

Report on an announced inspection of the prison,
police custody suites and border agency customs custody
suites in

Guernsey

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

12–15 May 2014

Glossary of terms

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

Crown copyright 2014

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

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

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

This publication is available for download at: <http://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/>

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Report A. Inspection of Guernsey Prison	9
Fact page	9
About this inspection and report	11
Summary	13
Section 1. Safety	21
Section 2. Respect	33
Section 3. Purposeful activity	47
Section 4. Resettlement	53
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	61
Appendix I: Inspection team	67
Appendix II: Prison population profile	69
Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	77
Report B. Inspection of police custody suites in Guernsey	93
Fact page	93
Background and key findings	95
Section 6. Strategy	97
Section 7. Treatment and conditions	99
Section 8. Individual rights	105
Section 9. Health care	109
Section 10. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	113
Appendix I: Inspection team	117

Report C. Inspection visit of Border Agency customs custody suites in Guernsey	119
Fact page	119
Background and key findings	121
Section 11. Strategy	123
Section 12. Treatment and conditions	125
Section 13. Individual rights	131
Section 14. Health care	135
Section 15. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	137
Appendix I: Inspection team	139
Annex: Prisoner survey responses	141

Introduction

Our invitation from Guernsey Home Department to inspect the prison, police, border agency and court custody on the island provided a rare opportunity to see the whole system in operation. Although the inspection was by invitation and announced rather than as of right, in all other respects it followed our normal inspection process.

In many respects, what we saw provided an exemplar of what can be achieved by well coordinated services and is a powerful reminder of how good a small prison can be. Of course, the small size of the island assisted with this, but that should not detract from giving credit to those responsible for these services.

The most serious and glaring anomaly to this otherwise positive picture was that five children, two just 15 years old, were held alongside adults in the prison and arrangements for dealing with children in police custody were inadequate. This breached fundamental international standards and was to the serious detriment of the individual children we met on this inspection, despite the best efforts of the governor and staff in the prison to improve the situation. The detention of children alongside adults would not happen in any other European country and few others worldwide. I urge the authorities in Guernsey to take urgent action to ensure this situation is not repeated.

All four of the agencies we inspected were overseen by the Home Department, and coordination was mostly good, and improving. The police and Guernsey Border Agency (GBA) were actively cooperating to develop shared work practices and facilities, and they had plans to go further with joint custody facilities. Prison staff ran the court cell complex, and most aspects of reception to the prison were conducted at court prior to movement to the prison, thus aiding the transition. There were good strategic relationships between senior managers at the prison and the police. There were also strong links between the prison offender management unit and the island probation services, which were resulting in very good outcomes, both in terms of risk management work and supporting prisoners in addressing their offending behaviour.

While the coordination of agencies overseen by the Home Department was good, our concerns about children reflected inadequate coordination between some agencies overseen by other departments. There was completely inadequate support from the school for the boys in the prison, and resettlement efforts were hindered by a lack of accommodation for offenders.

In other jurisdictions, coordination across a range of government departments has been a crucial part of the rehabilitation process and by reducing reoffending, benefits the community as a whole. The effective coordination of agencies with the Home Department shows what can be done and there would be real benefit in extending that approach to other relevant departments.

Guernsey Prison

In addition to children, the prison held a wide variety of individuals. The 98 prisoners the prison held at the time of this inspection included 79 men, six women, seven young men and one young woman aged between 18 and 20, and the five children already mentioned. The prisoners were held for a wide variety of offences and were serving sentences ranging from a few weeks to life. Prisoners ranged in age from 15 to 69.

The mix of prisoners held was a considerable challenge but very good relationships between staff and prisoners in a small establishment meant that prisoners' individual circumstances could usually be addressed, which mitigated some of the difficulties.

Staff evidently cared for the children in the prison and treated them kindly. The two younger boys were kept apart from all other prisoners and had a member of staff with them at all times. However, their accommodation, in what had previously been the women's segregation unit, was unacceptably cramped and much worse than any other accommodation in the prison. The two boys were due to take their GCSE examinations, which would be critical to their future life-chances. However, despite the fact their school was situated local to the prison, and despite the best efforts of the prison, inadequate arrangements had been made by the States of Guernsey Educational Department and the school for the boys to take their exams, or to prepare them to do so. It took a determined effort by the inspection team to rectify this situation. The prison had good child protection procedures and, in contrast to the States of Guernsey Educational Department, received good support from social services. However, no thought had been given to developing physical restraints or considering discipline processes that, should it be necessary to use them, were effective and safe for children. The very close proximity in which these two younger boys had to spend their days was clearly an issue for them, although one of the boys was due to be released before the other and this would raise the contrary problem of isolating the remaining boy. If a girl of the same age was also held at the prison it was impossible to see how this could be managed in a way that was at all acceptable. The three older children were held with the young adults. Given the circumstances of the prison, this was the most pragmatic solution, although it was far from ideal.

It was not desirable that women were held in a prison with men. Policies to address their specific needs had begun a month or two before the inspection and these needed to be continued. A small team headed by a senior officer had been established to manage the new women's policy and these staff were known to the women prisoners. The generally very good relationships that characterised the prison as a whole meant that outcomes for the women were reasonable and better than we often see in prisons in England. Nevertheless, women in the prison were disadvantaged compared with men and their specific needs were not always adequately considered. Few staff had any training on working with women prisoners and we were concerned that there was not always a trained female officer on duty at night. At a recent consultation event, women had raised basic issues such as the provision of sanitary items. Women had poorer access to the gym and fewer purposeful activities than men. Maternity care was adequate and although there was no mother and baby unit on the island, mothers could have their babies brought in to the prison to spend the day with them.

The effective reception process was continued with good first night arrangements, although induction needed to improve. Most prisoners felt safe and there were few problematic incidents. Arrangements to separate prisoners who were vulnerable because of their offence were effective, but some still felt unsafe. Support for the small number of prisoners deemed vulnerable to self-harm was also good. Security was well managed, as was the use of force, which was rare. Segregation was used only as a last resort and overall governance of discipline areas was good. Demand for illicit drugs was low, and some good support was offered, although inflexible opiate substitution prescribing processes created some risks.

Living conditions in the prison were generally decent and the practicalities of daily life were well managed. Prisoners were particularly positive about the food they received. The very good relationships between staff and prisoners ensured that most issues were quickly and informally resolved. Inevitably on a small island, some staff and prisoners had known each other outside the prison but this was sensibly managed to ensure that it did not compromise professional relationships. In addition to women and children, more needed to be done to ensure the needs of prisoners from other minority groups were understood and met; and that they obtained equivalent outcomes to the population as a whole. Prisoners were unusually negative about aspects of support for those with a faith. There were practical difficulties in meeting the requirements of some minority faiths and there were indications of some religious tensions between prisoners which needed to be investigated further. Health provision was generally good and took account of the specific needs of the women and children held. Vulnerable adults were sometimes sent to the prison as 'a place of safety'; the prison was not able to adequately cope with these individuals' needs and this was an inappropriate and dangerous practice.

Time out of cell was better than we usually see, but there were shortfalls in the leadership and management of learning and skills. Meeting the needs of the various groups in the prison was complex, but a greater focus was required on understanding the needs of the various groups in the prison, and in providing a broad-based curriculum to meet these needs. There were insufficient work and educational opportunities for women and vulnerable prisoners. However, the educational and training provision provided by prison staff and Guernsey College of Further Education was good, and managers had high aspirations for all groups of prisoners. There was some outstanding teaching, and volunteers from the community played a very useful role. PE provision was good and recent football matches with local community teams were a good initiative.

Resettlement work benefited from excellent joint working between the prison Offender Management Unit and the external probation services. This provided a strong coordinated approach to identifying risk of harm and coordinating action to manage or reduce the risk. Some very good practical support was offered to prisoners in addressing issues of need and risk, including release on temporary licence (ROTL) opportunities, support in maintaining relationships with children and families, and a wide range of interventions. Managers were seeking to address challenges in finding good quality and sustainable accommodation on release, but this reflected wider issues with housing stock and affordability on the island.

Guernsey prison was much improved from our last full inspection in 2005 and the short follow-up inspection that we carried out in 2009. Managers and staff are to be congratulated on the progress they have made. Those areas of most concern, particularly the detention of children in the prison, are not under their direct control and local managers have responded sensitively and thoughtfully to the challenges that this creates. Nevertheless, there are still areas of improvement that the prison itself can make and we hope that this inspection will assist the Guernsey authorities in making the major policy changes that are required.

Police

We inspected the custody suite at Police headquarters in St Peter Port. The Bailiwick of Guernsey also had small custody suites on the islands of Alderney and Sark. We did not formally inspect these small island 'prisons', but as they were in occasional use we suggest the authorities on the three islands work together to ensure that when they are used, this can be done safely and securely.

As in the other facilities we inspected, good relationships between staff and detainees, and individual treatment mitigated some of the weaknesses in the facilities and procedures we found. We were concerned that one child under 18 had been held overnight in the cells and that procedures to manage the specific needs of women and children were inadequate. Custody staff had not received relevant child protection training and women detainees were not offered the opportunity to speak to a female staff member, asked if they were pregnant or offered feminine hygiene products.

These weaknesses were, in part, a reflection of the inadequacies of the paper-based custody record system that did not record all relevant matters and risks, and that checks were not always made on the police national computer for warning markers before a detainee was placed in a cell. We found that the cell call bell system had been muted and staff on duty were unaware of this. There were many ligature points in cells and the layout of the custody suite was poor. Rousing checks on detainees who were intoxicated or vulnerable in other ways were not carried out in accordance with the force's own procedure. In one case an adult under the influence of alcohol who should have been visited and roused every 30 minutes was left for five hours with no checks recorded. Basic facilities were just adequate and the cells were cold but clean. We were not assured that the provision of clothing for those who needed it was adequate and detainees could not shower in private.

Arrangements to ensure that detainees' individual rights and legal requirements were adhered to were adequate. The provision of 'appropriate adults' for children was good. There were frequent delays in accessing court slots which was an exception to the generally good working relationships between the two agencies.

The medical room did not comply with relevant infection control standards. Medicines management was poor and in particular the management of controlled drugs needed to improve immediately. The forensic medical examiner provided a satisfactory and prompt service and there was good provision for emergencies. The custody suite was used too often as a place of safety for individuals with mental health problems.

The strategy for improvement, and the development of new facilities for the police and Guernsey Border Agency, was very welcome and necessary. However, in the short and medium term we found sloppy processes that created significant risks for individual detainees and affected the reputation of the force. Ligation points, a lack of rousing, muted call bells and poor record keeping were areas of trouble waiting to happen. On a day to day basis good individual relationships mitigated these risks but this needed to be quickly underpinned by implementing consistent procedures.

Guernsey Border Agency (GBA)

We inspected the GBA at White Rock in St Peter Port. This was mainly used for 'swallowers' – detainees who were suspected of smuggling drug packages by swallowing them to retrieve later. Apart from addressing the crime that this involved, the practice posed an obvious risk to the individual. On the whole, the GBA was well managed. Individuals suspected of other offences were transferred quickly to police custody. Plans to develop joint custody arrangements with the police would be an important improvement.

GBA staff were trained in the role they had to perform, but had little guidance about what was expected of them when working in custody. As with the police, custody record keeping required improvement. Nevertheless, staff were competent and conditions acceptable. More thought needed to be given to reducing the indignity of some of the processes involved. Medical services were appropriate.

Overall, these are encouraging inspections which demonstrate clearly the opportunities of good joined-up working and shared resources. Some challenges remain in all of the contexts we inspected and in some cases there is a risk that the small scale of the custodial settings becomes an excuse for a lack of appropriate care for some prisoners, and for sloppy and risky processes. We hope that the recommendations made in these reports assist the relevant authorities in making difficult decisions about the allocation of resources, and the services themselves, to improve further.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

November 2014

Report A. Inspection of Guernsey Prison

Fact page

Task of the establishment

The Guernsey Prison Service serves the public by keeping in custody those legally committed to its care. Its duty is to look after them with decency and to help them lead law-abiding lives in custody and after release.

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

Public

Region/Department

The Guernsey Prison Service is accountable to the Guernsey Home Department.

Number held

98 (79 adult men, six adult women, seven young men, one young women and five male young people/children)

Certified normal accommodation

130

Operational capacity

139

Date of last full inspection

Full inspection: 17 June – 1 July 2005

Short follow-up: 17 – 19 March 2009

Brief history

The present prison was opened in 1989 to replace the original prison in St Peter Port. As the only prison on the island, it is obliged to hold adults, young offenders and juvenile males and females, sentenced and unsentenced, and vulnerable prisoners.

Short description of residential units

There were 11 residential wings:

- A- Resettlement (maximum capacity 12)
- B- Vulnerable prisoners (maximum capacity 12)
- C- Women (maximum capacity 8)
- D- Women (maximum capacity 7)
- E- Juveniles and young adults (maximum capacity 6)
- F- Adult males (maximum capacity 14)
- G- Adult males (maximum capacity 6)
- H- Vulnerable prisoners (maximum capacity 14)
- I- Adult males (maximum capacity 13)
- J- Adult males (maximum capacity 44)
- K- Unoccupied
- L- Children (maximum capacity 2)

Name of governor/director

David Matthews

Escort contractor

Guernsey Prison Service escorts its own prisoners using prison custody officers.

Health service provider

Health and Social Services Department

Learning and skills providers

The prison employs its own head of learning and skills. The tutors are currently employed by the College of Further Education.

Independent Monitoring Panel chair

Jim Neill

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, court and border force custody and military detention.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons in England and Wales 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 Guernsey is not covered by OPCAT but the local Independent Monitoring Panel (IMP) provides regular scrutiny of facilities. HMI Prisons was invited by the States of Guernsey Home Department to undertake inspections of prison, police, court and border agency custody consistent with our inspections in England and Wales.

A4 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.

A5 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 Home Department.

- **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.

In this inspection we made separate judgements for adults and children.

A6 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.

A7 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.

A8 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances (or other jurisdictions). 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 inspection follows a short follow-up inspection and does not report directly on progress made against the previous recommendations.

This report

A9 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*. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection.

A10 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and II respectively.

A11 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix III of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

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

Summary

Safety

- S1** *Most reception procedures were carried out at court, which speeded up the process. Escorts were well managed. First night arrangements were good but induction was not sufficiently well coordinated. Most prisoners felt safe and there were few fights, assaults or incidents of self-harm. Support for prisoners deemed vulnerable was good. Adult safeguarding arrangements were informal but met needs. The prison was not a suitable environment for children and not equipped to meet their needs. Security arrangements were appropriate. Formal disciplinary procedures were applied appropriately and force and segregation were rarely used. Elements of substance misuse detoxification were too inflexible. **Outcomes for adult prisoners were good and for children were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** The court cells included safer cell features, were clean and had good facilities. The prison custody officer team included male and female officers, and was friendly and relaxed. Reception processes started at court, which speeded up the process. Journeys to and from the courts were well managed and there were appropriate arrangements to separate different populations.
- S3** The number of prisoners passing through prison reception was low, and arrivals were staggered. Prisoners in our survey and our groups were positive about their experiences in reception.
- S4** First night cells were clean and prisoners were helped to settle in. The community feel of the prison was supportive and most prisoners said that they had felt safe on their first night. Fewer vulnerable prisoners than their mainstream counterparts felt safe, which might have been because of the lack of staff supervision on their wings, in addition to their status.
- S5** There was no formal structured induction course. Records did not assure us that all prisoners were seen by all relevant departments in a timely fashion; however, the generally supportive relationships between prisoners and staff helped to mitigate this.
- S6** Overall, prisoners were well behaved and few felt unsafe. There were few fights or assaults, and no serious assaults. Most incidents were low level, involving threats. Few prisoners reached the second of the three stages of the anti-bullying process. This process included regular monitoring and reviews. The level of supervision on the wings was limited. We had some concerns about how prisoners locked on the wings could communicate with staff, but the planned in-cell telephone system would potentially address this.
- S7** There had been no self-inflicted deaths in custody for 10 years. Internal investigations had been completed into two deaths post-release and also a serious near-fatal incident which had led to the introduction of more effective anti-ligature knives. No external investigations into these deaths had been carried out. There were low levels of self-harm. An average of four assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents were opened each month. These demonstrated good care and input from staff from a range of disciplines. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) felt well supported by the prison and were accessible to all prisoners.

- S8 There were no formal adult safeguarding procedures but local knowledge of individuals and existing procedures, including initial assessments, offender management case discussions and weekly risk management meetings, were adequate for identifying and supporting adults who might need protection. The prison had occasionally been used as a place of safety for adults, which was inappropriate.
- S9 At the time of the inspection, five children under 18 years of age were being held. The prison was not a suitable environment in which to hold children. The living conditions for two 15-year-old boys were unacceptably cramped. We were told by the prison that the States of Guernsey Education Department had failed to ensure that the statutory educational needs of the children were being met. Critical procedures, such as behaviour management (including restraint), had not been adapted to meet the needs of children. Staff lacked sufficient training and expertise in dealing with this age group. However, within the constraints of an adult prison, staff made good efforts to provide a suitable regime. Help was given to sustain family links, including regular contact with the youth justice workers. The older children had been risk assessed to live in a supportive environment on E wing with young adults. A recently published child protection policy included the management of children, contact with and protection from adults who might pose a risk, and the procedures for referring on concerns. Arrangements for children subject to, or previously under, the care of social services were good.
- S10 Security measures were proportionate and good efforts were made to keep different groups apart and safe. A reasonable amount of security information was analysed well and the required actions were carried out quickly. Routine strip-searching had ceased. Key security areas requiring attention were identified at the monthly security meeting, with relevant longer-term objectives set, and actions were followed up.
- S11 Drug testing positive rates were low and there were few finds. In our survey, less than half the comparator said that it was easy to get drugs.
- S12 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was used appropriately to deal with less serious infringements of the rules. Reviews for the few on the basic regime were not well documented and did not show why a prisoner should remain on this level.
- S13 The number of adjudications was low. Records generally showed a full investigation into the incidents concerned, although some charges could have been better dealt with using IEP processes. Levels of use of force were low. Monitoring was undertaken at the risk management meeting but there were insufficient incidents to identify any trends. Documentation was well completed and showed that force was justified, and de-escalation was evident.
- S14 The segregation unit had been used only three times in the previous six months, and had been appropriately authorised and justified. The unit was clean and well maintained. Prisoners had not been held there long enough for formal review processes to take place but some care planning was put in place when required. Special accommodation was rarely used.
- S15 Elements of substance misuse detoxification were inflexible, and this created the potential for behavioural problems and risks to safety. However, some good services were offered, although there was insufficient integration of clinical and psychosocial services.

