one hour a day in the open air. (Repeated recommendation 6.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.6 *The provision of purposeful activity required improvement overall. The prison had focused on developing prisoners' employability skills but data were not analysed sufficiently to inform management decisions. The prison had increased the number of activity spaces available. However, the level of vocational qualifications was too low to prepare women well for employment and too many, although employed, were not engaged in activities in a purposeful way. Education required development in order to meet prisoners' needs. Achievements in English were low. The library offered an adequate service but it needed to be further developed as a learning resource.*

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

3.7	<i>Ofsted⁶ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:</i>	
	<i>Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
	<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
	<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>
	<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.8** The prison had implemented a comprehensive strategy focused on developing the employability skills of prisoners and supporting their resettlement. Several initiatives had been introduced, such as an excellent café facility, which allowed prisoners to experience a real work environment.
- 3.9** Since the previous inspection, external partnerships had started to develop and prisoners received direct training and coaching from some good employers. In the previous two years the prison had invested in the development of vocational training to ensure it provided specific activities for young women and those with longer sentences. However, some of these courses were not accredited or were accredited at a level that was not high enough to promote employability.
- 3.10** The activities management team had also been strengthened through the introduction of leaders for functional skills, vocational training and personal and social development, which, for example, had driven innovative developments in employability. A new, experienced and knowledgeable education manager had been appointed.
- 3.11** Despite these developments, education still required urgent improvement. The range of education courses was too narrow and there were not enough of them. The prison failed to meet the English language, literacy and numeracy needs of prisoners.
- 3.12** The collection and analysis of data was not sufficient to inform management decisions about how to improve poorly performing courses. As a consequence not all relevant actions for improvement had been identified in the self-assessment report or the quality action plan. The prison had a limited view of the actual achievement of different groups of prisoners. Managers did not set challenging improvement targets for poorer performing qualifications.
- 3.13** The quality improvement group was well attended and supported by the senior team, including the director. It focused on identifying poor performance across the provision, often seeking operational solutions to tackle low achievement. However, it did not scrutinise teaching and learning sufficiently or their links to poor achievement.
- 3.14** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was too variable and the teaching and learning observation system was not sufficiently rigorous. The process was new and not all teachers had been observed frequently enough. Some of the observations did not focus sufficiently on measuring learning and the prison did not observe its contractors teaching.

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

Recommendations

- 3.15** The analysis of data should be improved to allow leaders and managers to evaluate the effectiveness of the provision, set challenging targets to improve performance and monitor progress against such targets.
- 3.16** The teaching and learning observation system should be improved to ensure it offers leaders and managers a comprehensive and accurate view of the quality of teaching, learning and assessment.

Provision of activities

- 3.17** The prison delivered the majority of the activities provision through the Gildenburgh College. It had created 41 new activity places since the previous inspection, almost enough to occupy the prison's population.
- 3.18** There were vocational training and work places for 91 prisoners and plans to increase this to 110 by expanding existing workshops. Vocational activities were good, veering away from mundane repetitive work. However, some work areas, such as in the gardens, did not offer accreditation, while others offered only level 1 qualifications, which did not adequately prepare prisoners for work.
- 3.19** There was not enough provision to help prisoners develop personal and social skills, although the new Get Set course addressed this need for a small number. Prisoners received little support to develop their English and maths skills in the workshops.
- 3.20** A large number of women were employed as wing cleaners, painters or servery workers, which was not sufficient to keep them purposefully occupied and inspectors observed too many prisoners being unproductive on wings.
- 3.21** There were 70 part-time and 10 full-time places in the education department, which were largely fully occupied. The range of programmes was narrow and focused on mathematics and English. The small number of prisoners involved in distance learning and Open University courses received good support. The prison did not have enough provision that allowed women to express themselves through the arts, crafts, music and other media. Prisoners whose first language was not English could not take qualifications that met their needs.
- 3.22** Pay, although low, did not discourage women from joining education classes. The induction process now focused on developing an effective skills action plan to improve women's employability on release. The allocation process had been reviewed to ensure the resettlement needs of the prisoners were met. Staff from different parts of the prison had begun meeting weekly to allocate the most appropriate activity to each prisoner to ensure their diverse needs were considered.

Recommendations

- 3.23** Activities should be developed to ensure more vocational and work activity is accredited at levels that better prepare prisoners for employment.
- 3.24** All women should be able to participate in activities that keep them purposefully occupied and develop their personal and employability skills.

3.25 Prisoners for whom English is a second language should be able to take appropriate qualifications.

Quality of provision

- 3.26** The quality of the teaching, learning and assessment required improvement. In the better education lessons nearly all prisoners were actively involved. However, in some lessons learners were bored and inattentive. Women complained about sessions being too long. Typically, activities during sessions were not varied enough and did not use resources to sustain interest.
- 3.27** Tutors gave good verbal feedback in the individual learning plans but target-setting was too general; only very few tutors set individual time-bound targets. Several classes included prisoners with mixed abilities. Some skilled tutors managed these classes well ensuring each prisoner received the attention they needed to progress.
- 3.28** Tutors generally managed behaviour well and were respectful. Prisoners acting as learning support assistants (LSAs) were used well in the classroom but could not achieve accreditation for the role. Tutors did not promote equality and diversity during lessons.
- 3.29** In vocational training, instructors were capable and often enthusiastic, and developed a good rapport with learners. In the best workshops, learners worked in teams to achieve the work objectives, often supervised by unqualified LSAs. In the gardens, experienced LSAs gave new prisoners instructions on basic horticultural techniques, such as watering and planting. In other classes, teaching was slow and women lost interest.
- 3.30** Lesson plans and schemes of work were underdeveloped. Most activities narrowly focused on the task at hand rather than planned learning outcomes. Individual learning plans were used well in construction, but were poorly developed in most other areas and not enough prisoners were making good progress.

Recommendations

- 3.31 A greater variety of learning activities should be provided in shorter sessions.**
- 3.32 Staff should receive sufficient development opportunities to enable them to improve the planning of learning.**
- 3.33 Women acting as LSAs should be able to gain accreditation.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.34** Success rates for learners in education and vocational training courses required improvement. Achievements in information and communications technology and in personal and social development courses had been good in the previous two years. Success rates had improved in English at level 2 and above, but were still not sufficiently good. Success rates in mathematics had declined overall and required improvement. Achievement rates for learners undertaking entry level English and English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) qualifications had also declined in the previous two years and were very low. The number of prisoners gaining English and maths qualifications was too low. In education, prisoners only developed limited social and personal skills.

- 3.35** Learners generally enjoyed their vocational training work. Data on achievement was not available for all courses, but in the previous year, success rates had been high in construction but required improvement in hair and beauty. In these areas, prisoners had little opportunity to develop their English and maths skills. Prisoners' written work was good and their portfolios included photographic evidence and detailed descriptions of the work done.
- 3.36** Overall, attendance and punctuality were good. However, too many learners were removed from classes to attend appointments.

Recommendations

- 3.37** **The number of learners who achieve qualifications across all education and vocational training courses should be increased.**
- 3.38** **Learners should not be removed from classes to attend other appointments.**

Library

- 3.39** The library facilities were adequate. Prisoners attending education had good access to the facility. According to our survey, visits had increased since the previous inspection; however, too few prisoners used the library in 2013. Access to the library was limited at the weekends. The prison gathered information on the number of visits and books issued, but it did not analyse data sufficiently to determine which groups of prisoners used the facility.
- 3.40** Prisoners said they enjoyed using the library and appreciated being able to order books that were not in stock and which arrived promptly. Library resources adequately reflected the diverse needs of the prison population: it had daily newspapers, audio books, books for speakers of other languages and easy-read material. Prisoners did not have enough opportunities to improve their study skills, borrow film DVDs and music CDs or attend book or films clubs. Prisoners had good access to legal references and Prison Service Instructions.
- 3.41** Storybook Mums (in which prisoners record stories for their children) enabled women to keep in contact with their families on the outside. The Shannon Trust's Toe by Toe scheme to help prisoners learn to read was supported by 16 peer mentors. However, mentoring opportunities had decreased since the previous inspection because prisoners were prevented from visiting other wings.

Recommendation

- 3.42** **The prison should analyse data on library use by different groups to ensure all women can access the facilities regularly.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

All women understand the importance of healthy living, and are encouraged and enabled to participate in physical education in safe and decent surroundings.

3.43 *Well managed by an enthusiastic team, the physical education (PE) department had implemented several initiatives that enhanced the provision. It offered a good range of activities and accredited courses where achievements were good. It had developed good links with the outside community and different prison departments such as the health team. The prison did not analyse data sufficiently to ensure all groups of prisoners used the gym facilities.*

3.44 The management of the PE department was good. The newly appointed senior officer had brought in some positive initiatives, which were beginning to improve the provision. Prisoners received comprehensive information about the gym facilities and health and safety practices in recreational areas during induction. Before attending the gym, they undertook a thorough assessment of their literacy and numeracy skills, which prompted a referral to educational support if necessary. The functional skills tutor provided adequate support in the gym classroom.

3.45 The gym offered a good variety of activities, including health and fitness courses, circuit training, football and weight training, and it had a good selection of cardiovascular equipment. Focus groups involving prisoners had provided information on what activities they would have liked to see included, which influenced what was on offer. The range of courses was good and encompassed basic entry level fitness courses leading to qualifications above level 1, and an additional level 3 nutrition programme; success rates were good.

3.46 The gym was well advertised across the prison. Healthy living and eating were promoted well with fresh fruit available during the sessions. Specialist classes were offered to overweight prisoners as well as medical referrals and remedial classes.

3.47 The prison had a good-sized sports hall, an outdoor hard pitch and an outdoor walking trail. The professional quality dance studio was being completed and there were plans to offer an associated dance qualification. Staff were well qualified and had specialist qualifications. Four trained orderlies supported staff and assisted prisoners.

3.48 The showers were adequate. Prisoners could obtain gym kit, plimsolls and a towel if necessary. Good links had been established with the substance misuse team so that those with substance misuse problems could receive appropriate physical exercise. Gym staff did not use data to monitor access to the facilities.