Respect

S16 *Living conditions were good. Staff–prisoner relationships were strong and based on mutual respect. Aspects of equality and diversity support were underdeveloped. The lack of discrete accommodation for women led to some of their needs being subordinated to those of the majority. Arrangements for mothers and babies were appropriate. Faith provision was inadequate. Responses to complaints were good and legal services were adequate. Health services were good. Prisoners were positive about the food provided, and shop arrangements were appropriate. **Outcomes for adult prisoners and children alike were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

- S17** Wings, cells and the external environment were clean. Cells were satisfactory, other than for the younger children. Prisoners could wear their own clothing and laundry facilities were adequate, although the dryer on J wing had been out of order for some time. Access to showers was good. Most showers had been refurbished and were clean but not all were adequately screened.
- S18** There were sufficient telephones on all wings and access to them was good. The initiative to introduce in-cell telephones was positive. Application forms were freely available and prisoners in our survey were positive about how they were dealt with.
- S19** Staff–prisoner relationships were generally very good. Many staff and prisoners had knowledge of each other, which encouraged trust and mutual respect. In our survey, most prisoners said that they had someone they could turn to for help, and all had an allocated personal officer and a deputy. The electronic case-note system was generally used well to make a record of events but too many comments were about negative behaviour, and opportunities to credit good behaviour were sometimes missed.
- S20** The management of equality and diversity had improved. Many staff had received appropriate training and key post holders, including peer workers, were enthusiastic and committed. Equality incident forms had only recently been introduced and were not readily available to prisoners. The number of incidents reported had increased in recent months as awareness of diversity issues had improved. Action to manage these incidents had been proportionate but there was scope to improve scrutiny and oversight. The published strategy was limited, and did not explain how prisoners would be practically supported, and there was little focus on the specific needs of the various groups held. Overall, we saw a bespoke approach to managing individual needs when identified, although processes to identify needs were inadequate. There was no monitoring of outcomes for minority groups to ensure that needs were identified and addressed, and there was little evidence of the promotion of diversity.
- S21** The approach to foreign nationals was good, with regular consultation meetings and use of professional interpreters, but there was no independent immigration advice.
- S22** A recent survey conducted by the prison had identified that some prisoners did not feel their religious beliefs were respected. Our survey confirmed that these negative perceptions existed, particularly on J wing.
- S23** The prison had identified only two prisoners with disabilities, fewer than our survey suggested, and more work was needed to provide assurance that their needs were being met. There was limited specific support for older prisoners, although we did not identify any particular disadvantage for this group.

- S24 The lack of discrete accommodation for women meant that their needs were inevitably subordinated to those of the majority, and we were concerned that staff did not understand the specific needs of women in custody. However, despite this, outcomes for them were generally reasonable.
- S25 Mothers with babies were encouraged to take up 'mother and baby' places on the mainland but, as an alternative, their babies could spend the day with them in visits, although this happened infrequently.
- S26 There were no openly gay men or lesbians amongst the prisoners, although our survey suggested that there was one such prisoner. No specific support or information was offered for this group.
- S27 Religious provision was reasonable for the Christian majority, with a number of weekly worship and study opportunities. However, Sunday services were only available fortnightly for vulnerable prisoners and there was no Roman Catholic mass. Provision for minority faiths was limited because so few were represented on the island.
- S28 Prisoners had good access to the complaints system. Procedures were appropriate and timely. It was notable that 29% of complaints made in the previous six months had been upheld. Replies were respectful and well explained.
- S29 There was no designated legal services officer. Prisoners' access to advocates was facilitated through the offender management unit (OMU) and all calls to advocates were free of charge.
- S30 Prisoners were generally satisfied with the health services provided. A new reporting mechanism had been introduced recently, which would strengthen governance arrangements. The health care environment, infection control compliance and cleanliness were of a high standard.
- S31 Confidentiality at the medicines administration hatch could not be guaranteed; the area was subject to intermittent excessive noise from the food servery queue. There was a high level of preparedness for medical emergencies but in a recent event the time for emergency services to get from the gate to the wing had been excessive.
- S32 There was good access to primary care professionals, although the waiting time for the optician was sometimes too long. Gender- and age-appropriate assessment, screening and treatment were available but prisoners could not always access a GP of a specified gender. Mental health care was appropriate to the needs of the population.
- S33 Most prisoners said that the food was good. Menus were varied, portion sizes were ample and catering staff responded well to special dietary needs.
- S34 The prison shop was a local prison-run service that offered a wide range of items for purchase. Prisoners could place an interim order on arrival, before they got the chance to make their first full shop order. The catalogue service worked well and prisoners could order newspapers.

Purposeful activity

S35 *Prisoners had a good amount of predictable time out of cell. Managing the education, training and needs of various groups within the population was complex, and required improvement. There was inadequate use of data to improve the effectiveness of the education and training. Arrangements to help young people to prepare for their imminent GCSE exams were poor, although other support was good. Most prisoners had access to part-time work, training or education. Too few vocational training opportunities were offered, and there were insufficient education and work opportunities for women and vulnerable prisoners. The quality of teaching was good, with some outstanding aspects. Education outcomes were good overall. Library provision was adequate and the gym offered a wide range of opportunities. **Outcomes for adult prisoners were reasonably good and for children were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

- S36** Most prisoners had over 10 hours out of cell from Monday to Thursday, and around seven hours on Fridays and at weekends. Only a few unemployed prisoners were locked up during the working day. Exercise was available daily but on weekdays it was for only 30 minutes. The exercise areas for vulnerable prisoners and women were much less attractive than the field generally used by the main population.
- S37** The leadership and management of learning and skills required improvement across work, vocational training and education areas. There were insufficient vocational training opportunities but plans to develop additional vocational qualifications were well developed. There was inadequate support from the States of Guernsey Education Department for children with imminent GCSE examinations, although other aspects delivered by the prison were good. Data were not sufficiently well analysed or used to improve the effectiveness of the education and training, including the sub-contracted provision. The accommodation provided in the new learning and skills centre was very good and an appropriate range of information learning technology was provided. Most prisoners had access to part-time work, training or education.
- S38** The quality of teaching and support for learning was good, with some outstanding aspects, and learners improved their confidence in English and mathematics. Learners made at least adequate progress in lessons overall. There was good use of volunteer tutors in education areas to support, help and coach prisoners. The range and breadth of education and work opportunities for women and vulnerable prisoners was inadequate. Some work was insufficiently challenging to fill a working day, although it helped to foster confidence and self-esteem.
- S39** There were good pass rates for external examinations, and standards of work in art were particularly good. Learners developed useful social skills, engaged well with the prison regime and enjoyed their learning. There was little recognition of previous attainment and progress in non-accredited courses.
- S40** The library had recently re-opened after refurbishment. There were effective arrangements to access materials from other libraries but the range of legal materials was limited. There were few materials to support education or training, or in languages other than English.
- S41** The PE facilities were very good. Prisoners had good access to the gym. A range of recreational PE courses and vocational qualifications was offered but the sports field was unusable because of recent poor maintenance. There was good promotion of team sports.

Resettlement

S42 *The prison had a good understanding of the resettlement needs of the population. Release on temporary licence was used well to support resettlement and family contact. Offender management arrangements were very good, and nearly all prisoners had either a custody or sentence plan. Public protection arrangements were well developed. Categorisation was managed appropriately. The lack of suitable accommodation for ex-prisoners was a significant problem. Reintegration work was generally strong and some good support was offered to assist prisoners to maintain contact with family and friends. **Outcomes for adult prisoners and children alike were good against this healthy prison test.***

S43 The OMU was well established. Staff were well trained and confident, and knew prisoners well. All prisoners were quickly allocated to an offender manager and an offender supervisor, and were seen regularly. Nearly all had a sentence or custody plan. Categorisation reviews were up to date and provided a good marker of progress, and release on temporary licence was used well to support resettlement and family contact. Public protection measures, including multi-agency risk management and child protection processes, were robust and restrictions were explained to prisoners.

S44 Fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments knew where to find advice on accommodation, benefits and finance; however, resettlement needs were addressed through initial assessments undertaken by an offender supervisor.

S45 In a recent six-month period, only one out of 68 prisoners released had not had an address. Managers had identified that the quality and sustainability of some accommodation needed improvement, and a meeting with statutory and local services providers was planned to address this.

S46 Insufficient careers advice and guidance were given.

S47 Pre-release health support was appropriate. There was no palliative care/end-of-life protocol. Links with local drug and alcohol agencies and preparation for release for substance users were very good.

S48 Offender supervisors provided debt advice and assistance, and a money management course was available. Local banks were uninterested in helping prisoners to open bank accounts.

S49 The prison routinely collected information about prisoners' children and assessed need. Visits were relaxed and welcoming, if slightly cramped. Regular children's visits took place, run by volunteers with the support of a variety of community groups. There were several good initiatives to help prisoners maintain or re-establish contact with their family and friends, including family therapy. The 'cabin' was a valuable resource to support work with families and other areas of resettlement.

S50 A variety of group and one-to-one offending behaviour interventions was available, including a restorative justice scheme. However, there was no analysis of their effectiveness.

S51 Provision for those who had been involved in prostitution or were victims of abuse, rape or domestic violence was not sufficiently promoted but some individual support was provided.

Main concerns and recommendations

S52 Concern: Children sentenced to a custodial sentence on the island were held at the main prison, which also held both adult male and female prisoners. Mixing children with adult prisoners breached fundamental international standards for the treatment of children and involved staff having to make unacceptable compromises to keep them safe and ensure their welfare. Some important arrangements for managing adult prisoners, such as those related to the use of force, were inappropriate for children.

Recommendation: Children under 18 years of age should not be held in an adult prison (see also police main recommendation B19).

S53 Concern: Improvements in the management of equality and diversity had been implemented only in the previous six months and was not yet firmly embedded. The policy did not describe the needs of the main minority groups in the prison (children, young adults and women) or how they would be met. Staff did not have a good understanding of diverse needs, and systems to identify potential disadvantage and ensure fair treatment were inadequate.

Recommendation: The needs of different minority groups should be promoted to staff and prisoners, and there should be a widespread understanding of the services available and how they can be accessed. Regular processes designed to identify potential disadvantage should provide assurance of fair treatment.

S54 Concern: There was no States of Guernsey strategic approach to ensure that children held in custody continued to be supported by the relevant educational services while in custody and that a coordinated approach was adopted in meeting their educational needs.

Recommendation: The States of Guernsey education department should support the prison, and local schools, in ensuring that the education needs of all children of school age are met.

S55 Concern: The range of purposeful activity opportunities available was too narrow and there were too few. This had a disproportionate impact on women and vulnerable prisoners.

Recommendation: The range and number of places in education, training and work, particularly for women and vulnerable prisoners, should be increased.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

1.1 *The court complex was run by prison custody officers. The different prisoner populations were managed safely. Reception processes started in court. Escort vehicles were clean, staff were supportive and the journey to and from court was short. Some people were remanded to prison as a place of safety.*

1.2 The court complex was run by prison staff and had good facilities, including private interview rooms and a shower. The five cells were clean and included safer cell features. Officers managed the different populations (comprising men, women, children and vulnerable prisoners) safely. The prison custody officer team was friendly and relaxed, and included male and female officers. In our survey, 82%, compared with 67% at other local prisons, said that they had been treated well by escort staff.

1.3 First night interviews, wing and cell allocation risk assessments, identification procedures and the processing of property started at court, which had a computer link to the prison information management system (PIMS), thereby speeding up the process.

1.4 On average, 30 prisoners were taken from prison to the courts each month. Journeys to and from the court complex were short and took place in clean vehicles. Escorts were well managed, with appropriate arrangements to separate the different populations. Only women were handcuffed, as they were transported in a non-cellular vehicle. A helpful, up-to-date information leaflet, 'From Court Custody to Prison Custody', had been produced.

Good practice

1.5 *First night interviews, wing and cell allocation risk assessments, identification procedures and the processing of property started at court, utilising waiting time at court before returning to the prison.*

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.6** *Small numbers of prisoners were received. The offender management unit was alerted to new receptions through the prison information management system and could plan for their arrival. Prisoners were helped to settle in, there were good opportunities to address their immediate anxieties, and the community feel of the prison was supportive. There was no structured induction programme and we were not assured that all prisoners, particularly women, were provided with all the information they required in a timely way.*
- I.7** The prison received an average of three new prisoners each week. Due to its proximity to court, arrivals could be staggered, when necessary, to keep the different populations separate.
- I.8** The reception area had recently been refurbished and provided a clean and relaxed environment, with a pleasant waiting area. Routine strip-searching of prisoners on arrival had ceased but a security search portal was available. New arrivals were offered a meal and given an induction information pack, and standard compacts were explained and signed.
- I.9** The offender management unit (OMU) was alerted to new receptions through PIMS and could plan for their arrival. An offender supervisor interviewed new prisoners privately in reception, to complete a risk assessment. All essential areas were covered, including family circumstances and dependants, and a family liaison officer was based in the OMU. Prisoners were also asked about their employment status, accommodation and feelings of safety, and if they intended to have visits from children. A nurse completed a health screen in private. In our survey and our groups, prisoners were positive about their experiences in reception.
- I.10** First night cells were clean. New male prisoners were taken to J wing, where four cells, located close to the office, were used. Prisoners were helped to settle in. The first night locating officer completed the cell inventory with the prisoner, the cell alarm was tested and the Listener scheme (whereby prisoners are trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) was explained. This provided an opportunity to raise any anxieties that had not been addressed. The community feel of the prison was supportive, and most respondents to our survey said that they had felt safe on their first night. Prisoners had access to showers on their first night. There were similar arrangements for women on C and D wings.
- I.11** Not all wings were supervised but most areas of greater risks were, including J wing (adult male receptions), E wing (young adults) and L wing (children). One officer patrolled between the wings holding women (C and D) and those holding vulnerable prisoners (B and H). Far fewer vulnerable than mainstream prisoners had felt safe on their first night, and the lack of staff supervision may have been a factor in this (see also section on bullying and violence reduction).
- I.12** There was no formal structured induction course. Some prisoners could wait up to a week to attend the Listener-led induction talk, which took place every Tuesday evening and included representatives from the Samaritans. In the induction talk we observed, little

discussion was generated, some questions raised could not be answered and it did not adequately cover the needs of the one woman present. Records did not assure us that all prisoners were seen by all relevant departments in a timely fashion, but the generally supportive relationships between prisoners and staff (see section on staff–prisoner relationships) helped to ensure that prisoners found out essential information informally. Little information was translated into languages other than English.

Recommendation

- I.13 A structured induction programme should be introduced to ensure that the needs of the different populations are met in the early days of custody.**

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels and is safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

I.14 Prisoners were well behaved and there were few violent incidents. Not all wings were supervised but a planned in-cell telephone system could prove to be an added safety feature. More vulnerable than mainstream prisoners felt unsafe but this was not reflected in the actual levels of victimisation.

- I.15** Overall, prisoners were well behaved and few felt unsafe. There were few fights or assaults, and no serious assaults. Most incidents were low level, recorded as threats or ‘pranks’, and there were often disagreements when it had been difficult to ascertain the perpetrator. Mediation was used where appropriate. Seven assaults had been recorded in 2013 and only one of these had involved woman prisoners. One young adult had accounted for three of the 10 incidents to date in 2014.
- I.16** Few prisoners reached the second stage of the three-stage anti-bullying process initiated when evidence of bullying was found; this involved prisoners being placed on the basic regime, with regular monitoring and reviews. Victim support disclosure forms were available around the prison to report incidents.
- I.17** The level of supervision on the wings was limited. Closed-circuit television coverage helped monitoring, but we had some concerns about how prisoners locked on wings could communicate with staff; the planned in-cell telephone system would potentially address this.
- I.18** Safer custody meetings took place bimonthly, chaired by the assistant governor, and included staff from relevant departments and a Listener. There was a standing agenda, covering a range of indicators of bullying and violence, but there was often little to report. A senior officer took the role of violence reduction coordinator.
- I.19** Vulnerable prisoners were held on B and H wings; most were prisoners charged with or convicted of sex offences. In our survey, far more vulnerable prisoners than their mainstream counterparts said that they had ever felt unsafe at the prison. Local knowledge and media exposure across the island may have contributed to these poor perceptions of safety. They had a separate regime and were moved to activities at different times from

other prisoners, but their weekend visits took place with prisoners from other wings. There was no evidence that actual risks to vulnerable prisoners were greater than to others.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

I.20 *There had been no self-inflicted deaths at the prison for 10 years but there had been no external independent investigation of two deaths post-release. Levels of self-harm were low and the quality of care good. There were insufficient Listeners.*

- I.21** There had been no self-inflicted deaths in custody for 10 years. Internal investigations had been completed into two deaths post-release – one within two days of release. A wider, multi-agency review following one of these deaths (see section on safeguarding) had led to an internal review of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management procedures for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm, more staff being trained as ACCT assessors and the development of safer cells. There had been no external fully independent investigations of the deaths which could bring greater opportunities for learning across the island. Internal investigations into two serious near-fatal incidents had resulted in the introduction of more effective anti-ligature knives, which most officers now wore on their belts.
- I.22** There were low levels of self-harm. Nine prisoners had self-harmed in 2013 but most had involved relatively minor injuries.
- I.23** An average of four ACCT documents were opened each month. These demonstrated good care and input from staff from a range of disciplines. There was continuing training in ACCT procedures, mental health awareness and first aid. Individuals at risk were also discussed at the weekly risk management meetings.
- I.24** There were only three Listeners, including one woman prisoner who was due to be released, but more Listeners were being recruited. They felt well supported and were accessible to all prisoners. There was no portable Samaritans telephone but the planned in-cell telephones would provide an alternative. There were three safer cells; we were told that these were used infrequently, but there was no record kept of their use.

Recommendation

- I.25 Fully independent external investigations should be commissioned of all deaths, including those post-release.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.²

I.26 *There were no formal adult safeguarding procedures but weekly risk management meetings helped to identify prisoners at risk. Some multi-agency work across the island had begun in recent years.*

I.27 There were no formal adult safeguarding procedures but local knowledge of individuals and existing procedures, including initial assessments and case discussions in the OMU and weekly risk management meetings, were adequate for identifying and supporting adults who might need protection.

I.28 A multi-agency action plan had been instigated following the death of a vulnerable adult at risk post-release in 2010. A safeguarding framework had been outlined in 2011 but this had not yet developed into formal safeguarding procedures or protocols between agencies.

I.29 The prison occasionally received vulnerable people remanded to prison as a 'place of safety'; we considered this to be an inappropriate and potentially high-risk practice.

Recommendations

I.30 **Formal adult safeguarding processes should be developed with the health and social services department.**

I.31 **More appropriate alternatives to remanding people to prison as a place of safety should be developed.**

Young people and child protection

Expected outcomes:

The establishment promotes the welfare of children and young people, particularly those most at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.

I.32 *The prison was not a suitable environment in which to hold children. An increase in the number of children held had triggered some recent developments in policy. Children (under 18 years) and young adults (18–21 years) mixed with adults in some activities, although this was better risk assessed than at the time of the previous inspection. Critical procedures such as behaviour management (including restraint) had not been adapted to meet the needs of children. The two youngest children lived in unacceptably cramped conditions but efforts were being made to provide a suitable regime and sustain family links. Child protection procedures were developing.*

² We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

- I.33** At the time of the inspection, five children (under 18 years of age), all male, were being held, which was more than usual. A total of seven children had been held in the previous six months. This recent increase in numbers had triggered some developments in policy. The OMU had introduced child risk assessment and care plans for prisoners under 18, to be completed in consultation with youth justice workers. All five children had detailed sentence plans, risk assessments for activities which involved them mixing with older prisoners, and care plans, which was better than at the time of the previous inspection. There was no routine searching of young people, and when not in their rooms they were accompanied by an officer at all times.
- I.34** However, the prison was not a suitable environment in which to hold children. The living conditions for the two 15-year-old boys on L wing, previously used as the segregation unit for women, were unacceptably cramped (see also section on residential units). We were told by the prison that the States of Guernsey Education Department had failed to ensure that these boys' statutory educational needs were met (see main recommendation S52 and section on learning and skills and work activities). The older children had been risk assessed to live in a supportive environment on E wing with young adults (18–21 years); this wing was consistently staffed.
- I.35** A senior officer had specific responsibilities for children and young adults. Critical procedures, such as behaviour management (including restraint), had not been adapted to meet the needs of children. Staff lacked sufficient training and expertise in dealing with this age group. However, within the constraints of an adult prison, staff made good efforts to provide a suitable regime. Help was given to sustain family links, including family therapy and regular contact with the youth justice workers.
- I.36** A recently published child protection policy (April 2014) included the management of children, contact with and protection from adults who may pose a risk, and the procedures for referring concerns to the health and social services department. Children received at the prison subject to, or previously under, the care of social services were identified during induction by OMU staff. Effective communication with social workers and resettlement pathway advisers ensured that some of the reintegration needs of this vulnerable group were met.
- I.37** The OMU manager was the designated child protection coordinator for the prison. Senior managers were members of the island's child protection structures, and day-to-day oversight of protection and child contact issues were managed through the OMU. A log was kept of child protection issues that had been identified and referred to the local health and social services department; four referrals had been made since December 2013.
- I.38** Nine staff had completed training on 'Essential Safeguarding Children and Young People' through the Island's Child Protection Committee. Two staff had completed this training at a higher level.

Recommendations

- I.39 Existing procedures, particularly relating to behaviour management and restraint, should be reviewed to consider their suitability for children.**
- I.40 L wing should not be used to hold children or any other prisoners for protracted periods.**

Security

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- I.41** *Security measures were proportionate. A reasonable amount of security information was analysed well and required actions were carried out quickly. Routine strip-searching had ceased. Prisoners' access to activities was not restricted. Key areas requiring attention were identified at the monthly security committee meeting, with relevant longer-term objectives set. Information sharing with other departments was good. Few prisoners were subject to closed visits. Drug testing positive rates were low and there were few finds. In our survey, less than half the comparator said that it was easy to get drugs and none said that they had developed a drug problem in the prison.*
- I.42** Physical security measures were generally proportionate to the risks posed by the mix of prisoners held. There was supervised free movement to activities and the different groups of prisoners were kept apart during these times to ensure their safety. Prisoners were escorted to activities and appointments outside of these times. Security staff contributed to risk assessments for activities, assessments were proportionate and prisoners' access to activities was not restricted. Strip-searching was no longer routine, and was now carried out following individual risk assessment.
- I.43** A total of 413 security information reports had been submitted in the previous six months by staff from all departments. Intelligence was analysed well and the required actions, such as target searching, were completed swiftly. There was little evidence of serious substance misuse or possession of mobile telephones, and few illicit items were found in cell searches.
- I.44** Key departments were represented at the monthly security meeting. Relevant longer-term objectives were set to reflect the current issues faced by the prison in regard to substance and tobacco use (smoking was banned) and conflict between prisoners; actions were followed up monthly. Specific security information received was shared with relevant departments and with staff generally, if necessary, at a weekly staff briefing. The prison received good support from the local police, including the provision of drug detection dogs for visits and search dogs for searching, and this had achieved some good results. The professional standards procedures in place were adequate.
- I.45** At the time of the inspection, there were two prisoners subject to closed visits restrictions; there had been no others in the previous six months. Both had been placed under the restrictions for visits-related illicit activity but the appeal process had not been explained to them. Reviews were carried out monthly but we were told that they would both be under these restrictions for at least three months. Two visitors were banned from visiting the prison following the same incident. The visitors had been notified and appeal procedures clearly explained.
- I.46** The availability of drugs in the prison was very low. In our survey, no prisoners said that they had developed a drug problem at the prison. Less than half the comparator (15% versus 31%) said that it was easy to get drugs at the prison. Only 1%, against a comparator of 8%, said that they had developed a problem with diverted medication.

- I.47** In the six months to March 2014, there had been just one positive random mandatory drug test, giving a positive rate of 1.9% for the period. In the same period, 12 tests had been conducted on reasonable suspicion, with a positive rate of 27%.
- I.48** Just three small quantities of drugs had been found during searches in the previous six months. Since April 2014, mandatory drug testing had been carried out using oral swab tests instead of the traditional urine tests. Tests could be conducted anywhere in the prison, negating the necessity for a dedicated testing suite. It had been recognised that mouth swabs were not always as accurate as urine tests, but suitable confirmation facilities were in place to prevent unsafe adjudications. There was no protocol to facilitate an automatic referral of prisoners to the substance misuse worker in the event of a positive drug test result.

Recommendations

- I.49** **Prisoners should not automatically remain on closed visits for three months if there is insufficient evidence to support this measure.**
- I.50** **All prisoners with a confirmed positive drug test should be automatically referred to the substance misuse worker.**

Housekeeping point

- I.51** Prisoners placed on closed visits should be informed of their right to appeal.

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners understand the purpose of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and how to progress through it. The IEP scheme provides prisoners with incentives and rewards for effort and behaviour. The scheme is applied fairly, transparently and consistently.

I.52 *The incentives and earned privileges policy was used appropriately to deal with less serious infringements of the rules, and warnings were given appropriately. Reviews for the few prisoners on the basic level were not well documented and the requirement for prisoners to stay on this level for 28 days was excessive.*

- I.53** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was used by staff to deal with minor infringements of prison rules. Warnings were appropriate and there was scope in the policy for carrying out an immediate review of prisoners who had committed more serious offences. There was insufficient incentive to achieve enhanced status, and prisoners in our groups and individually told us that they would not bother to apply for it.
- I.54** Review boards were conducted weekly and all prisoners were routinely reviewed every 28 days. Prisoners could apply for promotion to the enhanced level after they had been in the prison for 56 days, and then every 28 days (14 days for young adults) thereafter. There were no separate arrangements for rewards and sanctions (equivalent to incentives and earned privileges) for children, and the adult policy was unsuitable for their needs (see main recommendation S53).

- I.55** The recording of initial review boards was good but weekly follow-up reviews for the few prisoners on the basic regime were not well documented and did not always show that continuation on this level of the scheme was justified, although staff were able to reassure us that prisoners had been legitimately kept on this level. Some staff told us that they were reluctant to place prisoners on basic as they would have to spend 28 days under these restrictions, despite reviews every seven days, which was excessive in some circumstances. Prisoners on the basic regime could attend work and education activities, giving them a chance to prove themselves. They were also given sufficient time to have showers, partake in association and make telephone calls daily. There was management oversight of the IEP scheme and quality assurance checks made of review boards.

Recommendation

- I.56** **Reviews for prisoners on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should be fully recorded and take into account the individual circumstances of each prisoner so they can be promoted to standard quickly once their behaviour improves.**

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.57** *The number of adjudications was low and had reduced since the previous year. Records showed a full investigation into the events leading to the charge. Some charges were more appropriate for incentives and earned privileges warnings. Levels of use of force were low. Monitoring was undertaken at the risk management meeting but there were insufficient incidents to identify any trends. Documentation was well completed and showed that force was justified, and de-escalation was evident. Special accommodation and segregation were rarely used. All incidents were appropriately authorised and justified. The physical environment of the segregation unit was clean and well maintained. Prisoners were not held on the unit long enough for formal review processes to take place but some care plans were provided when required.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.58** The number of adjudications was low, with 67 in the previous six months, and had reduced since the previous year. The main charge was for possession of unauthorised articles. Adjudications were held in the segregation unit and the independent adjudicator attended regularly to hear the more serious charges, usually relating to drugs and smoking.
- I.59** The documentation we reviewed showed that prisoners were given every chance to give their account of events. Records were generally detailed and showed a full investigation into the events leading to the charge. We found evidence that prisoners had been offered additional help during hearings, and prisoners were able to seek legal advice about any adjudication. Some charges could have been more appropriately dealt with using IEP procedures.

- I.60** Adjudication meetings were held regularly, attended by adjudicating managers, and included regular reviews of the tariff. There was good analysis of statistics and monitoring of trends, and quality assurance was carried out on completed adjudications.

The use of force

- I.61** Levels of use of force were low. There had been four incidents in the previous six months, only one of which had involved full use of restraint. Monitoring of use of force was undertaken at the weekly risk management meeting but the number of incidents was too low to identify any trends. Documentation was well completed and indicated that force was only used as a last resort. Use of de-escalation during incidents was evident. All use of force reports were reviewed by a manager when completed, to ensure that force had been used proportionately. No thought had been given to how this should be applied differently for children.
- I.62** Planned interventions in the past had not been video-recorded but there were arrangements to do so in the future, when necessary.
- I.63** Special accommodation had only been used once – and this was during the inspection. The use was appropriate in the circumstances and the prisoner received excellent support from staff and other agencies.

Segregation

- I.64** Segregation of prisoners was rare, which was a considerable improvement since the time of the previous inspection. Only three prisoners had been segregated in the previous six months. Segregation had been appropriately authorised in all cases and had been justified in the circumstances presented. The unit was clean and well maintained.
- I.65** One of the prisoners held on the unit had been on an ACCT. Consideration had been given to ensuring that segregation was the most suitable place to hold him and that other options were not appropriate. Prisoners did not remain on the unit for long periods. None had been there long enough for review processes to start or for consideration to be given to providing any kind of regime, although the segregation unit policy indicated that an adequate regime would be provided if someone remained segregated for long enough. Care plans and appropriate support were provided when needed. The unit policy identified the need to treat prisoners as individuals and wherever possible to meet prisoner needs with a view to returning them to mainstream residential accommodation.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.66** *Some good substance misuse support was offered but elements of detoxification were inflexible and there was insufficient integration of services. Prisoners reported high levels of satisfaction with psychosocial services.*

- I.67** At the time of the inspection, a total of nine adult males were receiving clinical opiate treatment, some in conjunction with benzodiazepine reduction treatment and one on alcohol detoxification. Dihydrocodeine was a commonly abused prescription drug on the island, so this was appropriately used to detoxify prisoners. Suboxone (buprenorphine + naloxone) was also available for those with a history of other opiate abuse but methadone was not administered at the prison, and had not been prescribed by any doctor on the island since the late 1990s.
- I.68** We were told that the primary aim of treatment was detoxification, although one of the nine prisoners currently receiving clinical substance use treatment was on maintenance doses owing to special circumstances. However, prescribing was insufficiently flexible; prisoners told us that their imposed detoxification regimes were too rapid. We spoke to a patient in crisis and on a short sentence who was subject to continued dose reduction, despite having a long-term history of high levels of drug abuse and a stated intention of high levels of use immediately following release. The risks of in-prison drug misuse and post-release overdose were therefore increased by rapid, inflexible detoxification.
- I.69** Clinical and psychosocial services were insufficiently well integrated. The substance misuse worker had no input into clinical reviews, so there were occasions when not all relevant information was presented to the GP when making decisions about dosing for detoxification.
- I.70** Prisoners could be referred to a small number of island-based services. Psychosocial support was provided by a substance misuse worker from the community-based Drug Concern agency. The service included drug and alcohol awareness, harm reduction and recovery-based interventions, in small groups or one-to-one as necessary. Prisoners we spoke to were very positive about the input from the substance misuse worker. Alcoholics Anonymous fellowship meetings were held weekly by an external facilitator (see also section on reintegration planning).

Recommendations

- I.71 Prescribing for opiate substitution should be flexible and based on individual needs.**
- I.72 Integration between clinical and psychosocial services should improve.**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

2.1 *The external environment was clean and well maintained, and wings and cellular accommodation were clean. The offensive display policy was not well enforced. Cells were adequately furnished. Prisoners could wear their own clothing and laundry facilities were generally reasonable. Access to showers was good. Most showers had been refurbished and were clean but not all were adequately screened, and not all toilets were screened. There were sufficient telephones on all wings. Application forms were freely available on all wings and prisoners were positive about how they were dealt with.*

2.2 The external environment was clean and well maintained. Residential units were mostly small but wings and cellular accommodation were generally clean and cells adequately equipped, and prisoners told us that they had no problem obtaining cleaning materials. The cells on L wing did not provide a suitable environment for children, and the wing was too small to enable the children housed there to have enough time in private (see recommendation 1.40). The offensive display policy was not well enforced and we saw many offensive displays in cells.

2.3 All prisoners could wear their own clothing and laundry facilities were good, although the dryer on J wing had been out of order for some time and prisoners had to resort to drying clothing and bedding on heating pipes. Prisoners were able to access their stored property by allocation and this was dealt with quickly, with none outstanding at the time of the inspection.

2.4 Access to showers was good. Most had been refurbished and were clean; those on J wing, which were dirtier and in poorer condition, were next to be refurbished. Not all were adequately screened, particularly on B wing. Not all toilets in cells were screened.

2.5 There were sufficient telephones for the number of prisoners held and access to them was good. The planned in-cell telephone system was a good initiative and welcomed by prisoners. This telephone system would enable prisoners to access telephone numbers that the prison had authorised from their own cells, and would be paid for in the usual way by the prisoners themselves. Prisoners could send and receive as much mail as they wished, and neither incoming nor outgoing post was unduly delayed.

2.6 Applications were logged on all wings and responses tracked. We welcomed the fact that staff attempted to manage as many applications as possible via face-to-face interaction with prisoners during prescribed times. Application forms were freely available on all wings and prisoners could submit them daily. In our survey, 72% of prisoners, against the 56% comparator, said that they were dealt with fairly and 67%, against the 43% comparator, that they were dealt with quickly.

Recommendations

2.7 The offensive display policy should be enforced.

2.8 All showers and toilets should be screened.

Housekeeping point

2.9 Laundry facilities should be repaired quickly or alternative arrangements made for prisoners to dry their clothing.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

2.10 *Staff–prisoner relationships were generally very good. Prisoners felt that they could get help with problems, and staff knew prisoners well.*

2.11 Relationships between staff and prisoners were polite, relaxed and respectful. The small island community meant that many staff and prisoners had previous knowledge of each other, and this encouraged accountability, trust and mutual respect. In our survey, high numbers of prisoners said that they were treated with respect. Managers were aware of the risks of over familiar and collusive relationships and encouraged a high degree of professional integrity amongst themselves and staff.

2.12 Every prisoner had a personal officer and a deputy, and most knew them. Officers had in-depth knowledge of most of the prisoners in their care, and in our survey 87% of respondents said that they had someone they could turn to for help if they had a problem.

2.13 Staff used the electronic case-note system to make a record of key events, but there were too few entries showing interactions with prisoners to assure us that they were regularly supported. In particular, there was little evidence of discussions about resettlement or progress against sentence plans. Many comments were about negative behaviour, and opportunities to credit good behaviour were missed.

2.14 We had concerns that prisoners held in unstaffed units sometimes found it hard to contact staff during association. They were reluctant to press their cell call bell, which was intended for emergency use only. We met women prisoners who had repeatedly knocked on the wing door in an effort to attract staff attention.

2.15 Most staff addressed prisoners by their preferred names but in written documents it was common to see surnames being used without a prefix. This was an anomaly in an otherwise respectful environment.

Recommendation

- 2.16 Prisoners on unstaffed wings should have a reliable method of contacting staff without pressing their cell call bell.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.17** Prisoners should always be referred to by their full or preferred name.