Recommendation

3.49 **Data should be collated and analysed to identify any differences in attendance between groups of learners.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Women are prepared for their release back into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on her arrival at the prison. Resettlement underpins the work of the whole prison, supported by strategic partnerships in the community and informed by assessment of prisoner risk and need. Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

- 4.1** *Strategic management of resettlement was generally good. The Link and Outside Links offered an excellent one-stop-shop for resettlement and through-the-gate services. More use could have been made of release on temporary licence.*
- 4.2** Strategic management of resettlement was generally good. There was an up-to-date resettlement strategy, which demonstrated clear integration between offender management and resettlement pathways work, and there was a current action plan. The needs analysis was out of date (2012) but a new one was being collated at the time of inspection. The bimonthly resettlement policy committee was well attended and considered resettlement issues and supporting data in detail.
- 4.3** Resettlement services were provided in a central area of the prison known as The Link; it offered an excellent one-stop-shop approach in a positive and relaxed environment. Prisoner peer workers were based in The Link and provided an efficient reception and referral service (see section on reintegration planning) which prisoners valued. The Outside Links service had been developed since the previous inspection. Managed by a senior officer, it provided through-the-gate services (see section on reintegration planning).
- 4.4** More use could have been made of release on temporary licence (ROTL) for resettlement purposes; in the previous six months, 26 women had been granted ROTL on a total of 361 occasions. The majority were for medical or dental appointments and only a small number were to maintain family ties or for resettlement purposes (54 occasions).
- 4.5** In our survey 63% of women said they had done something or something had happened to them at the prison to make them less likely to offend in the future.

Recommendation

- 4.6** **Well managed resettlement ROTL should be a key part of the resettlement strategy, and its use for appropriate women increased.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

All women have a sentence based on an individual assessment of risk and need, which is regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody.

Women, together with all relevant staff, are involved in drawing up and reviewing plans.

4.7 *The offender management unit (OMU) was well established, offender assessment system (OASys) documents and sentence plans were generally good and the majority of risk management plans were sufficient. Overall offender supervisors supported and encouraged women to undertake planned work. Not all releases on home detention curfew (HDC) were timely. Public protection work was robust and allocations processes were appropriate and prompt. Support for indeterminate sentence prisoners was good.*

4.8 The OMU was well established; there were 10 prison offender supervisor roles, nine of which were filled, three by female staff which was insufficient. There were also three probation services officers, two of whom were female. While probation staff received case management supervision from an external senior probation officer, prison staff received none. All staff had completed OASys and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) training and all but the two newest starters had completed the offender supervisor training course. Staff individually or in small groups attended a range of other courses, including sex offender training and mental health awareness training.

4.9 In our survey, 26% of women said that an offender supervisor was working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets against a comparator of 36%. However, contact logs indicated a minimum of monthly contact between offender supervisors and prisoners. Overall offender supervisors supported and encouraged women to undertake planned work, including offending behaviour programmes. Not all contact was recorded on P-Nomis, the Prison Service IT system; some information was recorded on a system which only offender supervisors could access. Communication between external offender managers and offender supervisors was generally good.

4.10 We saw a number of examples of good practice. In one case, the offender supervisor secured one-to-one work for a woman at risk through a clinical psychologist. As a result her interaction with her offender supervisor increased, she became involved in her sentence plan and there was a corresponding reduction in self-harming. Another prisoner stated her offender supervisor had given her the 'inspiration and courage to change.'

4.11 The number of delayed OASys assessments was small at only 10. Assessments were generally good. The majority of the case samples we inspected had an accurate and current risk of serious harm screening and an analysis of the risk of serious harm to others. A current and sufficient risk management plan was in place in around three quarters of the cases. Shortfalls included plans that did not address all identified risks, for example, the risk to staff, but all included action to be taken during custody and where relevant in the community too.

4.12 Almost all sentence plans inspected were generally good, but too few of the objectives were focused on outcomes with a specific timescale for completion. We saw many prisoners involved in sentence planning, although our survey indicated a reduction since the previous inspection (62% compared with 77%).

- 4.13** In the previous six months, 61 women had been released on HDC. Decisions were based on a good range of information collected from relevant sources including the security department, external offender managers and wing officers. However, not all were sufficiently prompt, which meant some women were not released until three weeks beyond their eligibility date. This was largely due to delays in receiving information from external offender managers.

Recommendations

- 4.14** Risk management plans should include actions to address all identified areas of risk of harm to others and objectives should be focused on outcomes and include specific timescales.
- 4.15** Women approved for release on HDC should be discharged on or as close as possible to their HDC eligibility date.
- 4.16** Prison offender supervisors should receive case management supervision.
- 4.17** A single recording system should be used by all staff working with prisoners.

Public protection

- 4.18** Initial public protection screening processes were robust; a designated clerk screened all new receptions every day to identify women for whom monitoring restrictions were appropriate, such as those with sexual and/or violent offences. Twenty-four women were subject to these measures. Restrictions were proportionate, reviewed regularly and communicated to women face to face. Information sharing with other relevant staff such as those in visits was good.
- 4.19** There was one MAPPA level 2 woman (where the active involvement of one or more agency is required) and 1 MAPPA level 3 prisoner (with the highest risk level). In addition, 21 prisoners were subject to harassment procedures and 18 to safeguarding procedures. Monthly inter-departmental risk management meetings were held to assess and review prisoners who presented the greatest risk to others and to contribute to MAPPA meetings. The group consisted of representatives from across the prison and was chaired by the public protection manager. Information was submitted irrespective of whether or not the case was eligible for MAPPA. A set of action points was produced at the end of the meeting. However MAPPA were well understood and appropriate systems were in place so staff could identify, track and participate in the management of cases.

Allocation

- 4.20** Allocation arrangements were good. The work of the observation, classification and allocation (OCA) team was up to date. All new arrivals were reviewed and an assessment undertaken based on offence information and previous convictions. During the inspection, 104 women were allocated to closed conditions and 44 to open conditions; the remainder were either remand prisoners or in the process of being allocated. Clinics were held so that women could ask questions about categorisation and allocations but they were not interviewed individually. Prisoners received a letter confirming categorisation decisions.

- 4.21** Re-categorisation decisions were based on an appropriate range of information including details supplied by the security department, OASys documents, wing officers and offender supervisors. All were timely and signed off by both a prison manager and the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) controller.
- 4.22** A number of women who were allocated to open conditions had not been transferred because they had chosen to stay to be nearer family and friends, which the prison supported. Foreign national prisoners were usually denied open conditions if the Home Office considered them a 'person of interest' and were facing potential deportation.

Recommendation

- 4.23 Foreign national women prisoners should be considered for open conditions whether or not they face deportation** (Repeated recommendation 9.29)

Housekeeping point

- 4.24** Women should be interviewed as part of the categorisation and allocation process to determine their specific needs and preferences. (Repeated recommendation 9.28)

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.25** There were 24 life sentence and seven indeterminate sentence for public protection prisoners. Prisoners facing a likely indeterminate sentence were not identified on remand or given information about the sentence or its implications.
- 4.26** Those we spoke to were positive about their care and felt supported and able to progress. Most were housed on the designated long-term wing (DI) where they had their own exercise yard, a kitchen where they could cook for themselves and the facility to order ingredients via the kiosk system.
- 4.27** There were four lifer family days per year, which prisoners valued; the most recent in June 2014 had been attended by over 70 people including prisoners and their families. Bimonthly lifer consultation meetings, facilitated by the OMU manager, took place and minutes showed that action points were addressed promptly. Parole assessments were up to date.

Recommendation

- 4.28 Prisoners facing a likely indeterminate sentence should be identified on remand and provided with support and information.**

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

Women's resettlement needs are addressed prior to release. An effective multi-agency response is used to meet the specific needs of each individual prisoner in order to maximise the likelihood of successful reintegration into the community.

4.29 *An immediate needs assessment undertaken on induction and reviewed before discharge meant prisoners' needs could be addressed promptly. Prisoners serving less than 12 months had custody plans. An impressive range of partner agencies was working with the prison. Peer workers helped identify the needs of other prisoners. All women being discharged were met at the gate by staff from the Outside Links facility. Support to help women maintain contact with their families and children was very good. Women who had been abused, victimised or trafficked received good support. Links with accommodation providers were good and most women were released to settled housing. The careers service required improvement. The resettlement centre provided a good service and the Outside Links facility offered women immediate support post-release. Women were seen at a health care discharge clinic before release but received no information about community services. Discharge planning for substance users began on their arrival and the prison liaised well with community teams. A good range of finance and debt services were available. The closed visits area was stark and strip-searching not authorised. Prisoners could participate in the Thinking Skills programme.*

4.30 Peer 'connections' workers helped identify the needs of other prisoners. They undertook an immediate needs assessment with new prisoners on induction, which was reviewed before discharge, and made referrals to the resettlement team in The Link which could address needs promptly. Prisoners serving less than 12 months had custody plans, informed by the immediate needs assessment. An impressive range of partner agencies was involved, including many specialising in work with women at risk.

4.31 All women being discharged were met at the gate by staff from the Outside Links facility, where they could obtain clothes and bags if needed, charge mobile phones, receive travel warrants, condoms and food vouchers and make phone calls. It also provided a free taxi service to the train station. We saw some very good examples of Outside Links working with women who had been discharged some weeks earlier (see section on education, training and employment). Women could call a freephone number if they wanted to talk to Outside Links staff. There were plans to open a post-release support centre in Peterborough.

Good practice

4.32 *The Link and Outside Links facilities provided excellent and innovative resettlement reintegration support through committed staff and peer workers.*

Children, families and contact with the outside world

4.33 Support to help women stay in touch with their families and children was very good. In our survey, more women than at other prisons (63% compared with 53%) said staff had helped them maintain contact with family and friends.