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 characteristic³ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.18** *The management of equality and diversity had improved considerably but the overall strategy was still relatively underdeveloped, and the needs of some key population groups had not been sufficiently well identified. Nevertheless, the generally respectful environment ensured reasonable outcomes. Foreign national prisoners were well supported. Some religious needs were not sufficiently well met. Prisoners with disabilities reported negatively in our survey about a range of safety indicators. There was no clear strategy for the care of women, children, or young or older adults.*

Strategic management

- 2.19** A diversity policy, published in October 2013, usefully combined several pre-existing policies. It described the prison's duty to support various minority groups, but lacked an analysis of the needs of the population and an explanation of the support available. In particular, it did not explain how the prison would care for women, children, or young or older adults alongside the majority adult male population.
- 2.20** The deputy governor, a principal officer, two diversity officers and two prisoner peer workers formed the core equality and diversity team. All were motivated, felt supported by their managers and were known to prisoners and staff alike. Fifty-six staff had received appropriate equality and diversity training since autumn 2013, and could now describe the need for a tolerant and inclusive approach. However, there was little understanding of the need to identify and prevent disadvantage. There was insufficient regular analysis of the population to provide reassurance that needs were being identified consistently. When disadvantage or special needs were noticed, we saw a bespoke approach to individual care, which meant that outcomes were generally reasonable, but we were not assured that needs would be identified if a prisoner was unable to recognise or articulate them for themselves.

³ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

- 2.21** Diversity meetings were generally regular and reasonably well attended. A diversity action plan had been developed but it was very broad, and there was scope to set local priorities for development where needs were greatest. In particular, there was insufficient promotion of diversity themes to develop prisoner awareness of services which might meet their needs.
- 2.22** A process to facilitate the reporting and investigation of alleged discrimination incidents had been introduced early in 2014 but equality incident reporting forms were not readily available to prisoners. Diversity officers had received some training in interviewing and investigation techniques and were growing in confidence. The number of incidents reported had increased, with 14 reported in the previous six months, as awareness of diversity issues had improved. Action to manage these incidents had been proportionate, ranging from advice to mediation and formal investigation. Most incidents had been reported by staff, and several had been about inappropriate conduct by vulnerable prisoners which did not necessarily involve discrimination and could have been resolved using other systems. These incidents were discussed at diversity meetings but the paperwork suggested that there was scope to increase management oversight of this process to ensure that all incidents were appropriately investigated and fully resolved (see main recommendation S53).

Protected characteristics

- 2.23** There were no black and minority ethnic prisoners at the time of the inspection. There were 11 foreign national prisoners, mostly Portuguese men, many of whom had lived on Guernsey for several years. Three men struggled to communicate in English, but there were staff and prisoners willing to interpret. The most important policies had been translated into key languages in the previous six months, and professional interpreting and translation services had been used regularly for sensitive or confidential matters.
- 2.24** Foreign national prisoners valued their monthly consultation forum, designed to resolve issues of general concern. Information was provided as necessary on court and parole processes. Deportation issues, particularly appeal processes, affected several prisoners but there was no independent immigration advice service.
- 2.25** Prisoners who did not have close family in Guernsey (including UK nationals) were identified during induction and given PIN telephone credit equivalent to the cost of one telephone call to their home country each month. Twelve prisoners received this facility but several more felt that they should qualify, and eligibility rules were unclear.
- 2.26** A survey conducted by the prison in November 2013 had identified that some prisoners did not feel their religious beliefs were respected. Our survey revealed that these negative perceptions existed, particularly on J wing. It was not clear how the prison had responded to its own survey but our investigations suggested that some prisoners on J wing were intolerant of religious belief, making it a hostile environment in which to practise a faith openly. Religious and cultural dietary needs were carefully observed by the catering team.
- 2.27** In our survey, 18% of prisoners said that they considered themselves to have a disability but the prison had identified only two individuals, both via the health care department. Learning and skills staff carried out some dyslexia screening and one-to-one work to meet needs. Our survey revealed comparatively poorer perceptions among prisoners with disabilities, particularly for safety indicators, suggesting that this under-identification of disability was creating disadvantage.
- 2.28** J and B wings had cells suitable for prisoners using a wheelchair. One cell on J wing had a grab rail near the toilet (but no privacy screen). There was also an accessible shower on J

wing but this was poorly ventilated and smelly. Its location on a wing for male prisoners meant that it was not suitable for a child, a vulnerable prisoner or a woman.

- 2.29** There was limited specific support for older prisoners but we did not identify any particular disadvantage for them. Appropriately, the prison had begun to plan for an anticipated increase in the number of such prisoners. Retired prisoners and those unfit for work had a reasonable weekly 'wage' and did not have to pay for their televisions.
- 2.30** The prison held only seven women prisoners at the time of the inspection. A 'female prisoners policy', published in March 2014, described, in general terms, how women prisoners should be treated. However, it did not clearly articulate the specific needs of women (of any ages) in custody or explain how these needs would be met at the establishment. A senior officer had been nominated to manage the women's policy in January 2014 and was supported by a team of four female liaison officers, who were known to the women prisoners. Monthly meetings had begun in March 2014 to ensure that women prisoners had a voice at the main prisoner consultation event. Minutes revealed concerns about basic issues such as the availability of sanitary items.
- 2.31** Only two staff had received any training in women-specific issues. Although most staff were kind, there was a general lack of understanding of women's needs and their routes into offending. We were told that some staff did not like working with women prisoners, and we were particularly concerned that there was not always a trained woman officer on duty at night.
- 2.32** The lack of discrete prison accommodation for women meant that their needs were inevitably subordinated to those of the majority. Women prisoners had poorer access to the gym and fewer purposeful activity opportunities than their male counterparts. Despite this, in comparison with most women's prisons, outcomes were reasonable.
- 2.33** The prison had held three mothers with babies in the previous 18 months but there were none at the time of the inspection. There were no facilities to care for babies overnight, and women were encouraged to transfer to a mother and baby unit in the UK. Alternatively, the prison would allow babies to come to the prison daily to be cared for by their mothers within the visits area, where appropriate equipment was available, although this happened infrequently. In one case in 2013, this had continued for four months, when the mother had chosen to take up a place on a mother and baby unit. Maternity care was adequate.
- 2.34** Unusually, there were two children (aged 15) and three young people (aged 16 or 17) in the prison. The policy document contained no guidance on how to manage these groups; some efforts had been made to provide for their needs within the constraints of the unsuitable facilities available but provision was still inadequate (see also sections on early days in custody, and young people and child protection).
- 2.35** Our survey suggested that there was one openly gay man at the prison but he was not known to staff. We were told that gay men and women had previously been successfully cared for on normal location.
- 2.36** There were no transgender prisoners in the prison at the time of the inspection. There was no written guidance for dealing with such prisoners but the diversity manager explained how he would devise an individualised care plan and he was aware of the main needs of this group.

Recommendations

- 2.37** There should be independent immigration advice available.
- 2.38** Prisoners' negative perceptions about respect for their religious beliefs should be understood and addressed.
- 2.39** All prisoners should be asked during induction whether they consider themselves to have a disability and should be offered individualised support when necessary.
- 2.40** All staff working with women prisoners should understand their specific needs and there should always be a trained female officer in the prison at night.

Housekeeping point

- 2.41** Eligibility arrangements for free telephone calls for foreign national prisoners should be clear to all staff and prisoners.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

2.42 *Religious provision was reasonable for the majority but weaker for Roman Catholics and for vulnerable prisoners. Provision for those of minority faiths was limited.*

- 2.43** The small worship space was adequate but not generally accessible to prisoners for private prayer or reflection. The managing chaplain worked 18 hours a week, which meant that new receptions were not always seen promptly after reception. He was assisted by a group of enthusiastic volunteers linked to community organisations which provided support to ex-offenders.
- 2.44** Of those who expressed a faith, most were Christian. Anglican provision was reasonable for the majority on normal location, with a weekly service and several midweek worship and study opportunities. Provision for Roman Catholic prisoners was far worse, with no weekly mass. A Roman Catholic priest visited the prison but did not draw keys, so opportunities to see him were limited to formal appointments, which tended to disrupt other activities at short notice. Vulnerable prisoners had a weekly midweek study and worship session and a Sunday service once a fortnight.
- 2.45** Women prisoners were offered a weekly service and valued the support and encouragement of a female faith volunteer, who visited the unit at least fortnightly. None of the children and young adults held expressed a faith but received regular pastoral visits on the wings.
- 2.46** Provision for minority faiths was limited because so few were represented on the island. The managing chaplain had an appropriate supply of religious books and artefacts, had links with various community groups who were willing to provide support, and could describe the arrangements which had been made for individuals.

Recommendation

- 2.47 Religious provision for vulnerable prisoners and for Roman Catholics should be improved.**

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

2.48 *Prisoners had good access to the complaints system. Procedures were appropriate and timely. In the previous six months, 29% of complaints submitted had been upheld. Replies were respectful and well explained.*

2.49 In the six months to March 2014, 42 complaints had been made, of which 12 (29%) had been upheld. Four (10% of the total) had been against staff; of these, one had been upheld. Thirty-seven (88%) had been completed within required timeframes. Replies were respectful and well explained.

2.50 The full range of forms for complaints, appeals and confidential access was available on each wing, along with envelopes and booklets describing the complaints process.

2.51 In our survey, of those who had made a complaint, far more than at comparator establishments said that it had been dealt with fairly (50% versus 32%) and quickly (56% versus 32%).

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.52 *Access to legal visits and communication with legal representatives were good. There were few legal textbooks in the library.*

2.53 There was no designated legal services officer, so prisoners obtained information from the offender management unit. They were provided with a list of advocates on the island and had to secure the services of one of them for themselves. There was no bail service and prisoners had to seek any assistance they required from their advocate. All calls to advocates were free.

2.54 In our survey, more respondents than at comparator establishments said that they could communicate easily with their legal representatives and could easily attend legal visits. There were few legal textbooks available in the library, and in our survey only 21% of respondents, against the 37% comparator, said that it was easy to access legal books.

Recommendation

2.55 Relevant legal textbooks should be available in the prison library.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.56 *Prisoners were generally satisfied with the health services provided. The health care environment, infection control compliance and cleanliness were of a high standard. Access to primary care professionals was good, although the waiting time for the optician was sometimes too long. Gender- and age-appropriate assessment, screening and treatment were provided. Confidentiality at the medicines administration hatch could not be guaranteed. Mental health care was appropriate to the needs of the population.*

Governance arrangements

2.57 In our survey, 77% of respondents said that they were satisfied with the overall quality of the health services, against a comparator of 38%. There was a comprehensive health needs analysis.

2.58 Guernsey Health and Social Services Department (HSSD) provided the prison health services. The governor and an HSSD senior manager met monthly and working relationships were said to be good. Governance arrangements were being strengthened at the time of the inspection, and a new reporting mechanism to assure learning from untoward events had been introduced in April 2014.

2.59 Health services staff contributed to prisoners' monthly forum if requested; this meant that attendance was infrequent. The health care department undertook an annual survey of prisoners' views, which yielded useful information.

2.60 Health services were well managed by a senior nurse. A small team of registered nurses, a GP and administrative staff offered services from 7am to 6.15pm, seven days a week. All nurses were up to date with mandatory training. Other forms of essential training were offered. Staff were offered clinical supervision but take-up was not recorded.

2.61 Clinical records were paper based and appropriately stored.

2.62 There were policies on the prevention of communicable diseases and on information sharing, based on professional guidance and advice from the general hospital.

2.63 All prisoners had equal access to health services. Health care facilities were of a reasonable size and well appointed. There was no waiting area for patients and we saw them being locked into a stairwell before attending clinics, which presented risks. The medicines storage room and administration hatch were on the lower corridor. Although custody staff regulated

medicine queues, the arrangement did not afford confidentiality and there was extraneous noise from the food servery queue on the opposite side of the corridor.

- 2.64** Infection control compliance was high, at 95%, and the facilities were very clean.
- 2.65** Most custody staff had been trained in the use of automated external defibrillators (AEDs). We were told that emergency services could enter the prison promptly if needed but we reviewed one near-miss incident in which an ambulance had taken five minutes to get from the main gate to A wing, which was too long. Resuscitation equipment – AEDs, airway support, oxygen and suction – was located in the prison centre and health care department. The equipment was sited in the dental surgery during clinics and an AED was kept in the court custody suite, which meant that cardio-resuscitation of a collapsed prisoner could be guided and augmented before the arrival of the emergency services. The equipment was checked regularly and checks were documented; some renewable items at the court were out of date.
- 2.66** We observed excellent relationships between prisoners and health services staff. Nurses appeared to know every prisoner and could recall most prisoners' circumstances without recourse to the records.
- 2.67** Prisoners were given information about how to access health services at reception but they could not easily see a doctor of the gender of their choice. Female patients had access to conventional antenatal services; those with babies could be transferred to UK prisons, although local arrangements were made on a bespoke basis. At the time of the inspection, 30% of prisoners were aged 50 or over. There was a senior nurse lead for older prisoners and health assessments were carried out for the over-50s. Specialist aids to daily living were available following an assessment by a visiting occupational therapist.
- 2.68** Prisoners knew how to make complaints about health care; there had been four in the quarter ending March 2014. The responses we sampled were focused and courteous. Seventy-five per cent of complaints concerned prescribing or medication, and 85% of the 10 serious incidents in 2013/14 had concerned medicines administration and management. There had been no dedicated medicines management training.
- 2.69** There was evidence of health promotion activities in the health care centre and in the gym, and a recent health promotion day had been well attended. Prisoners had access to age-related disease prevention and screening programmes that mirrored UK campaigns. Five patients were in receipt of smoking cessation support at the time of the inspection.

Recommendations

- 2.70** The medicines administration area should afford confidentiality to patients.
- 2.71** Emergency ambulances entering the prison should have unfettered access to the site of the incident.
- 2.72** Patients should be able to choose the gender of the GP who treats them.

Housekeeping points

- 2.73** Health representatives should attend the prisoner forum regularly.
- 2.74** The receipt of clinical supervision by staff should be recorded.

Good practice

2.75 *The siting of an automated external defibrillator in the court custody suite ensured that cardio-resuscitation of a collapsed prisoner could be guided and augmented before the arrival of the emergency services.*

Delivery of care (physical health)

2.76 Reception health screening and secondary assessments were comprehensive and included an appointment with a GP. Contact was made with other care agencies, with the patient's consent, as necessary. Medical notes were handwritten and sometimes difficult to read.

2.77 Services were nurse-led, via triage. A GP visited the prison for two sessions per week but there was very limited access to a female GP (see recommendation 2.72). Care of prisoners with lifelong conditions was good, as was antenatal care. There were some visiting specialists, such as a physiotherapist and optician, although the waiting time to see an optician was occasionally six weeks or more, which was too long. Care was tailored to the individual.

2.78 Prisoners could access health services via triage or the application system; a pictorial application form was in use. Appointments were well managed and the did-not-attend rate was very low. Patients requiring secondary care attended the local general hospital. On average, there were nine hospital appointments per week; these were well managed, prompt and rarely cancelled for security reasons. A primary care out-of-hours GP service was available but used infrequently.

2.79 Care plans and a patient-specific 'what to do' electronic screen were sited in the prison centre; these gave clear guidance to custody officers in predictable medical situations for individual patients who had consented.

2.80 The service was sensitive to the particular needs of women and children.

Recommendation

2.81 **Medical records should be printed, rather than handwritten.**

Housekeeping point

2.82 The waiting time to see an optician should be improved.

Good practice

2.83 *The availability of care plans and individualised medical advice in the prison centre ensured that custody staff had guidance for caring for patients in distress.*

Pharmacy

2.84 There was no on-site pharmacy and medicines were supplied by a local community pharmacy. An HSSD pharmacy adviser visited the prison but did not see patients. He attended the bimonthly medicines and therapeutic committee meetings.

- 2.85** At the time of the inspection, 49% of prisoners were on regular medication and 72% had it in possession. Medication charts did not always clearly indicate the duration of the prescription. The range of prescription medicines supplied by nurses using patient group directions (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) was too limited. There was no 'special sick' policy (immediate health treatment without an appointment) and, although items such as throat lozenges were available from the prison shop, there were insufficient over-the-counter remedies available.
- 2.86** When more potent medications were required, nurses consulted the doctor by telephone and the doctor faxed a prescription to the pharmacy. This meant that some controlled drugs were supplied against a faxed copy of the doctor's signature, rather than the handwritten original.
- 2.87** Some medicines stock items did not have a batch number and expiry date. Heat-sensitive products were stored appropriately. Waste medicines were segregated and needlessly returned to the supplying pharmacy – including controlled drugs.
- 2.88** Medicines were stored in the dispensary room; this was in close proximity to the servery and shop, resulting in some compromises of confidentiality. They were administered twice daily, at around 7.30am and 4.30pm; this meant that night-time medications were often administered too early. One patient told us that he found the medicines hatch intimidating and felt unable to talk about personal issues there, leaving him feeling frustrated.

Recommendations

- 2.89 Pharmacist consultations or clinics and medication use reviews should be provided.**
- 2.90 The duration and timing of medication administration periods should enable sedating medicines to be given at a more appropriate time.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.91** The range of patient group directions should include only P-list (prescribed by a retail registered pharmacist) and prescription-only medicines; other general stock items should be supplied separately under a 'special sick' policy, and a wider range of over-the-counter remedies should be made available.
- 2.92** There should be an agreed stock list and all medicines should have a batch number and expiry date.
- 2.93** Patients should be administered medicines in confidence.
- 2.94** Controlled drugs should only be supplied against original prescriptions, and unwanted controlled drugs should be destroyed on the premises, using denaturing kits.

Dentistry

- 2.95** The oral health of prisoners was sometimes poor; we were told that this reflected the situation in the general population on the island. Nurses provided triage and simple treatment for those in pain. A dentist visited the prison weekly and waiting times were no longer than seven days, which was excellent. All patients were given advice on oral hygiene.