4.34 The children and families pathways lead staff member and a temporary family support worker helped women to maintain family ties. A family strategy had been re-launched in early 2014 and productive family strategy meetings were held regularly, attended by a wide

range of staff from across the prison and outside agencies. The strategy was underpinned by a comprehensive action plan. The lead staff member had good links with social services departments and family law solicitors.

- 4.35** Primary carers, identified by reception staff on arrival, were seen by the family support worker within 72 hours of arrival and a care plan was developed. All other women were seen within 72 hours of arrival by a mother and baby liaison officer and their needs assessed.
- 4.36** A wide range of information regarding women's needs was recorded on prisoners' electronic case note records, and staff knew about prisoners' family circumstances. Women who did not receive visits were identified and offered an official visitor through the chaplaincy; many of them were foreign national women. Sentence plans we saw did not contain objectives relating to contact with relatives or friends.
- 4.37** The voluntary organisation Ormiston Families had run courses to help women improve their parenting skills and maintain family ties. Attendance at the previous course in January 2014 had been poor and none had run since.
- 4.38** Final contact visits took place in a dedicated family room that was spacious, suitably furnished and well cared for. Records showed that final visits were properly planned and provided appropriate support; women could have photographs taken of the visit.
- 4.39** Women could meet relatives in other prisons through video link or inter-prison visits, for example, a woman was allowed to meet her husband on the male side of HMP and YOI Peterborough. On top of their normal visits entitlement, women could request up to three additional visits a month from children. These three-hour visits were held in the family room. Arrangements for women to maintain contact with family and friends by telephone and mail were reasonably good.
- 4.40** The visits provision was good. Visits were held seven days a week, for which the prison had sufficient capacity. Prisoners booked visits through wing kiosks and informed their visitors.
- 4.41** The visitors' centre was based in temporary accommodation outside the prison gates and staffed by welcoming volunteers from the Friends of Peterborough Prison. The centre was in a reasonable condition given its temporary nature. Adfam had an office in the centre and offered services to visitors (see section on drugs and alcohol).
- 4.42** Visitors were taken to the reasonably welcoming visits room promptly. Unlike at our previous inspection, seating was soft and not fixed to the floor. An unsupervised children's play area and a snack bar staffed by prisoners was available. Staff were polite and the atmosphere was relaxed.
- 4.43** Security arrangements were proportionate overall. Visitors and prisoners had their fingerprints scanned in and out of the hall and prisoners wore a discreet red wrist band.
- 4.44** Seven women had been strip-searched in the three months before the inspection, following intelligence or suspected passing on of drugs. Visits staff could not provide evidence to justify this or show managerial authorisation. Cubicles used for strip-searching were only enclosed on three sides, which meant staff not involved in the search could potentially see women being searched. Four prisoners were restricted to closed visits (see section on security). The closed visits area was stark and austere.

Recommendations

- 4.45** Sentence plans should contain objectives about maintaining contact with supportive family members or friends.
- 4.46** The closed visits rooms should be improved.

Victimisation, abuse and vulnerability

- 4.47** Women who had been abused, victimised or trafficked received some very good support. Basic questions were asked as part of the immediate needs assessment to identify women who had experienced these problems, all women received an information leaflet detailing the services available, and a designated and well trained lead female officer and a peer worker headed up this area of work. Wing staff demonstrated a good understanding of the support needs of women at risk and knew what help was available in the prison.
- 4.48** The prison had good links with an excellent range of statutory and voluntary sector services, from across the country whose staff either visited the prison or provided through-the-gate services to support women at risk. These included a large number of organisations providing sex workers with support, specialising in support for victims of domestic abuse and forced marriages and offering counselling services for women who had experienced rape.
- 4.49** Voluntary organisation Hibiscus, based at the prison, provided a variety of support services, and was helping the prison to develop a strategy to identify and support trafficking victims. A new strategic meeting had been developed for this purpose; it had met for the second time during the inspection. Attended by a good range of staff from within the prison, it looked at issues, such as staff training in trafficking indicators and appropriate partner agencies. Hibiscus and the Poppy project (an organisation providing support and advocacy to trafficked women) referred those identified as victims of trafficking to the national referral mechanism (a process set up by the government to identify and support victims of trafficking in the UK). Two women had been bailed from the prison back into the community after they were identified as trafficking victims (see section on safeguarding (protection of adults at risk) and women with complex needs).

Accommodation

- 4.50** There were good links with local accommodation providers, including agencies that provided furniture. Information-sharing protocols were in place with some local authorities in Peterborough and more were being developed with others. On average 67 women were discharged each month, most to settled accommodation; in 2013, 91% of women were released into settled housing. Where accommodation could not be secured before release, appointments were made with accommodation providers.

Education, training and employment

- 4.51** The quality of the careers service required improvement, although changes had improved pre-release provision. The resettlement centre employed eight prisoners who had been trained to level 3 in delivering careers advice and guidance. They offered women a good service. All offenders were interviewed eight weeks prior to release to plan a programme tailored to their resettlement needs. The Get Set course addressed personal and social issues affecting women on release.

- 4.52** The innovative Outside Links facility provided released prisoners with immediate support, and was developing links with employers and training providers.
- 4.53** Good links had been made with several national employers: managers from companies had visited the prison to provide training in job application and interview skills. A small number of prisoners had benefited from work placements through ROTL. We saw some very good examples where women who had been discharged some weeks earlier had received help to obtain employment.

Health care

- 4.54** Women were seen at a discharge clinic prior to release or transfer, and a summary of their health record was sent to their registered GP; the woman received no information about community services. Women on prescribed medication were given three days' medication or five days' for a Friday release to cover the weekend. Links had been established with the local hospice and Macmillan nurses, but there was no palliative or end of life policy. The prison connected women on the care programme approach (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness) with their community mental health team prior to discharge; planning for this started soon after arrival.

Recommendations

- 4.55** **Women should be given information about registering with a GP and access to community health services.**
- 4.56** **The prison should have a policy that clearly defines the pathway for women with palliative needs.**

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.57** The psychosocial team started discharge planning and harm reduction education from admission. Prescribing continued on release or transfer. Liaison with community teams was excellent and several visited regularly. The prison community recovery manager was developing effective resettlement pathways for substance misuse clients. Workers from drug and alcohol support organisation Adfam continued to provide prisoners and their families with valuable support.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.58** The Money Advice Service ran a surgery one day per fortnight. Support was available to open bank accounts and address other debt issues. Help to address rent arrears had enabled some to re-qualify for a further tenancy on release. Jobcentre Plus staff were available every day to help address problems with benefits and employment. In our survey more women than in comparator prisons who needed help with finances before their release knew where they could get this.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.59** Interventions to address offending behaviour were not based on an accurate assessment of needs because the needs analysis was out of date (see section on strategic management of resettlement). The Thinking Skills programme (TSP) was available, and over the past 12 months 20 women had completed the five-week programme. A number of those who did not meet the qualifying criteria were referred to a thinking and reasoning course delivered by the education department. While in our case sample three-quarters of the women were undertaking the TSP, the total number of women benefiting from the programme was small compared to the number discharged each year. Family members and personal officers were invited to, and some had attended, post-programme reviews.
- 4.60** The prison did not have a victim awareness course, despite it being evident in some of the cases we looked at that such work was required, but we saw some good examples of offender supervisors delivering one-to-one work.

Recommendation

- 4.61** **A victim awareness course should be available to those women requiring it.**

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice included in this report. The reference numbers at the end of each refer to the paragraph location in the main report, and in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Women prisoners should only be strip-searched when there is sufficient, up-to-date intelligence suggesting it is necessary, and where no alternative is available. Decisions to conduct strip-searching, particularly under restraint, should be carefully monitored. (S41)
- 5.2 The proportion of women staff in contact roles with prisoners should be sufficient to ensure the most appropriate outcomes are achieved. (S42)
- 5.3 The overall quality and range of activity places needs to be improved to ensure women are purposefully occupied and better prepared to avoid re-offending on release. (S43)
- 5.4 The inpatient unit should not be part of the prison's CNA, its role and nature as a clinical therapeutic environment should be clearly defined and, clinical and discipline staff should have up-to-date mental health training. (S44)
- 5.5 The development of essential skills such as English and mathematics, and English for speakers of other languages needs to be improved. (S45)

Recommendation

To NOMS

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.6 Women should be transported separately from male prisoners and the time between their last court appearance and their arrival in reception should be substantially reduced. (1.5)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.7 Except where there are significant security concerns, women should be told the date and time of their hospital appointments in advance. (1.6)
- 5.8 Women should not routinely be required to wear mechanical restraints during escorts. (1.7)

Early days in custody

- 5.9 Prisoners should be able to purchase both tobacco and phone credit in reception. (1.18)

Safe and supportive relationships

- 5.10** A survey of women's perceptions of safety should be completed and analysed independently of the men's survey. (1.28)
- 5.11** The prison should improve the way it investigates, challenges and monitors prisoners' antisocial behaviour as well as increase its use of mediation and support plans for victims. (1.29)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.12** Following a death in custody the prison should conduct a formal internal review to consider what, if any, immediate lessons should be learned. (1.36)

Safeguarding

- 5.13** The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.43)
- 5.14** Specialist facilities to manage women with both complex needs and challenging behaviour should be developed. (1.44)

Security

- 5.15** Women considered suitable for open conditions should have access to a less restrictive regime. (1.51)
- 5.16** The MDT programme should be adequately resourced so that the required level of testing can be undertaken without any gaps in provision. (1.52)

Discipline

- 5.17** Force should only be used as a last resort and should be clearly authorised. (1.60)
- 5.18** All planned incidents should be recorded on video. (1.61)
- 5.19** Verbal de-escalation techniques should be used continuously throughout restraint processes. (1.62)
- 5.20** The rate of segregation should be carefully analysed to ensure that segregation is not being used unnecessarily and that minority groups are not being disadvantaged. (1.66)
- 5.21** Women on an open ACCT case management document should only be held in segregation in exceptional circumstances, which should be documented and agreed by a senior manager, as part of a care-planned approach. (1.67)