The States of Guernsey rules on dental treatment precluded many interventions in the first six months of a sentence, and some complex treatments thereafter. This reflected the limitations on States-aided dental treatment in the community.

- 2.96** The dental surgery was adequately equipped; the dentist brought clean supplies and removed used items for decontamination. Equipment was appropriately checked and certified and the facilities had been subject to an infection control audit.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.97** Most custody staff had been trained in mental health awareness and there was good joint working between custody and health services staff. All mental health services were provided by the HSSD via in-reach mental health services. A psychological well-being practitioner (a registered mental health nurse) visited several times a week and offered brief, solution-based therapies to up to 10 patients with mental health problems. There was access to bereavement and loss counselling if required. A psychiatrist and psychologist visited the prison each week. The psychologist supported patients with serious and enduring mental illnesses. Services were accessible, with relatively open referral systems, and were appropriate to the needs of the population.
- 2.98** Patients requiring in-patient hospital care were transferred to appropriate facilities in England for care. We were told that this was uncommon but that transfers were effected within a week or two.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.99** *In our survey, most prisoners said that the food was good or very good. Menus were varied, portion sizes were ample and catering staff responded well to special dietary needs.*

- 2.100** In our survey, many more respondents than at comparator establishments (83% versus 23%) said that the food was good or very good. In all the groups that we held, prisoners cited food as the top positive aspect of the prison. We found the quality of the food to be excellent and portion sizes ample. Catering staff responded well to special dietary needs.
- 2.101** Comments sheets were available to prisoners. Out of 24 comments that had been submitted in the previous six months, only five (21%) had been negative. In addition to comments sheets, representations could also be made at the prisoner forum meetings, which were attended by catering staff.
- 2.102** The kitchen was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. The menu was varied, and on a 4–5-week cycle. Additional meals could be added throughout any given month, and prisoners were encouraged to suggest new recipes.
- 2.103** Breakfast consisted of cereal, which was packed in the kitchen and issued weekly. Milk was issued daily. Lunch and evening meals were served from the kitchen servery and prisoners went there one wing at a time.

2.104 When we observed meals being served, the area was well supervised and the process was orderly. Prisoners were provided with trays and plate covers, which kept the food hot until they were back on the wings. Most prisoners could eat communally at least once a day.

2.105 Up to eight prisoners were employed in the kitchen, with the opportunity to achieve a level 2 certificate in food health and hygiene.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.106 *The shop was run by the prison and processes were efficient. Consultation took place regularly. Prisoners could make an interim order on arrival at the prison. Catalogue ordering was available.*

2.107 The prison shop was run by the prison, and staff sought to find the cheapest providers on the island. In our survey, more respondents than at comparator establishments (64% versus 47%) said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs.

2.108 Newly arrived prisoners could make their first full shop order within the first 10 days at the establishment but could place an interim order for essential goods on arrival. Shop order forms were issued on Tuesday mornings and goods delivered on Thursday mornings. Advances of pay could be authorised when necessary and paid back in instalments. All prisoners were given £3 PIN telephone credit on arrival. Women could place orders for feminine hygiene and other essential products, including make-up.

2.109 Prisoners could place orders from a range of catalogues and were not charged an administration fee. They could order newspapers from a nearby newsagent, for delivery to the prison. Shop consultation arrangements took place through the prisoner committee consultation meetings, and prisoners' views on the goods available on the shop list were taken into account. Prisoners could obtain a copy of their account free of charge.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁴

3.1 *Time out of cell was very good. Outside exercise lasted only 30 minutes on weekdays. The exercise areas used by vulnerable prisoners and women were much less attractive than the field generally used by the main population.*

3.2 Most prisoners had over 10 hours out of cell from Monday to Thursday, and around seven hours on Fridays and at weekends. Those on the enhanced regime were not locked up during the lunch period and had even more time out of their cells. Only a few unemployed prisoners were locked up during the working day. Association was regular.

3.3 Exercise was available daily but on weekdays it was for only 30 minutes. The main exercise area was a large field but because this was overlooked by the wings used to house adult males on normal location, it was unsuitable for vulnerable prisoners and for women. Vulnerable prisoners took exercise in a fenced concrete yard, with a few benches but no plants and no exercise equipment. Women used a portion of roadway with grass verges but had nowhere to sit. Appropriate exercise arrangements were made for the children held.

Recommendation

3.4 **The exercise areas for vulnerable prisoners and women should be improved.**

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.5 *There were sufficient activity places for all prisoners to have at least part-time work, training or education, and allocation arrangements for all activities were effective. The range of education, training and work was limited, particularly for women and vulnerable prisoners. Teaching in education classes was generally good but assessment in vocational training required improvement. Achievements on accredited courses were generally good. Much work was relatively low-skilled and undemanding. The library was adequately resourced and prisoners had sufficient access.*

⁴ 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.

3.6	<i>Ofsted⁵ 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>Good</i>
	<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision:</i>	<i>Good</i>
	<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Requires improvement</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.7** The educational and vocational training provision, funded by the prison and delivered by prison staff and staff from the sub-contractor, Guernsey College of Further Education (GCFE), was good. The leadership and management of learning and skills required improvement across work, vocational training and education areas. Senior leaders and managers had high aspirations for all groups of prisoners and promoted the benefits of education and training effectively.
- 3.8** The line-management arrangements for GCFE staff were unclear and day-to-day management was provided by prison managers; GCFE staff had not received recent performance appraisals.
- 3.9** The strategy to provide educational support to children of school age was inadequate (see main recommendation S54).
- 3.10** Managers had recently increased the number and range of activities for the main population. There were plans to increase further the number of vocational training opportunities but it was too early to judge their effectiveness.
- 3.11** Observations of teaching and learning assessment were carried out on GCFE staff, although had not been used to support their training and development or performance management. However, volunteers and prison training staff were not subject to the same arrangements and volunteer tutors needed more support to maximise their effectiveness and ensure consistency. The identification and sharing of best practice were ineffective (see recommendation 3.29).
- 3.12** The accommodation provided in the new learning and skills centre was very good and an appropriate range of information learning technology was provided to support learning.
- 3.13** Activities were sufficiently well sequenced to maximise the use of places and there were no waiting lists. Attendance and punctuality on all courses and activities were good but registers did not record when prisoners left sessions early. A range of data was collected but they were inadequately analysed and used to monitor the effectiveness of education and training for all groups of prisoners, including the sub-contracted provision.

⁵ 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

- 3.14** **Appropriate support and supervision arrangements for prison training staff and volunteer tutors should be developed.**
- 3.15** **The analysis and use of data to plan and monitor the quality of the provision should be improved, including that delivered by the Guernsey College of Further Education, to ensure that the needs of all groups of prisoners are met.**

Provision of activities

- 3.16** Most prisoners had access to part-time work, training or education, with 80 work, 17 training and 87 education places. An additional two prisoners were on Open University distance learning courses. There were sufficient activity spaces to offer all prisoners purposeful activity, although not all work was sufficiently challenging to ensure that all prisoners were purposefully occupied throughout a realistic working day. The range and breadth of education and work opportunities for women and vulnerable prisoners were inadequate (see main recommendation S55).
- 3.17** Education programmes included courses in information and communications technology, art, English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), English and mathematics, personal and social development, and administration. The range of the education provision was too narrow to meet the needs of all prisoners, with few higher-level courses offered (see main recommendation S55). Accredited courses were only offered by the sub-contractor during the 42 weeks of the academic year. Volunteer tutors made a valuable contribution to the learning and skills department and ensured the continuing provision of art and craft classes.
- 3.18** Two children of school age received support for English and mathematics, in addition to attending useful personal and social skills development sessions (see paragraph 3.24).
- 3.19** The range of vocational training was too narrow, comprising level I courses in waste disposal, recycling and catering, which provided too few opportunities for learners to develop work skills (see main recommendation S55). The catering course provided useful training for learners in a busy work area. There were plans to introduce a level I qualification in horticulture.
- 3.20** Contract work was available in the recycling workshop and tricateur workshop, manufacturing Guernsey knitwear. Too much work was mundane and low skilled. Many prisoners were insufficiently challenged and became bored. Some contract workshops did not have enough work to occupy prisoners adequately for a full working week.

Quality of provision

- 3.21** The quality of teaching, support for learning, and assessment in education courses were good, with some outstanding coaching and support in personal and social development sessions. Staff were knowledgeable and very skilled in successfully motivating prisoners to overcome their significant barriers to learning. Coaching in vocational training was good and allowed prisoners to gain confidence quickly and develop practical skills effectively; however, assessment required improvement as no waste management qualifications had met the standards of the awarding body.

- 3.22** The induction to education classes was appropriate, providing prisoners with a good understanding of the education options open to them. Initial assessment of their English and mathematics skills was accurate. Appropriate diagnostic testing supported the agreement of accurate individual learning plans for those with learning difficulties or disabilities.
- 3.23** Teachers planned effectively for learning across all accredited courses. Individual learning plans were generally used well to set and review learning targets. However, there was insufficient recognition of skills development in work areas. The personal, social and employability-related skills that prisoners gained at work were recorded well. In the better lessons, well-planned teaching techniques and good resources were used to make learning exciting and interesting.
- 3.24** The staff were unused to teaching GCSE subjects and were without the subject specific materials and detailed support from outside the prison which they needed. The absence of sufficient materials and expert guidance may have disadvantaged the children about to sit external examinations (see main recommendation S54).
- 3.25** There were adequate arrangements to develop the English speaking, reading and comprehension skills of ESOL learners.
- 3.26** There was good use of volunteer tutors in education areas to support, help and coach prisoners. Prisoners had access to specialist additional learning support as needed.
- 3.27** Vocational training areas were clean, tidy, appropriately equipped and well maintained. Assessment was well planned and verification arrangements were in accordance with awarding body requirements. However, there was no formal system for observing the quality of coaching provided for these courses.
- 3.28** Too much work was mundane and low skilled. Many prisoners were insufficiently challenged and became bored. Some contract workshops had insufficient work to occupy prisoners fully throughout the working day, although it helped to foster confidence and self-esteem.

Recommendations

- 3.29** **The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved to a consistently good standard across all the provision, through the identification and sharing of best practice.**
- 3.30** **The work available should be more purposeful and fully occupy prisoners throughout the working day.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.31** Outcomes for most prisoners in education and training were good. Achievement rates on the many education courses in English and mathematics, ESOL and administration were high, and learners made at least appropriate progress in lessons overall. Most learners improved their confidence in English and mathematics.
- 3.32** Most vocational training courses had high success rates. Prisoners demonstrated good skills. Standards of work in art were particularly good. However, there was little recognition of previous attainment and progress in non-accredited courses.

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

Recommendation

- 3.34** **The recognition and recording of previous attainment and identification of progress by prisoners in non-accredited learning should be introduced.**

Library

- 3.35** The library, operated by the States of Guernsey Guille-Allès Library, was a satisfactory facility. It had recently reopened following an extensive refurbishment.
- 3.36** Monthly loan rates were satisfactory. Prisoners had adequate access to the library, with lunchtime and evening sessions from Monday to Thursday, and Saturday and Sunday morning sessions. Staffing was adequate, with a full-time orderly supported by a visiting librarian.
- 3.37** An adequate range of fiction and non-fiction books, DVDs, legal journals and Prison Service Orders and Instructions was stocked. There were effective arrangements to borrow materials from other libraries but prisoners had access to a limited range of additional law books. There were few materials to support education and training, or in languages other than English.

Recommendation

- 3.38** **A wider range of materials to support education and training should be provided.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.39** *The PE facilities were very good and staff were suitably qualified. Prisoners had good access to the gym and most of them used the facilities regularly. The PE department provided a wide range of recreational PE courses and a reasonable range of accredited vocational courses up to level 1. There were effective links with the health care department and substance misuse team.*

- 3.40** Two well-qualified and experienced PE instructors provided a wide range of recreational PE courses; one other staff member had been absent for an extended period. PE facilities were very good and consisted of a compact sports hall with large cardiovascular and resistance weights areas. Outside facilities were good, with a full-sized grassed football pitch; however, this was unusable owing to health and safety issues arising from poor maintenance.

- 3.41** Prisoner feedback helped staff to develop and improve the recreational PE. There were strong links with the local community; for example, a prison football team had played successfully in a local league in the previous year. Recreational PE included a variety of team games, circuit training and racquet sports.
- 3.42** Induction to the gym was prompt and thorough. All prisoners had access to at least three PE sessions a week, and most could access more. Most prisoners used the facilities regularly.
- 3.43** The PE department offered a reasonable range of accredited vocational PE courses up to level 1, and there were plans to extend the range to include a level 2 qualification.
- 3.44** The department had effective links with the health care department and substance misuse team. Prisoners could be referred to improve their health and well-being – for example, for help with weight loss and general health and fitness programmes. Healthy living and healthy eating were promoted on noticeboards around the prison.
- 3.45** Showers in the gym were not used as they were not maintained to a high enough standard and prisoners preferred to shower in their living accommodation.

Recommendations

- 3.46** **The prison should undertake works to repair and restore the outside football field.**
- 3.47** **The prison should provide additional accredited vocational PE courses for prisoners.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.48** The shower/changing room should be refurbished and maintained.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *Resettlement and offender management work was influenced by existing strong criminal justice arrangements, and was well managed and integrated. Volunteer mentors provided a 'through the gate' service to prisoners and release on temporary licence was used to help suitable prisoners resettle back into the community.*

4.2 Resettlement and offender management work (see below) continued to be influenced by strong criminal justice arrangements on the island. It was well managed and integrated, without the need for formal resettlement meetings

4.3 The governor, deputy governor, island chief probation officer and the head of the offender management unit (OMU), who was a senior probation officer, met regularly to plan the development and joint work of probation and the OMU. Close strategic links between the prison, police and probation departments, and involvement in joint work with other key agencies, ensured informed and proactive working arrangements.

4.4 The Guernsey branch of Caring for Ex-offenders, a charity, provided trained, volunteer mentors to assist prisoners' resettlement pre- and post-release; 13 current and ex-prisoners were being supported at the time of the inspection.

4.5 After serving a minimum of one-quarter of their sentence, enhanced category D prisoners could apply for release on temporary licence (ROTL); 12 prisoners were in receipt of this during the inspection.

4.6 Initially, male prisoners worked outside the security perimeter fence in the prison grounds, progressing to voluntary work and ultimately to paid employment. Women prisoners were unable to work unsupervised alongside men in the grounds, and instead completed additional voluntary work hours.

4.7 One-third of wages was paid as 'board and lodging' to the prison and a contribution to victim support services, and the remainder was kept in a separate account for prisoners until their release. ROTL enabled prisoners to attend education classes and job interviews and view prospective accommodation, and was available for weekend leave in the last month of sentence to maintain family ties. Category C prisoners were able to apply for ROTL to attend community appointments; if successful, they were accompanied by an OMU staff member. There had been no ROTL failures.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8** *The offender management unit was well established and unit staff were suitably trained and experienced. All prisoners had an allocated 'offender management team', and staff knew prisoners very well. Prisoners had a regularly reviewed, high-quality custody or sentence plan.*
- 4.9** The OMU was well established and unit staff were suitably trained, experienced and confident in their work. Training was provided in conjunction with the probation service. Managed by the senior probation officer, the unit consisted of two senior officers, three prison officer offender supervisors (OSs) and one prison-based seconded probation officer, who was also an offender manager (OM). There was one case administrator.
- 4.10** All prisoners were quickly allocated their own named 'offender management team' of an OS, OM and two personal officers. There was frequent planned contact between prisoners and staff, and in our survey considerably more prisoners than at comparator establishments said that a member of staff had helped them to prepare for release.
- 4.11** Convicted prisoners serving over 12 months were allocated a community OM, and those serving shorter sentences were managed by the prison-based OM. Working alongside colleagues in the youth justice team, the OM also managed children in the prison (see also section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).
- 4.12** OSs completed initial assessment interviews with all newly arrived adult prisoners; a separate age-appropriate assessment was used for children. All prisoners were also assessed by the OM and initial assessments were discussed at weekly case discussion meetings.
- 4.13** All prisoners, except those subject to a short remand period of around seven to 10 days, were subject to formal custody or sentence planning, undertaken at multidisciplinary meetings within 20 working days of arrival. Minutes of the senior management team performance review meeting in March 2014 recorded that this expectation had been met in 87.5% of cases; in order to improve this, the planned target completion date was made known to the OM when allocated to the case. The plans we saw were of good quality and regularly reviewed. Partners could be invited to meetings, and parents of children were particularly encouraged to attend. We were told that when the meetings related to children in custody the prison learning and skills department were invited, although they rarely attended.
- 4.14** Staff knew prisoners well and used individual knowledge and a variety of information to inform plan development; this included data contained in sentence enquiry reports completed by community OMs, which identified risk of harm and reconviction scores using a structured risk and needs assessment tool ('level of services inventory – revised'). They also used initial assessment interviews and case discussion, previous convictions and information received from other departments and agencies (see section on public protection).
- 4.15** The quality of sentence planning work was not formally assessed and recorded, although there was evidence that the senior probation officer covered issues individually with staff during casework supervision, which she provided monthly to all unit staff.

- 4.16** In our survey, responses to many of the questions about preparation for release were much more positive than the local prison comparators.

Recommendation

- 4.17 Both the prison learning and skills department and the States of Guernsey Education Department should be represented at sentence planning meetings when they relate to children in custody.**

Public protection

- 4.18** The prison had good links with the island child protection committee (ICPC). Prison managers attended various ICPC subgroup meetings, including the public protection/multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) management group, attended by the senior probation officer as the public protection coordinator.
- 4.19** Current and previous offences were scrutinised and all prisoners were referred to the police public protection unit and safeguarder services (court welfare), with a request for public protection information. The information received was recorded in the prison information management system and overseen by an OS and allocated multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC) officer (involved in information sharing across local agencies on high-risk cases of domestic abuse). Wing staff knew where to find public protection details and to whom they should refer any concerns. Prisoners were seen by an OS to explain any restrictions and those subject to post and telephone monitoring were reviewed every three months by security staff.
- 4.20** Offender managers notified the prison of MAPPA prisoners, of whom there were 30 at the time of the inspection. MAPPA level 1 cases (single agency supervision) were usually identified quickly, and levels 2 and 3 identified nearer release. The timescale for this was not, as yet, formally agreed and a MAPPA policy was in the process of development. OSs attended MAPPA meetings, some of which were held in the prison.

Categorisation

- 4.21** Initial multidisciplinary categorisation boards quickly categorised newly sentenced prisoners. An electronic tracking system ensured that reviews took place every three months for prisoners serving less than 12-months, every six-months for those serving five years or less and annually for those serving longer sentences. Categorisation reviews were up to date and provided a good marker of progress. Prisoners received decisions in writing.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.22** Guernsey law did not provide for release on life licence, and therefore indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were routinely transferred to the UK where they were managed using UK law and procedures. They were accepted back in Guernsey prison for accumulated visits, and it had recently been agreed that category C life-sentenced prisoners could remain in Guernsey until their next recategorisation review, for which they would return to their sending UK prison.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.23 *Custody plans were developed for remanded prisoners and progress was monitored. The reintegration needs of prisoners were assessed on arrival by offender supervisors, who assisted with accommodation and financial issues. The quality and sustainability of accommodation provision were inadequate. Insufficient careers advice and guidance were routinely offered to all prisoners. Health discharge arrangements were good and there were links to a local drug and alcohol agency. A money management course was delivered by Citizens Advice. There was a wide variety of useful initiatives to help prisoners sustain relationships with their families. A range of offending behaviour interventions was available, although there was no analysis of their effectiveness. Support services for victims of abuse, rape or domestic violence, and for prisoners involved in sex work, were not sufficiently well promoted.*

4.24 Custody plans were in place for unconvicted prisoners and progress was regularly monitored (see section on offender management and planning).

4.25 In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments knew where to find advice on accommodation, benefits and finance. However, an OS completed an initial assessment of reintegration needs for all newly arrived prisoners, including accommodation, financial issues and family contact. A pre-release meeting addressed any outstanding issues.

4.26 The 'cabin' facility – a new building, with relaxed furnishings, in the prison grounds next to the visitors centre provided a useful and pleasant environment in which to address prisoners' issues of risk reduction and reintegration into the community. This was well used during the inspection.

Accommodation

4.27 OSs assisted prisoners to find accommodation, and resettlement licences were used to enable suitable prisoners to visit planned accommodation (see section on strategic management of resettlement). In the period October 2013 to April 2014, of 68 prisoners released, only one had not had an address.

4.28 Accommodation options were limited and included hostel places and rooms in lodging houses. Not all provision was sustainable or of good quality, and a meeting had been organised between prison and probation staff and other key agencies to try to improve this. Some of these issues reflected a more general problem with securing accommodation in Guernsey.

Recommendation

4.29 **A strategy should be developed to provide appropriate accommodation for those leaving custody.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.30** The careers information advice and guidance service was provided at the request of individual prisoners and following referral from prison staff. Prisoners did not all receive formal individual career advice as a matter of routine, or guidance as part of their preparation for release.

Health care

- 4.31** Health discharge arrangements were good, with nurses using a 'checklist for nurse consultation – prisoners' pre-release' and a health advice leaflet. There were local arrangements for palliative care but there was no formal pathway for end-of-life care.

Recommendation

- 4.32** **There should be a protocol for palliative and end-of-life care.**

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.33** In-prison work with substance misusers was well integrated with the OMU and the prison's psychotherapist. Interventions run by the psychotherapist included a course addressing post-traumatic stress disorder, work on family relationships and family casework, and joint family therapy in the 'cabin' facility (see paragraph 4.26). Preparation for release for substance users was delivered by the substance misuse worker and included relapse prevention interventions, which were run as required, and also harm reduction and overdose awareness. There were good links with the local community Drug Concern agency.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.34** OSs advised prisoners on finance and debt issues. Citizens Advice delivered four financial management courses annually, and also provided some individual debt advice.
- 4.35** Prison managers had been unable to identify a bank on the island that was willing to assist prisoners to open a bank account. A social security representative, based at the prison each Wednesday, gave benefit advice and arranged benefit claims pre-release.

Recommendation

- 4.36** **Prisoners should be able to open a bank account.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.37** A family liaison officer routinely saw new arrivals to collect data on prisoners' children, and aimed to identify those with primary carer responsibilities. However, during the inspection it became apparent that two female primary carers had not been identified, with the result that they had not been offered the daily visits to which they were entitled.
- 4.38** A family support team, including prison staff, volunteers and representatives of a variety of community organisations, met monthly. Minutes demonstrated cooperative and imaginative

planning to support families, such as conversational training for the parents of older children, information packs for families and assistance with transport to the prison. Activities included quarterly family fun days, with themed activities and a shared meal, and children's visits, which gave parents the chance to have a visit from their children without other carers present.

- 4.39** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments (59% versus 33%) said that they had been supported to maintain or re-establish contact with their family and friends. We found a wide variety of useful initiatives, including a project for prisoners to record stories for their children, a parenting course for fathers, a prison visitors scheme and various forms of therapy for individuals, couples and families. The 'cabin' (see paragraph 4.26) significantly enhanced this provision.
- 4.40** All except those on the basic regime could have at least one visit a week. Prisoners found it easy to book their own visits. Weekday visits lasted 45 minutes, which was shorter than we normally see, but they started on time and visitors felt that they were long enough. Weekend visits were for 75 minutes, to accommodate those travelling longer distances. The majority of visitors were from Guernsey, so most journeys were short. A visitors' survey in spring 2014 had been mostly positive.
- 4.41** Visits for vulnerable prisoners were restricted to Tuesday evenings and Friday afternoons, and they felt it unfair that they could not access the longer weekend visits.
- 4.42** There was no visitors centre. Visitors waited in a small, but clean, area in the gate lodge. This had play equipment for young children but no toilet, and limited information about the prison. There was insufficient seating but waiting times were short. Searching processes were relaxed and informal.
- 4.43** The visits room was newly refurbished and pleasant but felt cramped. Officers were stationed very close to some visitors, unnecessarily encroaching on privacy, and we were told that those using wheelchairs found it difficult to navigate the narrow gaps between the rows of chairs. Despite this, the atmosphere was generally relaxed. A play area met the needs of young children but was unsupervised, and there was nothing to occupy older children. Light refreshments were available, at reasonable prices. When male and female prisoners visited each other, they were allowed to buy themselves refreshments at the café.

Recommendations

- 4.44** **Vulnerable prisoners should have access to weekend visits.**
- 4.45** **Supervision in visits should not unnecessarily encroach on privacy. Visits should take place in sight, but out of hearing, of officers.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.46** Women prisoners should routinely be made aware of the specific arrangements available to primary carers.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.47** The delivery of a variety of non-accredited group and one-to-one offending behaviour interventions was planned annually and delivered flexibly according to need identified in

sentence plans. In our survey, 83% of prisoners, against the 52% comparator, said that they had been involved in an offending behaviour programme in the prison.

- 4.48** Programmes included a generic cognitive skills programme ('Choices and Challenges'), delivered by the prison psychotherapist and OSs; this was also available to women, vulnerable prisoners and young adults. A victim awareness course was facilitated by the prison-based probation officer and an OS, and community OMs delivered a course called 'Dealing with Destructive Levels of Male Aggression', which addressed male instrumental violence, within the prison.
- 4.49** Individual programmes, such as addressing domestic abuse, were developed by the prison psychotherapist and community OMs, and specific interventions were provided to women and girls as necessary. The psychotherapist delivered relationship, loss and family interventions, and also motivational support for those unable or unwilling to engage in programmes or group work. The substance misuse worker delivered substance awareness programmes.
- 4.50** Individual treatment plans for sex offenders were devised by OMs and a visiting consultant forensic psychologist. The Isle of Man sex offender treatment programme was delivered, usually by two OMs, to individual prisoners. An 'Only Pictures' programme was available for internet offenders.
- 4.51** Interventions for children were planned and delivered by OMs and youth justice workers, and a trained OS managed the Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme for young people aged 16–24.
- 4.52** There was an island-wide restorative justice strategy, and awareness training had been delivered to many staff, including all OMU staff. Some supervised meetings had taken place between prisoners and victims.
- 4.53** There had been no formal analysis of the effectiveness of the interventions available.

Housekeeping point

- 4.54** The effectiveness of interventions should be assessed to inform their development.

Additional resettlement services

- 4.55** The screening tool used by OMs in preparing sentence enquiry reports (see section on offender management and planning) identified historical or current abuse, and the psychotherapist supported prisoners individually when necessary. Initial assessments undertaken by OSs did not directly address prisoner experiences of abuse, rape, domestic violence or involvement in sex work, and support services were not sufficiently identified or promoted across the prison.

Recommendation

- 4.56** **Prisoners should be able to disclose experiences of abuse, rape or domestic violence and/or involvement in sex work confidentially, and support and information services in the prison, local community and UK-wide should be promoted across the establishment.**

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The reference number at the end of each recommendation, housekeeping point or example of good practice refers to its paragraph location in the main report.

Main recommendation

To the Home Department

- 5.1** Children under 18 years of age should not be held in an adult prison. (See also police main recommendation B19.) (S52)

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.2** The needs of different minority groups should be promoted to staff and prisoners, and there should be a widespread understanding of the services available and how they can be accessed. Regular processes designed to identify potential disadvantage should provide assurance of fair treatment. (S53)
- 5.3** The States of Guernsey education department should support the prison, and local schools, in ensuring that the education needs of all children of school age are met. (S54)
- 5.4** The range and number of places in education, training and work, particularly for women and vulnerable prisoners, should be increased. (S55)

Recommendation

To the Home Department

Safeguarding

- 5.5** More appropriate alternatives to remanding people to prison as a place of safety should be developed. (1.31)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.6** A structured induction programme should be introduced to ensure that the needs of the different populations are met in the early days of custody. (1.13)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.7** Fully independent external investigations should be commissioned of all deaths, including those post-release. (1.25)

Safeguarding

- 5.8** Formal adult safeguarding processes should be developed with the health and social services department. (1.30)

Young people and child protection

- 5.9** Existing procedures, particularly relating to behaviour management and restraint, should be reviewed to consider their suitability for children. (1.39)
- 5.10** L wing should not be used to hold children or any other prisoners for protracted periods. (1.40)

Security

- 5.11** Prisoners should not automatically remain on closed visits for three months if there is insufficient evidence to support this measure. (1.49)
- 5.12** All prisoners with a confirmed positive drug test should be automatically referred to the substance misuse worker. (1.50)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.13** Reviews for prisoners on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme should be fully recorded and take into account the individual circumstances of each prisoner so they can be promoted to standard quickly once their behaviour improves. (1.56)

Substance misuse

- 5.14** Prescribing for opiate substitution should be flexible and based on individual needs. (1.71)
- 5.15** Integration between clinical and psychosocial services should improve. (1.72)

Residential units

- 5.16** The offensive display policy should be enforced. (2.7)
- 5.17** All showers and toilets should be screened. (2.8)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.18** Prisoners on unstaffed wings should have a reliable method of contacting staff without pressing their cell call bell. (2.16)

Equality and diversity

- 5.19** There should be independent immigration advice available. (2.37)
- 5.20** Prisoners' negative perceptions about respect for their religious beliefs should be understood and addressed. (2.38)

- 5.21** All prisoners should be asked during induction whether they consider themselves to have a disability and should be offered individualised support when necessary. (2.39)
- 5.22** All staff working with women prisoners should understand their specific needs and there should always be a trained female officer in the prison at night. (2.40)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.23** Religious provision for vulnerable prisoners and for Roman Catholics should be improved. (2.47)

Legal rights

- 5.24** Relevant legal textbooks should be available in the prison library. (2.55)

Health services

- 5.25** The medicines administration area should afford confidentiality to patients. (2.70)
- 5.26** Emergency ambulances entering the prison should have unfettered access to the site of the incident. (2.71)
- 5.27** Patients should be able to choose the gender of the GP who treats them. (2.72)
- 5.28** Medical records should be printed, rather than handwritten. (2.81)
- 5.29** Pharmacist consultations or clinics and medication use reviews should be provided. (2.89)
- 5.30** The duration and timing of medication administration periods should enable sedating medicines to be given at a more appropriate time. (2.90)

Time out of cell

- 5.31** The exercise areas for vulnerable prisoners and women should be improved. (3.4)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.32** Appropriate support and supervision arrangements for prison training staff and volunteer tutors should be developed. (3.14)
- 5.33** The analysis and use of data to plan and monitor the quality of the provision should be improved, including that delivered by the Guernsey College of Further Education, to ensure that the needs of all groups of prisoners are met. (3.15)
- 5.34** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved to a consistently good standard across all the provision, through the identification and sharing of best practice. (3.29)
- 5.35** The work available should be more purposeful and fully occupy prisoners throughout the working day. (3.30)
- 5.36** The recognition and recording of previous attainment and identification of progress by prisoners in non-accredited learning should be introduced. (3.34)

5.37 A wider range of materials to support education and training should be provided. (3.38)

Physical education and healthy living

5.38 The prison should undertake works to repair and restore the outside football field. (3.46)

5.39 The prison should provide additional accredited vocational PE courses for prisoners. (3.47)

Offender management and planning

5.40 Both the prison learning and skills department and the States of Guernsey Education Department should be represented at sentence planning meetings when they relate to children in custody. (4.17)

Reintegration planning

5.41 A strategy should be developed to provide appropriate accommodation for those leaving custody. (4.29)

5.42 There should be a protocol for palliative and end-of-life care. (4.32)

5.43 Prisoners should be able to open a bank account. (4.36)

5.44 Vulnerable prisoners should have access to weekend visits. (4.44)

5.45 Supervision in visits should not unnecessarily encroach on privacy. Visits should take place in sight, but out of hearing, of officers. (4.45)

5.46 Prisoners should be able to disclose experiences of abuse, rape or domestic violence and/or involvement in sex work confidentially, and support and information services in the prison, local community and UK-wide should be promoted across the establishment. (4.56)

Housekeeping points

Security

5.47 Prisoners placed on closed visits should be informed of their right to appeal. (1.51)

Residential units

5.48 Laundry facilities should be repaired quickly or alternative arrangements made for prisoners to dry their clothing. (2.9)

Staff-prisoner relationships

5.49 Prisoners should always be referred to by their full or preferred name. (2.17)

Equality and diversity

5.50 Eligibility arrangements for free telephone calls for foreign national prisoners should be clear to all staff and prisoners. (2.41)

Health services

- 5.51** Health representatives should attend the prisoner forum regularly. (2.73)
- 5.52** The receipt of clinical supervision by staff should be recorded. (2.74)
- 5.53** The waiting time to see an optician should be improved. (2.82)
- 5.54** The range of patient group directions should include only P-list (prescribed by a retail registered pharmacist) and prescription-only medicines; other general stock items should be supplied separately under a 'special sick' policy, and a wider range of over-the-counter remedies should be made available. (2.91)
- 5.55** There should be an agreed stock list and all medicines should have a batch number and expiry date. (2.92)
- 5.56** Patients should be administered medicines in confidence. (2.93)
- 5.57** Controlled drugs should only be supplied against original prescriptions, and unwanted controlled drugs should be destroyed on the premises, using denaturing kits. (2.94)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.58** The shower/changing room should be refurbished and maintained. (3.48)

Reintegration planning

- 5.59** Women prisoners should routinely be made aware of the specific arrangements available to primary carers. (4.46)
- 5.60** The effectiveness of interventions should be assessed to inform their development. (4.54)

Examples of good practice

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.61** First night interviews, wing and cell allocation risk assessments, identification procedures and the processing of property started at court, utilising waiting time at court before returning to the prison. (1.5)

Health services

- 5.62** The siting of an automated external defibrillator in the court custody suite ensured that cardio-resuscitation of a collapsed prisoner could be guided and augmented before the arrival of the emergency services. (2.75)
- 5.63** The availability of care plans and individualised medical advice in the prison centre ensured that custody staff had guidance for caring for patients in distress. (2.83)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick
Sean Sullivan
Paul Fenning
Joss Crosbie
Jeanette Hall
Karen Dillon
Helen Ranns
Lucy Higgins

Chief Inspector
Team leader
Inspector
Inspector
Inspector
Inspector
Researcher
Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts
Paul Tarbuck
Sharon Monks
Gerard McGrath

Drugs inspector
Health services inspector
Pharmacist
Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

MALE ADULT AND YOUNG ADULTS

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	4	60	65.30
Recall		2	2.04
Convicted unsentenced		1	1.02
Remand	2	17	19.38
Civil prisoners			
Detainees			
Total	6	80	87.74

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	2	18	20.40
Less than six months		4	4.08
six months to less than 12 months		3	3.06
12 months to less than 2 years	2	10	12.24
2 years to less than 4 years	1	13	14.28
4 years to less than 10 years	1	25	26.52
10 years and over (not life)		6	6.12
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)			
Life		1	1.02
Total	6	80	87.72

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	18	
Under 21 years	6	6.12
21 years to 29 years	33	33.67
30 years to 39 years	22	22.44
40 years to 49 years	12	12.24
50 years to 59 years	10	10.20
60 years to 69 years	3	3.06
70 plus years	0	
Please state maximum age here:	69	
Total	86	87.73

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	6	67	74.48
Foreign nationals	0	13	13.26
Total	6	80	87.74

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B	1	24	25.51
Category C	3	24	27.55
Category D	0	15	15.30

Other	2 remand category B	17 remand category B	19.38
Total	6	80	87.74

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	6	67	74.48
Irish			
Gypsy/Irish Traveller			
Other white		13	13.26
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean			
White and black African			
White and Asian			
Other mixed			
Asian or Asian British			
Indian			
Pakistani			
Bangladeshi			
Chinese			
Other Asian			
Black or black British			
Caribbean			
African			
Other black			
Other ethnic group			
Arab			
Other ethnic group			
Not stated			
Total	6	80	87.74