Substance misuse

- 5.22** The recovery strategy should be updated annually to include specific women's issues and a detailed action plan with up-to-date performance measures informed by an annual needs analysis. (1.77)

- 5.23** Prisoners with substance-related problems should receive accessible, consistent and well-coordinated care from an integrated substance misuse service. (1.78)

Residential units

- 5.24** Women in shared cells should each have a lockable cabinet. (2.7)
- 5.25** Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.7)

Equality and diversity

- 5.26** Equality monitoring should extend beyond race to ensure equality of treatment. (2.20, repeated recommendation 4.5)
- 5.27** Details of external support networks and how protected groups can contact them should be widely available. (2.21)
- 5.28** Lone male officers should not be left on the MBU at night. (2.40)

Legal rights

- 5.29** The legal services provided should meet the needs of the population. (2.50)

Health services

- 5.30** Women should be able to make a confidential complaint directly to health providers, including verbal complaints. (2.64)
- 5.31** One clinical electronic record should reflect all care women receive without routine duplication or separate use of a paper record. (2.65)
- 5.32** The care needs of older women and those with disabilities should be identified and shared care plans developed to inform care on the wings, alongside clinical care; they should include access to community physiotherapy and occupational therapy services. (2.66)
- 5.33** Health screening on arrival and in the first 72 hours for all women should clearly identify risks and ensure appropriate follow-up of identified needs, including the management of women with long-term conditions. (2.75)
- 5.34** Women should be able to access all of their prescribed medicines in a timely way. (2.83)
- 5.35** The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named-patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock only if unavoidable. (2.84, repeated recommendation 5.36)
- 5.36** Collaborative working between the mental health team and the primary care provider should be prioritised and input into the inpatient unit strengthened. (2.96)

Time out of cell

- 5.37** All women prisoners should have the opportunity to spend one hour a day in the open air. (3.5, repeated recommendation 6.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.38** The analysis of data should be improved to allow leaders and managers to evaluate the effectiveness of the provision, set challenging targets to improve performance and monitor progress against such targets. (3.15)
- 5.39** The teaching and learning observation system should be improved to ensure it offers leaders and managers a comprehensive and accurate view of the quality of teaching, learning and assessment. (3.16)
- 5.40** Activities should be developed to ensure more vocational and work activity is accredited at levels that better prepare prisoners for employment. (3.23)
- 5.41** All women should be able to participate in activities that keep them purposefully occupied and develop their personal and employability skills. (3.24)
- 5.42** Prisoners for whom English is a second language should be able to take appropriate qualifications. (3.25)
- 5.43** A greater variety of learning activities should be provided in shorter sessions. (3.31)
- 5.44** Staff should receive sufficient development opportunities to enable them to improve the planning of learning. (3.32)
- 5.45** Women acting as LSAs should be able to gain accreditation. (3.33)
- 5.46** The number of learners who achieve qualifications across all education and vocational training courses should be increased. (3.37)
- 5.47** Learners should not be removed from classes to attend other appointments. (3.38)
- 5.48** The prison should analyse data on library use by different groups to ensure all women can access the facilities regularly. (3.42)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.49** Data should be collated and analysed to identify any differences in attendance between groups of learners. (3.49)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.50** Well managed resettlement ROTL should be a key part of the resettlement strategy, and its use for appropriate women increased. (4.6)

Offender management and planning

- 5.51** Risk management plans should include actions to address all identified areas of risk of harm to others and objectives should be focused on outcomes and include specific timescales. (4.14)
- 5.52** Women approved for release on HDC should be discharged on or as close as possible to their HDC eligibility date. (4.15)
- 5.53** Prison offender supervisors should receive case management supervision. (4.16)

- 5.54** A single recording system should be used by all staff working with prisoners. (4.17)
- 5.55** Foreign national women prisoners should be considered for open conditions whether or not they face deportation (4.23, repeated recommendation 9.29)
- 5.56** Prisoners facing a likely indeterminate sentence should be identified on remand and provided with support and information. (4.28)

Reintegration planning

- 5.57** Sentence plans should contain objectives about maintaining contact with supportive family members or friends. (4.45)
- 5.58** The closed visits rooms should be improved. (4.46)
- 5.59** Women should be given information about registering with a GP and access to community health services. (4.55)
- 5.60** The prison should have a policy that clearly defines the pathway for women with palliative needs. (4.56)
- 5.61** A victim awareness course should be available to those women requiring it. (4.61)

Housekeeping points

Substance misuse

- 5.62** Night time observations on the stabilisation unit should be recorded on SystemOne. (1.79)
- 5.63** The facilities for administering opiate substitution therapy should be private. (1.80)
- 5.64** The compact-based drug testing facilities should have separate surfaces for testing and completing paperwork. (1.81)

Equality and diversity

- 5.65** Prisoners should complete a confidential diversity questionnaire to determine their needs. (2.22)

Health services

- 5.66** Nurses should consistently be able to provide a range of simple pain relief and treatment for minor ailments including paracetamol. (2.85)

Purchases

- 5.67** Canteen ordering arrangements should be explained in detail to newly arrived prisoners. (2.103)

Offender management and planning

- 5.68** Women should be interviewed as part of the categorisation and allocation process to determine their specific needs and preferences. (4.24, repeated recommendation 9.28)

Examples of good practice

- 5.69** Collaborative working between the prison and the local hospital ensured women had prompt access to secondary health care. (2.76)
- 5.70** The Link and Outside Links facilities provided excellent and innovative resettlement reintegration support through committed staff and peer workers. (4.32)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Beverley Alden	Inspector
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Rachel Prime	Senior research officer
Alissa Redmond	Research officer
Caroline Elwood	Research officer
Lucy Higgins	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Majella Pearce	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Steve Eley	Health services inspector
Peter Gibbs	Pharmacist
Jan Fooks-Bale	Care Quality Commission
Catherine Raycraft	Care Quality Commission
Charles Clarke	Ofsted inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector
Denise Olander	Ofsted inspector
Steven Oliver-Watts	Ofsted inspector
Helen Davies	Offender management inspector
Krystyna Findlay	Offender management inspector
Helen Rinaldi	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2011, some women had long journeys and arrived at the prison late. Reception procedures were welcoming but more focus on meeting immediate needs during reception and first night interviews was needed. Induction arrangements were unsatisfactory. Most women felt safe and anti-social behaviour, usually about minor matters, was dealt with appropriately. Suicide and self-harm procedures were very good. The segregation unit provided some good care and support for troubled women. Use of force was not high but needed more oversight. Integrated drug treatment system support was very effective. Appropriate priority was given to drug supply reduction practice. Outcomes for women prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

New arrivals should receive good personal support, which should ensure that immediate needs and anxieties are identified and addressed sensitively and that women understand what will happen to them on their first night and the following day. (HP44)

Partially achieved

An appropriate and up-to-date induction programme should be delivered shortly after arrival to ensure women understand prison regimes, know how to access services and are helped to cope with imprisonment. (HP45)

Achieved

Recommendations

Women prisoners should be held in court cells for the minimum possible period and arrive at the prison before 7pm except in exceptional circumstances. (1.7)

Not achieved

Women prisoners should travel on separate van from men. (1.8)

Not achieved

Prisoners' monies should transfer with them from other prisons without delay. (1.21)

Achieved

Unless there are security concerns, all women prisoners should receive 24 hours notice of transfer. (1.9)

Not achieved

More use should be made of the video link for court appearances. (1.10)

Partially achieved

Officer interviewing new arrivals should give good personal attention to prisoners to ensure immediate needs and anxieties are identified and met and explain to women what will happen on their first night and following day. (1.20)

Achieved

Clear first night procedures should ensure that all new arrivals have their immediate needs met, including the opportunity to have a shower and are informed of the Listener and Samaritans service. (1.27)

Partially achieved

Women prisoner representatives should be included in the violence reduction meeting. (3.13)

Achieved

Violence reduction meetings should include discussion on emerging trends or concerns identified in the safer custody coordinator's monthly report and how these are being addressed. (3.14)

Achieved

Formalised procedures to support victims should be developed. (3.15)

Achieved

Recommendations from the death in custody investigation and the prison's response to these should be discussed with the safety custody team and periodically reviewed to ensure compliance is maintained. (3.28)

Achieved

Prisoners should routinely be asked if they want their friends or families contacted following an incident of self-harm and, in appropriate cases, invited to reviews. (3.29)

Not achieved

The resources available in the Link should be better promoted in the care plans for women subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork procedures. (3.30)

Not achieved

More Listeners should be recruited and retained. (3.31)

Partially achieved

All prisoners should be issued with a copy of the rules of the prison. (7.9)

Achieved

The use of force committee should be chaired by a senior manager and meet regularly to review data to ensure all use of force is appropriate and to identify and promulgate learning points. (7.17)

Partially achieved

Special accommodation should be used only as a last resort, only while the prisoner is violent and refractory and prisoners should not routinely be left in darkness. (7.18)

Achieved

Clinical reviews for prisoners on the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) should involve the GP and the prisoner's named CARAT worker and IDTS nurse. (3.66)

Not achieved

The tackling drugs through physical education course should be run for women prisoners. (3.67)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2011, staff-prisoner relationships were good, with some effective personal officer work. Living conditions were clean and decent. Women prisoners were actively involved in some useful diversity work across most strands. There was too little use of translated material and interpreting services to support women who did not speak or understand English well. A new application system was beginning to be more effective. The mother and baby unit provided positive support for mothers. Health services were good. Outcomes for women prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Residential staff, particularly personal officers, should engage fully with foreign national women, using formal and professional telephone interpreters as necessary, to ensure they understand the prison's routines and procedures and know how to get help. (HP46)

Achieved

The health care appointment system should be reviewed to reduce the rate of non-attendance at clinics and ensure that women are able to access services quickly. (HP47)

Achieved

Recommendations

Unconvicted prisoners should not be asked to share cells with convicted prisoners unless they consent to share with a particular convicted prisoner. (1.28)

Achieved

Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared. (2.7)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.8)

Ventilation in cells should be improved. (2.8)

No longer relevant

Women prisoners should be able to use the telephones in private. (2.9)

Not achieved

Efforts should be made to increase the proportion of women officers to 70%. (2.21)

Not achieved

Women prisoners should not move cell unnecessarily during their time in custody at Peterborough and thus impair relationships with personal officers. (2.26)

Achieved

Women prisoners should be able to place shop orders within 24 hours of arrival. (8.10)

Not achieved

Equality monitoring should extend beyond race to ensure equality of treatment. (4.5)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.20)

Prisoner diversity representatives should receive appropriate training to understand and effectively carry out their role. (4.6)

Not achieved

Ethnic monitoring should extend to specific groups within the black and minority ethnic population to check for equality of outcomes. (4.15)

Achieved

Processes should be introduced to ensure that women prisoners currently or previously convicted of a racially aggravated offence are identified and that staff are aware of such women on their wing. (4.16)

Achieved

Foreign national women should routinely receive a free telephone call to their family abroad without surrendering visits. (4.26)

Not achieved

Systems should be established to ensure that all women prisoners with a disability are identified on reception, have appropriate care plans and are routinely consulted. (4.32)

Partially achieved

A formal prisoner paid carer scheme for women requiring additional ongoing support should be introduced. (4.33)

Achieved

Retirement pay should be increased to be sufficient for those with no other source of income and retired prisoners should not have to pay for their television. (4.34)

Partially achieved

Details of external support networks and how gay or bisexual prisoners can contact them should be widely available. (4.39)

Not achieved

Services for older women and women with disabilities should be developed and a lead nurse identified. (5.6)

Not achieved

Mothers with young babies should not be required to remain in their rooms after 7.45pm. (3.42)

Achieved

Provision should be made for partners to be involved in antenatal care and preparation for birth with their pregnant partner. (3.43)

Partially achieved

Women prisoners should have free access to application forms and should be able to submit these throughout the day. (3.48)

Achieved

Responses to complaints should be comprehensive and address the matter raised. (3.49)

Achieved

Prisoners should have appropriate IT facilities to help conduct defences and appeals. (3.53)

Partially achieved

Women who need specialist medical equipment and mobility aids should receive them in good time. (5.13)

Not achieved

Women should be able to access physiotherapy and occupational therapy where necessary. (5.14)

Not achieved

All wing staff should receive regular first aid and resuscitation training and there should be sufficient trained staff to use emergency equipment. (5.15)

Partially achieved

Verbal complaints should be recorded and patterns monitored. Resulting changes to practice should be communicated to women prisoners. (5.16)

Not achieved

Women prisoners should have access to a female GP and this should be widely advertised. (5.23)

Partially achieved

The pharmacist should be supported to develop pharmacy-led clinics and medicine use reviews. (5.33)

Achieved

Women should have timely access to pain killers such as paracetamol and ibuprofen. (5.34)

Partially achieved

A policy for women reporting sick to nurses should be implemented and reviewed regularly by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied. (5.35)

Not achieved

The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named-patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock only if unavoidable. (5.36)

Not achieved

The high failure to attend rate should be investigated and action taken to reduce the number of women not attending appointments. (5.43)

Achieved

All inpatient beds should be removed from the list of certified normal accommodation. (5.47)

Not achieved

All prison staff should receive mental health awareness training. (5.52)

Partially achieved

Day care services should be available to prisoners with mental health problems who find it difficult to cope on the wings. (5.53)

Not achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2011, Time out of cell and the number of activity places were comparatively good for a local prison. However, not all women were kept purposefully occupied and those without an allocated activity spent too long locked in their cells. Opportunities for women to spend time in the open air were too restricted. The range of learning and skills places was limited and most education and training was at a low level, with little for the more able women and those who spent longer periods at the prison such as life-sentenced women. The needs of young adult women were not sufficiently identified. Access to the library was poor. PE provision was satisfactory. Outcomes for women prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The learning and skills curriculum should be reviewed in line with the annual needs analysis and prisoner forums to introduce more learning above level 1 and in subjects relevant to prisoners' length of stay, abilities and interests and in particular to provide appropriate provision for young adult women and longer-stay prisoners such as those serving life sentences. (HP48)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

All women prisoners should have the opportunity to spend one hour a day in the open air. (6.5)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 3.5)

Learning and skills strategic planning should be reviewed to ensure that objectives are appropriately focused on the specific learning needs of the women prisoners, including young adult women and those serving life sentences. (6.15)

Partially achieved

The number of prisoners successfully completing accredited courses should be increased by investigating reasons for non-completion and achievement and taking action to address the causes. (6.16)

Not achieved

The self-assessment process should be improved to ensure it systematically includes feedback from prisoners, staff and external partners and focuses separately on women prisoners in its evaluation and subsequent action planning for improvements. (6.17)

Partially achieved

Ways of recognising and recording women's knowledge and skills development should be introduced into non-accredited areas to enhance their self-awareness and enable them to value new skills and gain evidence for use on release for employment. (6.25)

Partially achieved

Literacy, numeracy and language support should be provided in work areas to encourage those with below level 2 assessed skills to improve their skills to help in gaining employment on release and for communicating with their family and community. (6.26)

Partially achieved

Support for prisoners with additional learning needs should be implemented to enable them to participate more fully in learning and improve their skills for reducing re-offending. (6.35)

Partially achieved

Access to the library should be improved. (6.39)

Partially achieved

Greater use should be made of the gym during the day for recreational activities to allow more women to participate, particularly those without allocated activities. (6.48)

Partially achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2011, the resettlement strategy was not based on a comprehensive needs analysis and the regime, interventions and services were not sufficiently tailored to the specific needs of the wide range of women held. We were not satisfied that the prison was an appropriate environment or sufficiently resourced for young adult women and those beginning life sentences. Women prisoners were able to access some reasonably good reintegration services, although many failed to attend appointments. Offender management and sentence planning for eligible women were satisfactory but there was no formal custody planning system for the majority of women serving short sentences or on remand. Some good family work was provided. The range of interventions was limited. Outcomes for women were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The resettlement strategy should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis and both it and the custody planning should identify and meet the specific needs of the full range of women prisoners held. (HP49)

Partially achieved

All women prisoners, including unconvicted women, should have a thorough initial assessment of needs backed up by an effective custody planning process. (HP50)

Achieved

Recommendations

A suitable regime, services and interventions should be provided to meet the specific needs of young adult women and those serving indeterminate sentences. (9.7)

Partially achieved

A comprehensive offender management strategy should draw together all the different functions, roles and responsibilities with the aim of raising its profile across the establishment. (9.21)

Partially achieved

Women not in formal scope for offender management should receive regular and meaningful contact throughout their sentence to ensure the plan of work is delivered as intended. (9.22)

Achieved

The quality of OASys and sentence plans should be improved to ensure they are outcome-focused and meaningful. (9.23)

Partially achieved

Women prisoners should be interviewed as part of the categorisation and allocation process to determine their specific needs and preferences. (9.28)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point, 4.24)

Foreign national women prisoners should be considered for open conditions whether or not they face deportation. (9.29)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.23)

Delays in identifying the level of public protection restrictions should be reduced.

Achieved

The prison should ensure appropriate involvement in all relevant multi-agency public protection arrangement meetings. (9.35)

Achieved

The specific needs of indeterminate-sentenced women prisoners should be analysed and a strategy developed to manage them effectively and provide an appropriate regime. (9.40)

Partially achieved

The role of the prison as a first stage prison for women sentenced to life imprisonment should be clarified and resources allocated to reflect the provision in other first stage prisons. (9.41)

No longer relevant

Aggregate data should show how many prisoners have been helped to secure accommodation by the prison. (9.45)

Achieved

The dedicated housing adviser should not be cross-deployed to other operational duties. (9.46)

Achieved

An effective accredited peer mentoring programme should be introduced to reflect the good practice in the men's prison. (9.52)

Achieved

Opportunities for women prisoners to participate in release on temporary licence for work placements should continue to be extended. (9.53)

Partially achieved

Better links should be developed with national employers to support women in gaining employment on release. (9.54)

Achieved

Women's needs in relation to finance, debts and benefits should always be thoroughly assessed on arrival and appropriate services provided. (9.57)

Achieved

The drug and alcohol strategy document should be revised to seek ways to address the specific issues found in the women's needs analysis and contain detailed action plans and performance measures. (9.65)

Not achieved

The service users giving advice (SUGA) service should be provided for women. (9.66)

No longer relevant

The number of visits places available should be increased, particularly at weekends. (9.75)

Achieved

Entry procedures for visitors should be improved and prisoners should arrive in visits on time. (9.76)

Achieved

Family liaison services should be further developed to meet identified need. (9.77)

Achieved

The type of offending behaviour work provided to women prisoners should be based on regular and thorough needs analysis. (9.85)

Partially achieved

The role of personal officers in supporting programme outcomes should be better defined and implemented. (9.86)

Achieved

Specialist support and counselling for women who have experienced sexual abuse should be available. (9.91)

Achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	15	239	74.1
Recall	0	11	3.2
Convicted unsentenced	1	16	5.0
Remand	8	51	17.2
Civil prisoners	0	0	0.0
Other	0	1	0.3
Detainees	1	0	0.3
Total	25	318	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	11	73	24.5
Less than 6 months	3	48	14.9
6 months to less than 12 months	0	21	6.1
12 months to less than 2 years	4	39	12.5
2 years to less than 4 years	3	54	16.6
4 years to less than 10 years	2	46	14.0
10 years and over (not life)	1	7	2.3
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	1	23	9.0
Life	0	7	2.0
Total	25	318	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	-	-
Under 21 years	25	7.3
21 years to 29 years	97	28.3
30 years to 39 years	109	31.8
40 years to 49 years	76	22.2
50 years to 59 years	28	8.2
60 years to 69 years	7	2.0
70 plus years	1	0.3
Please state maximum age here:	-	-
Total	343	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	21	270	84.8
Foreign nationals	4	47	14.9
Not stated	0	1	0.3
Total	25	318	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Female closed	19	194	
Female open	1	47	
Unclassified	0	3	
Unsentenced	7	67	
Total	27	311	