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England		17	17.34
Roman Catholic		12	12.24
Other Christian denominations			
Muslim		1	1.02
Sikh			
Hindu			
Buddhist			
Jewish			
Other		17 agnostic	17.34
No religion	6	33	39.79
Total	6	80	87.73

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			2	2.04
1 month to 3 months			6	6.12

3 months to six months	1		7	8.16
six months to 1 year	1		15	16.32
1 year to 2 years	1		16	17.34
2 years to 4 years	1		15	16.32
4 years or more			2	2.04
Total	4		63	68.34

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry			
Public protection cases (cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).			
Total	NA	NA	

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			3	3.06
1 month to 3 months	2		7	9.18
3 months to six months			5	5.10
six months to 1 year			2	2.04
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total	2		17	19.38

Main offence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	4	20	24.48
Sexual offences		18	18.36
Burglary		4	4.08
Robbery		2	2.04
Theft and handling		2	2.04
Fraud and forgery		1	1.02
Drugs offences	2	27	29.59
Other offences		6	6.12
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded /holding warrant			
Total	6	80	87.73

FEMALE: ADULTS AND YOUNG ADULTS

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	1	4	5.10
Recall			
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand		2	2.04
Civil prisoners			
Detainees			
Total	1	6	7.14

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		2	2.04
Less than six months	1	2	3.06
six months to less than 12 months			
12 months to less than 2 years			
2 years to less than 4 years			
4 years to less than 10 years		2	2.04
10 years and over (not life)			
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)			
Life			
Total	1	6	7.14

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	20	
Under 21 years	1	1.02
21 years to 29 years	1	1.02
30 years to 39 years	1	1.02
40 years to 49 years	2	2.04
50 years to 59 years	2	2.04
60 years to 69 years		
70 plus years		
Please state maximum age here:	52	
Total	7	7.14

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	1	6	7.14
Foreign nationals			
Total	1	6	7.14

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B	1	4	5.10
Category C		1	1.02
Category D		1	1.02
Other			
Total	1	6	7.14

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	1	6	7.14

Irish			
Gypsy/Irish Traveller			
Other white			
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean			
White and black African			
White and Asian			
Other mixed			
Asian or Asian British			
Indian			
Pakistani			
Bangladeshi			
Chinese			
Other Asian			
Black or black British			
Caribbean			
African			
Other black			
Other ethnic group			
Arab			
Other ethnic group			
Not stated			
Total	1	6	7.14

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England		2	2.04
Roman Catholic			
Other Christian denominations			
Muslim			
Sikh			
Hindu			
Buddhist			
Jewish			
Other			
No religion	1	4	5.10
Total	1	6	7.14

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	1	1	1	1.02
1 month to 3 months			1	1.02
3 months to six months				
six months to 1 year			1	1.02
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years			1	1.02
4 years or more				
Total	1	1%	4	4.08

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry			
Public protection cases (requiring monitoring/restrictions).			
Total	NA	NA	

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month				
1 month to 3 months			1	1.02
3 months to six months			1	1.02
six months to 1 year				
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total			2	2.04

Main offence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	1		1.02
Sexual offences			
Burglary			
Robbery		1	1.02
Theft and handling		1	1.02
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences		3	3.06
Other offences		1	1.02
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded /holding warrant			
Total	1	6	7.14

YOUNG PEOPLE/CHILDREN

Status	Number of young people	%
Sentenced	5	5.10
Recalls		
Convicted unsentenced		
Remand		
Detainee		
Total	5	5.10

Age	Number of young people	%
15 years	2	2.04
16 years	1	1.02
17 years	2	2.04
18 years		
Total	5	5.10

Nationality	Number of young people	%
British	5	5.10
Foreign nationals		
Total	5	5.10

Ethnicity	Number of young people	%
White		
British	5	5.10
Irish		
Gypsy/ Irish traveller		
Other white		
Mixed		
White and black Caribbean		
White and black African		
White and Asian		
Other mixed		
Asian or Asian British		
Indian		
Pakistani		
Bangladeshi		
Chinese		
Other Asian		
Black or black British		
Caribbean		
African		
Other black		
Other ethnic group		
Arab		
Other ethnic group		
Not stated		
Total	5	5.10

Religion	Number of young people	%
Baptist		
Church of England		
Roman Catholic		
Other Christian denominations		
Muslim		
Sikh		
Hindu		
Buddhist		
Jewish		
Other		
No religion	5	5.10
Total	5	5.10

Sentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 month	1–3 months	3–6 months	6–12 months	1–2 years	2 years +	4 years +	Total
Age								
15 years		2						2
16 years			1					1
17 years		1	1					2
18 years								
Total		3	2					5

Unsentenced only – length of stay by age

Length of stay	<1 month	1–3 months	3–6 months	6–12 months	1–2 years	2 years +	4 years +	Total
Age								
15 years								
16 years								
17 years								
18 years								
Total								

Main offence	Number of young people	%
Violence against the person	4	4.08
Sexual offences		
Burglary		
Robbery		
Theft and handling	1	1.02
Fraud and forgery		
Drugs offences		
Other offences		
Offence not recorded / holding warrant		
Total	5	5.10

Number of Section 53 (2)/91s (determinate sentences only) by age and sentence

Sentence	Under 2 years	2–3 years	3–4 years	4–5 years	5 years +	Total
Age						
15 years	2					2
16 years		1				1
17 years	2					2
18 years						
Total	4	1				5

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

A voluntary, confidential and anonymous survey 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

Questionnaires were offered to all prisoners.

At the time of the survey on 14 April the prisoner population at Guernsey Prison was 93; 82 prisoners were adult males, six were adult females and five males were under 18. Everyone was offered a survey. Overall, this represented 100% of the prisoner population.

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

No females refused to complete a questionnaire.

No males under the age of 18 refused to complete the questionnaire.

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

In total, 76 adult male respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 82% of the prison population. The response rate was 93%. In addition to the five respondents who refused to complete the questionnaire, one questionnaire was not returned.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	10
B	7
F	8
G	4
H	8
I	6

J	31
E	2

All female respondents completed and returned their questionnaire.

All under 18 male respondents completed and returned their questionnaire.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for Guernsey Prison.

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

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

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

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

Due to the size of the female and under 18 population, it was not possible to conduct additional analyses.

The following comparative analyses are presented for the adult male population:

- The current survey responses from Guernsey 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all local prisons in England and Wales. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 36 local prisons since April 2008.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who consider themselves to be a foreign national and those who do not.
- 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 the vulnerable prisoner wings (B and H) and the rest of the adult male population.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between J wing and all other wings holding adult males.

Survey summary (adult male)

Section I: About You

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

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		5 (7%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		29 (39%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		19 (25%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		9 (12%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		9 (12%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		3 (4%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		62 (83%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		7 (9%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		4 (5%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		12 (16%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		4 (5%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		4 (5%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		14 (19%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		11 (15%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		23 (31%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		5 (7%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Life</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	<i>Yes</i>		11 (14%)
	<i>No</i>		65 (86%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		74 (97%)
	<i>No</i>		2 (3%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		74 (97%)
	<i>No</i>		2 (3%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	60 (79%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)

<i>White - other</i>	12 (16%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - African</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	0 (0%)		

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

Yes	3 (4%)
No	72 (96%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

<i>None</i>	39 (51%)	<i>Hindu</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Church of England</i>	12 (16%)	<i>Jewish</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Catholic</i>	14 (18%)	<i>Muslim</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	6 (8%)	<i>Other</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Buddhist</i>	0 (0%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>	74 (97%)
<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	0 (0%)

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	14 (18%)
No	62 (82%)

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

Yes	8 (11%)
No	68 (89%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	31 (41%)
No	45 (59%)

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

Yes	36 (47%)
No	40 (53%)

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

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	70 (92%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	4 (5%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (3%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	70 (92%)
Yes	2 (3%)
No	3 (4%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)

Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	70 (92%)
	Yes	1 (1%)
	No	2 (3%)
	Don't remember	3 (4%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	45 (59%)
	No	21 (28%)
	Don't remember	10 (13%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	66 (87%)
	No	8 (11%)
	Don't remember	2 (3%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	31 (41%)
	Well	31 (41%)
	Neither	11 (14%)
	Badly	0 (0%)
	Very badly	1 (1%)
	Don't remember	2 (3%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	51 (68%)
	Yes, I received written information	4 (5%)
	No, I was not told anything	10 (13%)
	Don't remember	12 (16%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	57 (75%)
	No	17 (22%)
	Don't remember	2 (3%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	43 (57%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	28 (37%)
	Don't remember	5 (7%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	69 (91%)
	No	3 (4%)
	Don't remember	4 (5%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well	29 (38%)
	Well	36 (47%)
	Neither	9 (12%)
	Badly	0 (0%)
	Very badly	1 (1%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	7 (10%)	<i>Physical health</i> 12 (16%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	6 (8%)	<i>Mental health</i> 13 (18%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	5 (7%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 6 (8%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	19 (26%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 17 (23%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	4 (5%)	<i>Other</i> 2 (3%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	15 (21%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> 29 (40%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	19 (26%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	<i>Yes</i>		19 (27%)
	<i>No</i>		22 (31%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>		29 (41%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>		15 (20%)
	<i>A shower</i>		22 (29%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>		33 (43%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>		54 (71%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>		42 (55%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>		56 (74%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>		4 (5%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>		17 (23%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>		60 (80%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>		43 (57%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>		21 (28%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>		7 (9%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>		39 (54%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>		42 (58%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>		39 (54%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>		38 (53%)
	<i>Health services</i>		46 (64%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>		31 (43%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>		14 (19%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	<i>Yes</i>		65 (88%)
	<i>No</i>		6 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		3 (4%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?		
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>		25 (33%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>		29 (39%)
	<i>More than a week</i>		12 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		9 (12%)

Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	25 (34%)
	<i>Yes</i>	20 (27%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	15 (21%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	10 (13%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	11 (15%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	45 (60%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (12%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	20 (27%)	40 (53%)	6 (8%)	5 (7%)	3 (4%) 1 (1%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	15 (21%)	40 (56%)	5 (7%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%) 6 (8%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	7 (10%)	10 (15%)	13 (19%)	4 (6%)	6 (9%) 28 (41%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					2 (3%)
	<i>Yes</i>					37 (49%)
	<i>No</i>					36 (48%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	<i>Yes</i>					16 (21%)
	<i>No</i>					17 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					42 (56%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	71 (95%)	4 (5%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	74 (97%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	64 (86%)	7 (9%)	3 (4%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	61 (81%)	14 (19%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	35 (48%)	27 (37%)	11 (15%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	60 (81%)	14 (19%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	37 (50%)	19 (26%)	18 (24%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	<i>Very good</i>					27 (36%)
	<i>Good</i>					34 (46%)
	<i>Neither</i>					12 (16%)
	<i>Bad</i>					1 (1%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					0 (0%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?					
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>					0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>					47 (64%)
	<i>No</i>					27 (36%)

Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes	70 (93%)
	No	2 (3%)
	Don't know	3 (4%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	31 (43%)
	No	5 (7%)
	Don't know/ N/A	36 (50%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	38 (51%)
	No	2 (3%)
	Don't know/ N/A	35 (47%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	22 (30%)
	Very easy	14 (19%)
	Easy	17 (23%)
	Neither	3 (4%)
	Difficult	0 (0%)
	Very difficult	0 (0%)
	Don't know	18 (24%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	62 (85%)
	No	7 (10%)
	Don't know	4 (5%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (<i>If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	5 (7%) 44 (66%) 18 (27%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	5 (7%) 42 (63%) 20 (30%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	41 (60%)
	No	8 (12%)
	Don't know	19 (28%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (<i>If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	34 (49%) 18 (26%) 18 (26%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	34 (49%) 20 (29%) 16 (23%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	15 (21%)
	No	55 (79%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Panel (IMP)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	21 (28%)
	Very easy	11 (15%)
	Easy	14 (19%)

Neither	17 (23%)
Difficult	6 (8%)
Very difficult	5 (7%)

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>	1 (1%)
	Yes	42 (59%)
	No	27 (38%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	1 (1%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	1 (1%)
	Yes	42 (57%)
	No	29 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (3%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	3 (4%)
	No	70 (96%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	69 (96%)
	Very well	0 (0%)
	Well	1 (1%)
	Neither	1 (1%)
	Badly	0 (0%)
	Very badly	1 (1%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	65 (89%)
	No	8 (11%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	61 (87%)
	No	9 (13%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	35 (48%)
	No	38 (52%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	0 (0%)
	Never	2 (3%)
	Rarely	27 (38%)
	Some of the time	26 (37%)
	Most of the time	12 (17%)
	All of the time	4 (6%)

Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	44 (61%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	16 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (13%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	24 (32%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	22 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (12%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	7 (9%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	9 (12%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	15 (20%)
	<i>No</i>	59 (80%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	5 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	68 (93%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	59 (82%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	5 (7%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>At work</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>During movement</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>At education</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>At health services</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	0 (0%)
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (25%)
	<i>No</i>	56 (75%)
Q8.5	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>	12 (16%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	11 (15%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	5 (7%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	2 (3%)

<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (5%)
<i>You were new here</i>	6 (8%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	11 (15%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	24 (32%)
No	50 (68%)

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>	11 (15%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	10 (14%)
<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (3%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your age</i>	2 (3%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (4%)
<i>You were new here</i>	2 (3%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	5 (7%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)

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

<i>Not been victimised</i>	40 (58%)
Yes	12 (17%)
No	17 (25%)

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	2 (3%)	15 (20%)	36 (49%)	10 (14%)	10 (14%)	1 (1%)
The nurse	2 (3%)	22 (30%)	38 (51%)	10 (14%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
The dentist	8 (11%)	11 (15%)	21 (29%)	11 (15%)	14 (19%)	8 (11%)

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	3 (4%)	34 (46%)	25 (34%)	8 (11%)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)
The nurse	3 (4%)	32 (43%)	19 (26%)	11 (15%)	7 (9%)	2 (3%)
The dentist	16 (22%)	14 (19%)	23 (32%)	9 (12%)	8 (11%)	3 (4%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Very good</i>	27 (37%)
<i>Good</i>	28 (38%)
<i>Neither</i>	7 (10%)
<i>Bad</i>	8 (11%)
<i>Very bad</i>	2 (3%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	36 (49%)
	No	38 (51%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?	
	Not taking medication	38 (51%)
	Yes, all my meds	7 (9%)
	Yes, some of my meds	19 (26%)
	No	10 (14%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	20 (27%)
	No	54 (73%)
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.)	
	Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	54 (73%)
	Yes	15 (20%)
	No	5 (7%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	16 (22%)
	No	58 (78%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	15 (20%)
	No	59 (80%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	3 (4%)
	Easy	8 (11%)
	Neither	10 (14%)
	Difficult	1 (1%)
	Very difficult	10 (14%)
	Don't know	42 (57%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	2 (3%)
	Easy	3 (4%)
	Neither	8 (11%)
	Difficult	5 (7%)
	Very difficult	12 (16%)
	Don't know	44 (59%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	0 (0%)
	No	74 (100%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	1 (1%)
	No	73 (99%)

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>	57 (78%)
	Yes	10 (14%)
	No	6 (8%)
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>	59 (80%)
	Yes	12 (16%)
	No	3 (4%)
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>	58 (79%)
	Yes	13 (18%)
	No	2 (3%)

Section II: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	1 (1%)	10 (14%)	30 (41%)	18 (25%)	11 (15%)	3 (4%)
	Vocational or skills training	8 (12%)	6 (9%)	19 (28%)	16 (23%)	10 (14%)	10 (14%)
	Education (including basic skills)	2 (3%)	9 (13%)	39 (56%)	12 (17%)	6 (9%)	2 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	11 (15%)	8 (11%)	24 (33%)	15 (21%)	10 (14%)	4 (6%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					8 (11%)	
	Prison job					63 (86%)	
	Vocational or skills training					7 (10%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					32 (44%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					22 (30%)	
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	1 (1%)	25 (36%)	41 (59%)	3 (4%)		
	Vocational or skills training	16 (29%)	16 (29%)	18 (33%)	5 (9%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	8 (13%)	26 (41%)	25 (40%)	4 (6%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	10 (17%)	25 (42%)	15 (25%)	9 (15%)		
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					6 (9%)	
	Never					16 (24%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					18 (26%)	
	<i>About once a week</i>					27 (40%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i>					1 (1%)	
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>					16 (24%)	
	Yes					28 (42%)	
	No					23 (34%)	
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					11 (15%)	
	0					7 (10%)	

	<i>1 to 2</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	20 (28%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	32 (45%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	8 (11%)
	<i>0</i>	4 (6%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	28 (39%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	17 (24%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	14 (20%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	3 (4%)
	<i>0</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	9 (13%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	56 (79%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	8 (11%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	7 (10%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	17 (24%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	18 (25%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	18 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	2 (3%)

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>	41 (59%)
	<i>No</i>	29 (41%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (26%)
	<i>No</i>	53 (74%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	60 (82%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	18 (25%)
	<i>Easy</i>	26 (36%)
	<i>Neither</i>	7 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	2 (3%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	14 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	0 (0%)

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>	12 (16%)

	Yes	58 (77%)
	No	5 (7%)
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>	17 (24%)
	<i>No contact</i>	7 (10%)
	<i>Letter</i>	9 (13%)
	<i>Phone</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Visit</i>	48 (67%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	65 (92%)
	No	6 (8%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	12 (16%)
	Yes	58 (79%)
	No	3 (4%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	15 (21%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	12 (16%)
	<i>Involved</i>	31 (42%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6 (8%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	7 (10%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	2 (3%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	15 (20%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	14 (19%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	36 (49%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	21 (28%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	16 (22%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	10 (14%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	15 (21%)
	Yes	38 (53%)
	No	10 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (13%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	15 (20%)
	Yes	9 (12%)
	No	39 (53%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (15%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	15 (20%)
	Yes	24 (32%)
	No	24 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (15%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	Yes	3 (4%)

No	35 (49%)
Don't know	34 (47%)

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

Yes	22 (31%)
No	48 (69%)

**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	21 (31%)	12 (18%)	35 (51%)
Accommodation	22 (33%)	9 (13%)	36 (54%)
Benefits	19 (29%)	9 (14%)	38 (58%)
Finances	21 (32%)	4 (6%)	40 (62%)
Education	19 (29%)	15 (23%)	32 (48%)
Drugs and alcohol	26 (38%)	18 (26%)	24 (35%)

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>	12 (17%)
Yes	37 (52%)
No	22 (31%)

Report B. Inspection of police custody suites in Guernsey

Fact page

Task of the force

The island police force covers the Bailiwick of Guernsey (30 square miles).