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	19	246	77.3
Irish	0	1	0.3
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	1	0.3
Other white	0	19	5.5
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	1	6	2.0
White and black African	0	0	0.0
White and Asian	0	0	0.0
Other mixed	0	4	1.2
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	2	0.6
Pakistani	0	2	0.6
Bangladeshi	0	0	0.0
Chinese	0	1	0.3
Other Asian	0	6	1.7
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	10	2.9
African	4	8	3.5
Other black	1	4	1.5
Other ethnic group	0	6	1.7
Arab			
Other ethnic group			
Not stated	0	2	0.6
Total	25	318	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	0	0.0
Church of England	2	58	17.5
Roman Catholic	2	62	18.7
Other Christian denominations	7	65	21.0
Muslim	4	11	4.4
Sikh	0	2	0.6
Hindu	0	0	0.0
Buddhist	0	5	1.5
Jewish	0	1	0.3
Other	0	1	0.3
No religion	10	113	35.9
Total	25	318	100

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	0	23	7.2
Total	0	23	7.2

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	3	0.9%	52	15.2
1 month to 3 months	4	1.2%	81	23.6
3 months to 6 months	2	0.6%	42	12.2
6 months to 1 year	2	0.6%	41	12.0
1 year to 2 years	1	0.3%	14	4.1
2 years to 4 years	2	0.6%	15	4.4
4 years or more	0	0.0%	0	0.0
Total	14	4.2%	245	71.5

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0.0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/ restrictions).	2	56	16.9
Total	2	56	16.9

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	4	4.8%	20	23.8
1 month to 3 months	4	4.8%	26	31
3 months to 6 months	1	1.2	17	20.2
6 months to 1 year	1	1.2%	9	10.7
1 year to 2 years	1	1.2%	1	1.2
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0%	0	0.0
4 years or more	0	0.0%	0	0.0
Total	11	13.2	73	86.9

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	11	60	22.9
Sexual offences	0	3	1
Burglary	2	20	7.1
Robbery	3	28	10
Theft and handling	4	65	22.3
Fraud and forgery	0	32	10.3
Drugs offences	2	37	12.6
Other offences	6	23	9.4
Civil offences	0	1	0.3
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	0	1	0.3
Total	28	270	96.2

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment⁷. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 16 June the prisoner population at HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women) was 342. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 171 prisoners.

We received a total of 153 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 89%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Seven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, six questionnaires were not returned and five were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
IA	12
IB	12
IC	17

⁷ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes an 80% response rate (70% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

ID	10
1E	12
2A	14
2B	18
2C	17
2D	19
2E	15
Mother and Baby Unit	3
Healthcare	3
Segregation Unit	1

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women).

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences⁸ are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women) in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in seven local prisons since April 2009.
- The current survey responses from HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women) in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women) in 2011.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other and those who consider themselves to be heterosexual.

⁸ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

Section I: About You

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	Under 21	11 (7%)	
	21 - 29.....	41 (27%)	
	30 - 39.....	52 (34%)	
	40 - 49.....	31 (21%)	
	50 - 59.....	10 (7%)	
	60 - 69.....	5 (3%)	
	70 and over	1 (1%)	
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	Yes.....	114 (76%)	
	Yes - on recall.....	9 (6%)	
	No - awaiting trial.....	15 (10%)	
	No - awaiting sentence	12 (8%)	
	No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)	
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Not sentenced.....	27 (19%)	
	Less than 6 months.....	27 (19%)	
	6 months to less than 1 year	12 (8%)	
	1 year to less than 2 years	19 (13%)	
	2 years to less than 4 years	24 (17%)	
	4 years to less than 10 years.....	25 (17%)	
	10 years or more.....	4 (3%)	
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	2 (1%)	
	Life.....	5 (3%)	
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	Yes.....	20 (13%)	
	No.....	130 (87%)	
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	Yes.....	147 (99%)	
	No.....	2 (1%)	
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	Yes.....	148 (98%)	
	No.....	3 (2%)	
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	106 (71%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 0 (0%)
	White - Irish.....	5 (3%)	Asian or Asian British - other..... 2 (1%)
	White - other.....	13 (9%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean . 7 (5%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	4 (3%)	Mixed race - white and black African..... 0 (0%)
	Black or black British - African.....	5 (3%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 0 (0%)
	Black or black British - other.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - other..... 3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	1 (1%)	Arab..... 0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	1 (1%)	Other ethnic group..... 2 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)	

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes	14 (10%)	
	No.....	131 (90%)	
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	28 (19%)	Hindu
	Church of England	69 (46%)	Jewish
	Catholic	27 (18%)	Muslim
	Protestant.....	2 (1%)	Sikh
	Other Christian denomination	14 (9%)	Other.....
	Buddhist.....	3 (2%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight	105 (72%)	
	Homosexual/Gay.....	17 (12%)	
	Bisexual.....	24 (16%)	
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)		
	Yes	49 (33%)	
	No.....	101 (67%)	
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes	1 (1%)	
	No.....	146 (99%)	
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes	80 (53%)	
	No.....	71 (47%)	
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes	79 (52%)	
	No.....	73 (48%)	

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	Less than 2 hours	54 (36%)	
	2 hours or longer	87 (57%)	
	Don't remember	11 (7%)	
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	My journey was less than two hours	54 (36%)	
	Yes	44 (29%)	
	No.....	47 (31%)	
	Don't remember	5 (3%)	
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	My journey was less than two hours	54 (36%)	
	Yes	13 (9%)	
	No.....	77 (51%)	
	Don't remember	7 (5%)	
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?		
	Yes	87 (58%)	
	No.....	52 (34%)	
	Don't remember	12 (8%)	

Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	108 (71%)
	No.....	37 (24%)
	Don't remember	7 (5%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	58 (38%)
	Well.....	62 (41%)
	Neither	24 (16%)
	Badly.....	3 (2%)
	Very badly	2 (1%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	122 (80%)
	Yes, I received written information	8 (5%)
	No, I was not told anything	20 (13%)
	Don't remember	4 (3%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	124 (82%)
	No.....	24 (16%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?			
	Less than 2 hours	86 (56%)		
	2 hours or longer	52 (34%)		
	Don't remember	15 (10%)		
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?			
	Yes	134 (89%)		
	No	13 (9%)		
	Don't remember	4 (3%)		
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well.....	48 (32%)		
	Well.....	65 (43%)		
	Neither	24 (16%)		
	Badly.....	5 (3%)		
	Very badly.....	6 (4%)		
	Don't remember	4 (3%)		
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Loss of property	15 (10%)	Physical health	31 (21%)
	Housing problems.....	37 (25%)	Mental health	46 (31%)
	Contacting employers	2 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	6 (4%)
	Contacting family	38 (25%)	Getting phone numbers.....	31 (21%)
	Childcare	9 (6%)	Other	4 (3%)
	Money worries.....	34 (23%)	Did not have any problems.....	39 (26%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	48 (32%)		

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	48 (33%)
	No.....	59 (40%)
	Did not have any problems	39 (27%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco.....	120 (80%)
	A shower	77 (51%)
	A free telephone call.....	124 (83%)
	Something to eat.....	122 (81%)
	PIN phone credit.....	77 (51%)
	Toiletries/ basic items	102 (68%)
	Did not receive anything	1 (1%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain	91 (61%)
	Someone from health services.....	102 (68%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	75 (50%)
	Prison shop/ canteen	55 (37%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	13 (9%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you	82 (57%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	71 (49%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	54 (37%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	57 (39%)
	Health services	75 (52%)
	Chaplaincy	73 (50%)
	Not offered any information.....	27 (19%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	115 (77%)
	No.....	26 (17%)
	Don't remember	8 (5%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	16 (11%)
	Within the first week.....	86 (59%)
	More than a week.....	38 (26%)
	Don't remember	7 (5%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	16 (11%)
	Yes	80 (54%)
	No.....	39 (27%)
	Don't remember	12 (8%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment.....	20 (14%)
	Within the first week.....	58 (40%)
	More than a week.....	45 (31%)
	Don't remember	22 (15%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to...						
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	23 (16%)	38 (26%)	18 (12%)	29 (20%)	14 (10%)	24 (16%)
	Attend legal visits?	24 (18%)	48 (36%)	16 (12%)	8 (6%)	3(2%)	34 (26%)
	Get bail information?	10 (8%)	14 (11%)	18 (14%)	19 (15%)	16 (12%)	53 (41%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	Not had any letters.....						24 (16%)
	Yes.....						45 (30%)
	No.....						79 (53%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	Yes.....						65 (44%)
	No.....						13 (9%)
	Don't know.....						71 (48%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		Yes	No	Don't know			
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	109 (75%)	35 (24%)	1 (1%)			
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	147 (98%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)			
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	138 (95%)	4 (3%)	3 (2%)			
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	125 (84%)	16 (11%)	7 (5%)			
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	83 (56%)	38 (26%)	27 (18%)			
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	102 (70%)	41 (28%)	2 (1%)			
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	52 (36%)	53 (37%)	40 (28%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	Very good.....						5 (3%)
	Good.....						41 (27%)
	Neither.....						42 (28%)
	Bad.....						47 (31%)
	Very bad.....						16 (11%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know.....						6 (4%)
	Yes.....						72 (48%)
	No.....						71 (48%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?						
	Yes.....						109 (73%)
	No.....						9 (6%)
	Don't know.....						32 (21%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?						
	Yes.....						97 (65%)
	No.....						16 (11%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....						37 (25%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?						
	Yes.....						108 (72%)
	No.....						11 (7%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....						32 (21%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i>	23 (15%)
<i>Very easy</i>	51 (34%)
<i>Easy</i>	42 (28%)
<i>Neither</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Difficult</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Don't know</i>	17 (11%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	127 (87%)
<i>No</i>	10 (7%)
<i>Don't know</i>	9 (6%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are applications dealt with fairly?</i>	27 (19%)	85 (61%)	27 (19%)
<i>Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	27 (20%)	61 (45%)	49 (36%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

<i>Yes</i>	94 (68%)
<i>No</i>	8 (6%)
<i>Don't know</i>	37 (27%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are complaints dealt with fairly?</i>	66 (46%)	39 (27%)	38 (27%)
<i>Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	66 (47%)	38 (27%)	35 (25%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	27 (20%)
<i>No</i>	105 (80%)

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

<i>Don't know who they are</i>	49 (33%)
<i>Very easy</i>	20 (14%)
<i>Easy</i>	19 (13%)
<i>Neither</i>	37 (25%)
<i>Difficult</i>	15 (10%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	7 (5%)

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

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	13 (9%)
<i>Yes</i>	88 (60%)
<i>No</i>	30 (20%)
<i>Don't know</i>	16 (11%)

Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>Yes</i>	80 (56%)
	<i>No</i>	37 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (10%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	134 (93%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	102 (74%)
	<i>Very well</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Well</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Neither</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Badly</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	4 (3%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	127 (88%)
	<i>No</i>	18 (12%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	125 (86%)
	<i>No</i>	21 (14%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	72 (49%)
	<i>No</i>	75 (51%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Never</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	35 (24%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	42 (28%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	29 (20%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	46 (31%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	61 (41%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	20 (14%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	46 (33%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	48 (34%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>Neither</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	9 (6%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?		
	Yes	63 (43%)	
	No.....	83 (57%)	
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?		
	Yes	17 (12%)	
	No.....	121 (88%)	
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe	83 (60%)	At meal times..... 13 (9%)
	Everywhere	8 (6%)	At health services..... 11 (8%)
	Segregation unit	4 (3%)	Visits area..... 6 (4%)
	Association areas	15 (11%)	In wing showers
	Reception area	11 (8%)	In gym showers
	At the gym	14 (10%)	In corridors/stairwells..... 12 (9%)
	In an exercise yard	9 (6%)	On your landing/wing
	At work.....	11 (8%)	In your cell
	During movement.....	19 (14%)	At religious services..... 6 (4%)
	At education	15 (11%)	
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?		
	Yes	55 (37%)	
	No.....	93 (63%)	
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	27 (18%)	
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	19 (13%)	
	Sexual abuse	5 (3%)	
	Feeling threatened or intimidated.....	39 (26%)	
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	14 (9%)	
	Medication.....	13 (9%)	
	Debt	3 (2%)	
	Drugs.....	11 (7%)	
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	5 (3%)	
	Your religion/religious beliefs	4 (3%)	
	Your nationality	4 (3%)	
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	2 (1%)	
	You are from a traveller community	3 (2%)	
	Your sexual orientation	5 (3%)	
	Your age.....	3 (2%)	
	You have a disability.....	7 (5%)	
	You were new here.....	9 (6%)	
	Your offence/ crime	7 (5%)	
	Gang related issues.....	6 (4%)	
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?		
	Yes	43 (29%)	
	No.....	104 (71%)	

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

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	18 (12%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	23 (16%)
<i>Medication</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Debt</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Drugs</i>	9 (6%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	4 (3%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (1%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	4 (3%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your age</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (4%)
<i>You were new here</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)

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

<i>Not been victimised</i>	80 (60%)
<i>Yes</i>	27 (20%)
<i>No</i>	26 (20%)

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

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	14 (10%)	17 (12%)	40 (28%)	19 (13%)	38 (26%)	17 (12%)
The nurse	11 (8%)	28 (20%)	61 (44%)	17 (12%)	16 (11%)	7 (5%)
The dentist	22 (16%)	11 (8%)	23 (16%)	9 (6%)	40 (29%)	35 (25%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	9 (6%)	24 (17%)	51 (35%)	23 (16%)	20 (14%)	17 (12%)
The nurse	9 (6%)	30 (22%)	51 (37%)	27 (19%)	12 (9%)	10 (7%)
The dentist	37 (27%)	21 (15%)	27 (20%)	23 (17%)	13 (10%)	15 (11%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	7 (5%)
<i>Very good</i>	20 (14%)
<i>Good</i>	43 (30%)
<i>Neither</i>	32 (23%)
<i>Bad</i>	27 (19%)
<i>Very bad</i>	13 (9%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

<i>Yes</i>	105 (72%)
<i>No</i>	40 (28%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	40 (27%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	26 (18%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	28 (19%)
<i>No</i>	52 (36%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	85 (59%)
	No.....	58 (41%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff.)	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems.....</i>	58 (41%)
	Yes	43 (30%)
	No.....	40 (28%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	65 (44%)
	No.....	83 (56%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	39 (27%)
	No.....	108 (73%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	18 (12%)
	Easy	21 (14%)
	Neither	6 (4%)
	Difficult.....	12 (8%)
	Very difficult.....	10 (7%)
	Don't know	78 (54%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	0 (0%)
	Easy	3 (2%)
	Neither	1 (1%)
	Difficult.....	9 (6%)
	Very difficult.....	37 (25%)
	Don't know	96 (66%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	7 (5%)
	No.....	141 (95%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	11 (7%)
	No.....	136 (93%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	80 (55%)
	Yes	53 (36%)
	No.....	13 (9%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....</i>	108 (74%)
	Yes	23 (16%)
	No.....	15 (10%)

Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	90 (64%)
	<i>Yes</i>	48 (34%)
	<i>No</i>	3 (2%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	9 (6%)	18 (13%)	37 (26%)	13 (9%)	47 (33%)	19 (13%)
	Vocational or skills training	28 (21%)	9 (7%)	37 (28%)	18 (13%)	35 (26%)	7 (5%)
	Education (including basic skills)	23 (17%)	18 (13%)	42 (31%)	18 (13%)	28 (21%)	7 (5%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	43 (32%)	9 (7%)	24 (18%)	18 (14%)	28 (21%)	11 (8%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					36 (26%)	
	Prison job.....					74 (54%)	
	Vocational or skills training.....					12 (9%)	
	Education (including basic skills).....					34 (25%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes.....					12 (9%)	
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	37 (28%)	48 (36%)	31 (23%)	16 (12%)		
	Vocational or skills training	53 (53%)	27 (27%)	10 (10%)	10 (10%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	44 (40%)	49 (45%)	10 (9%)	6 (6%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	52 (51%)	28 (27%)	12 (12%)	10 (10%)		
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					14 (10%)	
	<i>Never</i>					26 (18%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					45 (31%)	
	<i>About once a week</i>					40 (27%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i>					21 (14%)	
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>					27 (19%)	
	<i>Yes</i>					76 (53%)	
	<i>No</i>					41 (28%)	
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					38 (27%)	
	<i>0</i>					45 (32%)	
	<i>1 to 2</i>					26 (18%)	
	<i>3 to 5</i>					20 (14%)	
	<i>More than 5</i>					13 (9%)	
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					18 (13%)	
	<i>0</i>					11 (8%)	
	<i>1 to 2</i>					38 (27%)	
	<i>3 to 5</i>					30 (21%)	
	<i>More than 5</i>					46 (32%)	

Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	12 (9%)
	<i>0</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	9 (7%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	19 (14%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	94 (68%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	26 (18%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	25 (17%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	23 (16%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	19 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	20 (14%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	90 (63%)
	<i>No</i>	53 (37%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	42 (29%)
	<i>No</i>	103 (71%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	23 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	121 (84%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	24 (17%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	23 (16%)
	<i>Easy</i>	33 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	30 (21%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	25 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (1%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	27 (19%)
	<i>Yes</i>	67 (48%)
	<i>No</i>	47 (33%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	74 (51%)
	<i>No contact</i>	32 (22%)
	<i>Letter</i>	19 (13%)
	<i>Phone</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Visit</i>	23 (16%)

Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	54 (42%)
	No.....	76 (58%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Not sentenced	27 (19%)
	Yes	66 (46%)
	No.....	49 (35%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	76 (54%)
	Very involved.....	19 (13%)
	Involved	21 (15%)
	Neither	9 (6%)
	Not very involved	11 (8%)
	Not at all involved.....	5 (4%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	76 (55%)
	Nobody.....	23 (17%)
	Offender supervisor	16 (12%)
	Offender manager	13 (9%)
	Named/ personal officer	8 (6%)
	Staff from other departments	14 (10%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	76 (54%)
	Yes	45 (32%)
	No.....	7 (5%)
	Don't know	14 (10%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	76 (54%)
	Yes	11 (8%)
	No.....	36 (26%)
	Don't know	17 (12%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	76 (54%)
	Yes	17 (12%)
	No.....	27 (19%)
	Don't know	21 (15%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	23 (17%)
	No.....	45 (33%)
	Don't know	70 (51%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	Yes	29 (22%)
	No.....	100 (78%)

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

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	22 (18%)	58 (47%)	44 (35%)
Accommodation	22 (18%)	60 (49%)	41 (33%)
Benefits	16 (12%)	75 (58%)	39 (30%)
Finances	22 (18%)	49 (41%)	48 (40%)
Education	22 (19%)	51 (44%)	44 (38%)
Drugs and alcohol	27 (23%)	63 (55%)	25 (22%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i>	27 (20%)
Yes.....	69 (50%)
No.....	41 (30%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women) 2014

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

Key to tables

		HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	Local Women prisons comparator	HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		153	1012	153	146
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	7%	8%	7%	11%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	82%	77%	82%	76%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6%	6%	6%	9%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	27%	23%	27%	31%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	1%	2%	1%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13%	12%	13%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	97%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	95%	98%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	17%	20%	17%	23%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	7%	10%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	3%	6%	3%	2%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	28%	25%	28%	24%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	33%	26%	33%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1%	1%	1%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	53%	46%	53%	44%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	52%	54%	52%	52%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	57%	35%	57%	38%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	46%	45%	46%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	13%	13%	13%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	58%	62%	58%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	71%	79%	71%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	75%	79%	76%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	80%	74%	80%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%	4%	5%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	82%	81%	82%	83%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	56%	47%	56%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	89%	87%	89%	91%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	Local Women prisons comparator	HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	HMP Peterborough 2011
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	74%	74%	76%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	74%	76%	74%	80%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	10%	13%	10%	11%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	25%	28%	25%	26%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	2%	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	25%	30%	25%	36%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	6%	7%	6%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	23%	25%	23%	27%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	35%	32%	33%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	21%	23%	21%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	31%	29%	31%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	6%	4%	6%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	21%	28%	21%	28%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	45%	51%	45%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	80%	83%	80%	87%
3.6	A shower?	51%	46%	51%	21%
3.6	A free telephone call?	83%	80%	83%	88%
3.6	Something to eat?	81%	83%	81%	75%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	51%	57%	51%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	68%	77%	68%	
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:					
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	61%	50%	61%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	69%	70%	69%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	50%	43%	50%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	37%	22%	37%	16%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	57%	50%	57%	45%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	49%	51%	49%	53%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	37%	40%	37%	38%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	39%	40%	39%	49%
3.8	Health services?	52%	52%	52%	47%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	51%	48%	51%	51%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	Local Women prisons comparator	HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	77%	73%	77%	80%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	89%	86%	89%	90%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	61%	59%	61%	56%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	86%	80%	86%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	42%	45%	42%	41%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	54%	61%	54%	57%
4.1	Get bail information?	19%	27%	19%	24%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	30%	41%	30%	25%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	44%	48%	44%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	75%	72%	75%	54%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	91%	98%	90%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	95%	89%	95%	95%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	84%	83%	84%	82%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	56%	49%	56%	61%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	70%	66%	70%	65%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	36%	31%	36%	30%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	31%	26%	31%	31%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48%	48%	48%	51%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	73%	68%	73%	62%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	59%	65%	58%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	72%	64%	72%	62%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	61%	52%	61%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	81%	87%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	76%	65%	76%	62%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	56%	47%	56%	46%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	68%	65%	68%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	51%	46%	51%	50%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	52%	46%	52%	46%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	15%	20%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	26%	35%	26%	24%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	60%	51%	60%	49%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	Local Women prisons comparator	HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	56%	50%	56%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	5%	7%	7%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	50%	60%	50%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	88%	79%	88%	90%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	86%	81%	86%	82%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	49%	44%	49%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	48%	21%	48%	43%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	69%	60%	69%	71%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	68%	73%	68%	74%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	43%	41%	43%	45%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	15%	12%	15%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	37%	35%	37%	27%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18%	17%	18%	15%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	7%	13%	7%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	26%	23%	26%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	9%	7%	9%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	9%	5%	9%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	1%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	8%	3%	8%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	3%	1%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	2%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	4%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	9%	6%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	8%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	3%	4%	2%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	25%	29%	15%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	Local Women prisons comparator	HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	10%	12%	7%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	11%	16%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	6%	6%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	1%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	3%	6%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	3%	1%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	6%	2%	6%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	4%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	51%	55%	51%	40%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	39%	32%	39%	25%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	64%	58%	64%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	24%	17%	24%	12%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	56%	52%	56%	41%
9.2	The nurse?	62%	64%	62%	65%
9.2	The dentist?	49%	46%	49%	38%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	47%	46%	47%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	72%	73%	72%	61%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	51%	50%	51%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	59%	52%	59%	48%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	52%	55%	52%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	Local Women prisons comparator	HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	44%	42%	44%	44%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	26%	31%	26%	34%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	25%	27%	23%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	2%	4%	2%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	5%	6%	5%	5%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	8%	6%	8%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	80%	82%	80%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	61%	78%	61%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	94%	83%	94%	72%
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	38%	49%	38%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	34%	44%	34%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	44%	59%	44%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	32%	25%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	54%	55%	54%	72%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	9%	14%	9%	14%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	25%	37%	25%	24%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	9%	16%	9%	4%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	72%	80%	72%	87%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	51%	57%	51%	58%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	47%	71%	47%	64%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	57%	59%	57%	63%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	60%	81%	60%	76%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	75%	69%	75%	66%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	49%	67%	49%	56%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	56%	62%	56%	56%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42%	49%	42%	36%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	53%	52%	53%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	23%	23%	23%	20%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	53%	35%	53%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	55%	68%	67%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	Local Women prisons comparator	HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	13%	16%	13%	17%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	63%	53%	63%	63%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	29%	39%	29%	35%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	16%	21%	16%	16%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	39%	32%	39%	
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	59%	62%	59%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	46%	33%	46%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	27%	27%	27%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	13%	12%	13%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	33%	48%	33%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	42%	44%	42%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	57%	53%	57%	37%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	62%	68%	62%	77%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	39%	31%	39%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	26%	36%	26%	
13.6	Offender manager?	21%	28%	21%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	13%	17%	13%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	22%	20%	22%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	68%	77%	68%	79%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	17%	25%	18%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	26%	36%	26%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	17%	7%	17%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	23%	23%	23%	25%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	57%	41%	57%	
13.12	Accommodation?	59%	56%	59%	
13.12	Benefits?	66%	59%	66%	
13.12	Finances?	51%	35%	51%	
13.12	Education?	54%	44%	54%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	72%	65%	72%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	63%	57%	63%	58%

Diversity analysis



Question responses (ethnicity and foreign national) HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women) 2014

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		25	124	20	130
1.3	Are you sentenced?	76%	83%	76%	83%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	29%	10%		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	95%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	91%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			37%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	11%	10%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	0%	0%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	30%	34%	16%	36%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	52%	52%	84%	48%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	84%	77%	60%	81%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	82%	84%	79%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	92%	84%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	61%	77%	79%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	71%	75%	69%	74%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	59%	69%	60%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	76%	79%	56%	80%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	89%	91%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	40%	42%	42%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	70%	75%	91%	72%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	97%	100%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	50%	57%	26%	60%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	13%	35%	30%	29%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	25%	53%	21%	52%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	75%	39%	78%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	87%	60%	56%	66%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	80%	72%	71%	72%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	88%	71%	90%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	78%	65%	60%	69%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	57%	61%	36%	64%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	57%	21%	61%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	7%	5%	7%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	92%	88%	91%	87%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	88%	96%	84%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	43%	48%	20%	54%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	65%	69%	50%	72%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	43%	42%	44%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	13%	18%	12%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	37%	36%	24%	39%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	22%	27%	9%	29%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	2%	4%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	4%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	3%	4%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	6%	0%	6%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	22%	29%	16%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	8%	16%	5%	17%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	8%	3%	10%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	3%	5%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	4%	4%	0%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	31%	40%	31%	40%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	61%	64%	53%	65%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	75%	72%	69%	73%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	52%	61%	37%	63%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	26%	28%	10%	29%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	47%	55%	47%	55%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	4%	10%	11%	8%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	28%	24%	24%	25%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	9%	8%	5%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	50%	41%	68%	39%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	22%	24%	33%	21%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	52%	53%	37%	55%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	60%	71%	24%	75%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	8%	14%	0%	15%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	26%	30%	31%	29%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	8%	18%	21%	14%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP and YOI Peterborough 2014

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

Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		49	101	16	135
1.3	Are you sentenced?	77%	84%	100%	80%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	16%	25%	12%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	15%	17%	6%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	12%	8%	6%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	4%	0%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	-	-	50%	31%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	0%	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	61%	88%	49%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	82%	89%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	84%	80%	94%	78%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	91%	100%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	76%	89%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	84%	69%	56%	76%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	71%	67%	61%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	76%	88%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	92%	100%	88%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	44%	40%	42%	42%

Key to tables

Diversity Analysis

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	66%	79%	100%	72%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	99%	100%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	62%	53%	53%	57%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	27%	32%	33%	29%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	47%	50%	48%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	72%	73%	81%	72%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	71%	61%	75%	64%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	76%	70%	89%	70%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	93%	83%	89%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	64%	70%	39%	71%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	51%	65%	63%	60%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	62%	42%	57%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	6%	0%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	91%	86%	81%	88%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	81%	88%	100%	84%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	45%	50%	33%	50%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	64%	71%	81%	68%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	45%	43%	33%	45%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	16%	11%	0%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	56%	29%	25%	39%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	46%	17%	25%	27%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	3%	6%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	2%	6%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	3%	0%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	4%	1%	6%	1%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	15%	0%	6%	5%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	23%	37%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	29%	9%	19%	16%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	2%	4%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	3%	6%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	4%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	4%	3%	6%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	10%	1%	6%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%	45%	44%	39%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	66%	64%	53%	65%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	96%	62%	63%	74%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	91%	45%	53%	60%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	19%	31%	12%	29%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	45%	58%	65%	53%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	9%	7%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	31%	22%	13%	26%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	9%	9%	0%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	41%	43%	75%	38%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	18%	26%	6%	26%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	52%	54%	37%	54%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	71%	68%	44%	72%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	18%	12%	25%	12%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	27%	11%	32%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	9%	20%	6%	17%

Diversity analysis



Question responses (sexual orientation) HMP and YOI Peterborough (Women) 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		41	105
1.3	Are you sentenced?	88%	80%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	17%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	14%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	8%	11%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	39%	30%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	29%	63%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	73%	82%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	80%	83%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	91%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	69%	78%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	88%	68%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	67%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	48%	40%

Key to tables

Diversity analysis

		Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	77%	75%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	67%	52%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22%	35%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	48%	49%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	71%	75%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	63%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	70%	75%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	92%	86%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	81%	62%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	59%	64%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	64%	55%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	91%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	90%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	45%	49%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	67%	71%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	53%	37%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	9%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	49%	31%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	34%	23%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	2%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By prisoners)	12%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	2%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	10%	3%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	48%	22%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	18%	14%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	2%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By staff)	18%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	2%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	5%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	40%	41%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	67%	65%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	85%	66%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	79%	51%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	23%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	64%	51%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	11%	8%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	36%	22%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	20%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39%	44%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	25%	23%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50%	55%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	67%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	10%	15%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	36%	26%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	21%	14%