Brief history

Policing in Guernsey started in 1853 with the appointment of four assistant constables, who operated under the direction of the parish constable and were known as the St Peter Port constables. Policing evolved over the years and Guernsey Police started on 10 April 1920, when the St Peter Port police were disbanded. The force's remit is to maintain peace and order and uphold the law in the Bailiwick of Guernsey, which also includes Alderney and Sark. (Their by-line is: 'Working together to make the Bailiwick safe and secure'.)

On 1 January 2013, the Chief Officer of Police, was appointed by the Home Department as the Head of Law Enforcement to provide operational oversight of both Guernsey Police and Guernsey Border Agency. This was with a view to aligning the work of the two organisations more closely.

At the time of the inspection, Guernsey Police had three police stations, all of which had custody facilities. We did not inspect the custody facilities at Alderney or Sark as our invitation was to inspect the main site at Police Headquarters in St Peter Port, which is the only site that is staffed on a 24/7 basis. The custody suites are visited on a regular basis by Independent Custody Visitors.

The three designated police custody facilities in the Bailiwick of Guernsey were located as follows:

	Number of cells
Police headquarters	7
Alderney	2
Sark	2

Background and key findings

- B1** In England and Wales, police custody is inspected jointly by HM Inspectorates of Prisons and Constabulary. These inspections form part of the joint work programme of the criminal justice inspectorates and 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 Inspectorates of Prisons and Constabulary are two of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.
- B2** Guernsey is not covered by OPCAT but the local Independent Custody Visitors (ICV) provide regular scrutiny of facilities. HMI Prisons was invited by the Guernsey Home Department to undertake inspections of prison, police, court, and border agency custody consistent with our inspections in England and Wales.
- B3** The inspections of police custody look beyond police law and guidance. They are informed by a set of Expectations for Police Custody about the appropriate treatment of detainees and conditions of detention, developed by the two inspectorates to assist best custodial practice.

Strategy

- B4** Good joint working had led to an internal review of practice, resulting in the formation of a working group between the police and the Guernsey Border Agency (GBA) which was working to influence change.
- B5** Guernsey police had an agreement to utilise court and GBA cells at peak times, and there were plans to develop joint custody facilities.
- B6** Custody sergeants were trained for most aspects of their role but police constables used as gaolers were not. There was little written guidance for staff about what was expected of them when working in custody. Quality assurance arrangements were inadequate.

Treatment and conditions

- B7** Although the custody estate was clean and decent, the layout of the facilities was poor, and cells had a number of ligature points.
- B8** We saw professional and courteous interactions between staff and detainees but a limited focus on the specific needs of diverse groups such as women and children.
- B9** Custody records were paper based and were inadequate; they did not cover all relevant questions related to risk, and did not adequately focus on the needs of women or make clear the observation levels for vulnerable prisoners. Pre-release risk assessments were not completed.
- B10** Use of force was not monitored to ensure proportionality.

- B11 Basic care was provided to detainees, although those held overnight were not always offered a shower.

Individual rights

- B12 Individual rights and legal requirements were generally adhered to, although complaints were not readily facilitated. Appropriate adult (AA) provision was generally good but children were inappropriately held in police custody overnight. Interpreting services were adequate.
- B13 There were frequent delays in accessing court slots, which was an exception to the usual good working relationships between criminal justice agencies.

Health care

- B14 The medical room did not comply with relevant standards of infection control or forensic sampling. Medicines management was poor. In particular, assurance systems for managing controlled drugs needed to be implemented immediately. There was no liaison and diversion mental health service.
- B15 The forensic medical examiner services appeared appropriate but medical records were not printed, leading to the potential for error. There was good availability of equipment for use in medical emergencies.

Main recommendations

- B16 **Given the level of duplication between police and Guernsey Border Agency custodial work, and the size of the island, joint services should be developed.**
- B17 **Custody records should be reviewed to ensure that they cover all relevant questions relating to risk and the needs of detainees.**
- B18 **Observation levels for detainees should be appropriate to keep them safe, and should be recorded in a prominent position on the custody record; this information should be clearly exchanged between staff during the handover.**
- B19 **Children under 18 years of age should not be held in custody overnight (see recommendation 7.11 and prisoners main recommendations S52)**
- B20 **Good practice principles and practices in medicines management should be introduced, and assurance systems for the receipt, storage, checking, use and discarding of controlled drugs should be implemented.**

Section 6. Strategy

Expected outcomes:

There is a strategic focus on custody that drives the development and application of custody-specific policies and procedures to protect the well-being of detainees.

- 6.1** A superintendent was responsible for the strategic leadership of custody, supported by a chief inspector (uniformed operations) and an inspector, who was the custody manager. The custody manager was also a shift inspector, with additional responsibilities for traffic, firearms and the control room, which meant that he had little time to devote to custody matters. While there were a number of individual policies relating to custody, there was no overarching custody policy which staff could refer to for guidance.
- 6.2** Good working relationships between the police and GBA had been strengthened following an internal review of custody. This had led to the introduction of a joint custody working group, which met regularly and was working hard to make improvements. As a result of this group meeting, custody was now a standing item on the agenda at the joint senior management team (police/GBA) meeting.
- 6.3** There was a plan to build new premises to accommodate both the police and GBA, which would include joint custody facilities; however, this was at a very early stage in its development. The force believed that the current capacity of its custody estate at police headquarters (HQ) was inadequate to meet demand, sometimes resulting in the nearby court cells being used outside office hours as an overflow suite. The force accepted detainees from GBA for charging and processing purposes at the direction of law officers, and had also recently agreed to accept detainees who were not suspected of swallowing drugs packages direct from GBA. In return, they had a reciprocal agreement to use the custody facilities at New Jetty and the airport, if they provided the staff to operate them.
- 6.4** Staffing in the custody suite was provided by response officers who otherwise would have been out on the street; they were rostered to work in the facility on a five-week rotating basis. All sergeants had received specific custody training, and refresher training had recently been introduced jointly for police and GBA staff alike, although not all sergeants had undertaken it (see recommendation 7.10). We were told that acting sergeants had sometimes been utilised in the custody suite, although a directive had since been issued, stating that this should occur only in exceptional circumstances. When the suite was busy, sergeants requested the assistance of a police constable to act as a gaoler; however, these officers were untrained in custody duties (see recommendation 7.10).
- 6.5** The superintendent attended bimonthly meetings with criminal justice partners. There was no custody user group where staff or partner organisations at the practitioner level could discuss issues relevant to custody. Independent custody visitors attended the custody suite monthly and the force was responsive to issues raised.
- 6.6** The custody record system in use was paper based but a computerised system, both for the police and GBA, was under development (see also section on treatment and conditions). However, no date had been set for its implementation and there was no plan for how it would be introduced to the two agencies.
- 6.7** Quality assurance checks had only recently been introduced and a small sample of custody records were peer reviewed by a GBA member of staff. These checks were not conducted against a qualitative template and it was unclear how outcomes would be fed back to staff. The checks did not include cross-referencing to prisoner transfer forms or closed-circuit television (CCTV) footage.

- 6.8** Adverse incidents that occurred in custody were recorded, and constructive feedback from these and 'lessons learnt' nationally was circulated to all sergeants. These documents were also accessible on the police intranet.

Recommendations

- 6.9** The force should review custody procedures and introduce a professional custody policy, accessible to all staff working in custody.
- 6.10** There should be a quality assurance process for sampling custody records; this should be corporate, recorded, have an audit trail of feedback and dissemination to staff, and inform refresher training. The process should also include cross-referencing to prisoner transfer forms and closed-circuit television.

Section 7. Treatment and conditions

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are held in a clean and decent environment in which their safety is protected and their multiple and diverse needs are met.

Respect

- 7.1 We saw positive and courteous interactions between custody staff and detainees, with staff using detainees' title or forename as appropriate. Detainees we spoke to indicated that they had been dealt with respectfully.
- 7.2 The booking-in area was private, with only one person being booked in at a time. The exception to this was when cells 1 and 2, which were directly opposite the booking-in desk, were occupied; at these times, the detainees within would have been able to hear the conversation between the custody staff and the detainee, including information of a confidential nature. Staff mitigated this issue by ensuring that these cells were the last to be occupied. Detainees were searched and put in cells by the arresting police officer.
- 7.3 We saw two women being booked in but neither was asked if they were pregnant or wished to speak to a female member of staff, or told about the availability of a choice of feminine hygiene products, as these questions were not included in the custody record. Similarly, no detainees being booked in were routinely asked if they had any dependants who would be affected by their detention (see main recommendation B17).
- 7.4 The custody suite had a copy of the Bible and the Qur'an. There was also a prayer mat with an embedded compass, to determine the direction of Mecca. In our custody record analysis, in nine out of 30 cases detainees' ethnicity had not been recorded.
- 7.5 No physical adaptations had been made in the cells to cater for detainees with mobility issues. However, a portable cell call bell was available for use in a cell and a portable raised toilet seat was also in stock. No hearing loop was available.
- 7.6 Staff needed to be sensitive to the diverse needs of detainees, but had received limited guidance about how to achieve this or who to approach for advice if required.
- 7.7 Staff also indicated that they had not received custody-specific training in relation to child protection and safeguarding.
- 7.8 In our custody record analysis, there were five (17%) young people in the sample who were under 18 years of age (one was 16, two were 15, one was 14 and one was 13). They had all been detained for under six hours, the longest detention being just over five hours and the shortest 55 minutes. Only one young person had been detained overnight, from 1.05am to 6.10am, before being released home. Staff told us that secure and non-secure beds were available via children's services but there was no record in the custody record of alternative accommodation being sought for this young person. Sergeants told us that, where possible, they would bail a young person rather than detain them overnight in police custody.

Recommendations

- 7.9** There should be clear policies about how to manage the diverse needs of detainees, particularly young people and women, with which all staff working in custody should be familiar.
- 7.10** Staff should receive up-to-date training before working in custody, including awareness of child protection and safeguarding.
- 7.11** Guernsey Police should engage with children's services on every occasion that alternative accommodation is required for a young person, to prevent them from being held in police custody overnight.

Housekeeping points

- 7.12** Detainees' ethnicity should be recorded on the custody record to enable police to monitor any patterns or trends.
- 7.13** A hearing loop should be available and staff briefed about how to use it.

Safety

- 7.14** All detainees were risk assessed on arrival into custody. The medical risk assessments we saw were brief and, although all questions were answered, they did not include much detail or observation from custody officers. Background checks were conducted on the police national computer (PNC) but we saw these being conducted after the detainee had already been placed in a cell, rather than during the booking-in process. We were told that this was because the custody sergeant had not been trained to access the PNC and therefore had to contact the force control room to complete the check on his behalf. In only 10 (33%) of the records in our custody record analysis was it clear that the PNC had been checked, and the information retrieved had been used for only two detainees. In the other eight records, it was unclear if the information had been used or been relevant.
- 7.15** PPACE⁶ law (2003) states that all detainees must be visited once every hour, and young people and mentally vulnerable detainees more frequently; and that if a detainee is intoxicated through drink or drugs, they must be visited and roused at least every 30 minutes. In our custody record analysis, the risk assessments did not always explicitly state the level of observation that detainees had been placed on. One detainee who had been intoxicated and also suffered from psychotic episodes had been left in their cell for over an hour between observations. Twelve detainees in the sample had come into custody under the influence of alcohol but only two had been placed on 30-minute visits with rousals; three had been placed on 30-minute visits with no rousing; and six had been visited hourly with no rousing. In another case, the detainee had been held for nearly five hours with no observations recorded in their custody record (see main recommendation B18).
- 7.16** We observed one handover between sergeants; this included an exchange of relevant information but not the level of observation under which the detainee was being monitored. Although in this case we found this information recorded in the custody record, the incoming custody sergeants did not always read through the custody record and observations levels were not always recorded.

⁶ Police Powers and Criminal Evidence (Bailiwick of Guernsey)

- 7.17** Anti-ligature knives were available at the booking-in desk and in the custody back office but staff did not routinely carry them.
- 7.18** Prisoner transfer forms were completed for detainees being moved from police custody to the magistrates' court, allowing risk information to be shared between agencies, but there was nowhere on them to record self-harm as a risk. Our custody record analysis showed that a detainee had been transferred to hospital without a prisoner transfer form being completed, and it was unclear how escorting staff had been made aware of the risks associated with this detainee. Custody sergeants confirmed that they did not complete prisoner transfer forms for detainees attending hospital.
- 7.19** Custody records were paper based and were inadequate; they were not always legible and did not cover all relevant questions related to risk or the needs of detainees. They had recently been amended to include a pre-release risk assessment but there had been no guidance to staff on how to complete it. Our custody record analysis included no pre-release risk assessments. Twenty-five (83%) of the detainees in our sample had been released home from custody, 12 of whom had had risks, including age, being released late at night, self-harm and mental health issues; it was unclear if these had been addressed on release (see main recommendation B17).
- 7.20** A list of support agencies was available for issue to detainees on release but this was available only in English. Staff told us that if any detainees had difficulty in getting home, they would be assisted to make arrangements for transportation or they would be taken home by the police.
- 7.21** In our custody record analysis, none of the detainees had been strip-searched on arrival into custody. Staff told us that strip-searches were conducted in the cells, all of which were monitored by CCTV. We were reassured that strip-searches were only conducted on the basis of a risk assessment.
- 7.22** None of the detainees we saw being brought into custody had been handcuffed. In our custody record sample, no detainees had been placed in restraints during their detention.
- 7.23** The use of force was recorded in the pocket notebook of the officer concerned, in the detainee's custody record and through the submission of a use of force monitoring form; the latter was basic and lacked detail. Completed forms were submitted to the officer safety training unit, which monitored them to prepare future training scenarios. No further analysis of these forms was carried out to enable the force to ensure proportionality and to identify patterns and trends.

Recommendations

- 7.24** **The police national computer should always be checked for warning markers before a risk assessment is completed and before the detainee is placed in a cell.**
- 7.25** **Prisoner transfer forms should be completed on every occasion that a detainee is moved, in order to share risk information with escorting officers. The form should be updated to include a box in which to record self-harm as a risk.**
- 7.26** **Staff should ensure that detainees being released from custody receive the appropriate support.**

7.27 Strip-searches should not be conducted in cells covered by closed-circuit television unless there is a means of removing the footage from display on the monitors in the custody back office.

7.28 The force should update the use of force monitoring form, collate use of force data and monitor for proportionality and trends.

Housekeeping point

7.29 Custody staff should carry anti-ligature knives in the custody suite at all times.

Physical conditions

7.30 The custody suite was clean and decent but the layout was poor, with most of the cells out of sight of the booking-in area, and the medical room doubling up as a consultation room for advocates and sometimes for social visits between detainees and their families (see recommendation 9.7). Levels of graffiti were minimal but most cells we inspected contained multiple potential ligature points. Staff carried out a daily check of the cells but this was done on an individual ad hoc basis, with no guidance from managers, and was not documented. The suite was cold, and several detainees, police officers and an advocate commented on this; staff could not adjust the temperature of the cells.

7.31 Detainees were told how to use the cell call bells. However, when we tested these we found that the system had been muted, and the custody sergeant was unaware of this. Staff said that maintenance arrangements were good.

7.32 We were told that a fire drill had recently been held but could find no documentation to confirm this. Details of the fire evacuation procedure were displayed on a noticeboard in the custody back office. There were sufficient sets of handcuffs available to evacuate detainees safely if required.

7.33 The small custody facilities on Sark and Alderney were used infrequently and were not in the remit of this inspection. However, we suggest that the various authorities work together to ensure that on the rare occasions that the custody facilities on Sark and Alderney are used, this can be done safely and securely.

Recommendation

7.34 Cells should be free of potential ligature points. When current resources do not allow these to be removed, a strategy should be put in place to manage the new risks identified.

Housekeeping points

7.35 There should be thorough daily and weekly maintenance checks which include monitoring the temperature of the suite and the functioning of cell call bells. These should be recorded and quality assured by managers.

- 7.36** Cell call bells should not be muted without good reason; when this occurs, all staff should be made aware of it.
- 7.37** Fire evacuation drills should be carried out regularly and be recorded.

Detainee care

- 7.38** All cells contained a mattress and a pillow but blankets were available only on request. Staff said that they wiped down mattresses with antibacterial wipes after use but we did not see this taking place. Five of the seven cells had toilets but toilet paper was available only on request. The view of the toilet area in the cells was obscured on the CCTV monitors.
- 7.39** A shower was available but it was located in a small room, with nowhere to place clothing. Staff indicated that if a detainee wished to use the shower, they had to undress in their cell, which was monitored by CCTV, and walk to the shower clothed in a towel. In our custody record analysis, one detainee had received a shower shortly after arriving into custody. However, three detainees who had been detained overnight and then transferred to court had not had access to washing facilities. Cotton towels were available and there was a good stock of toothbrushes, toothpaste, shampoo, shower gel, soap, deodorant, razors and shaving gel.
- 7.40** Stocks of replacement clothing were available but these were second-hand items which had been donated by staff. They were stored haphazardly in the plant room, making it impossible to establish if there was an appropriate range of sizes to meet all needs. Disposable unisex underwear was available, although not all members of staff were aware of this, and also a few pairs of disposable slippers. Detainees could have clothing brought in by family members, provided that custody staff checked it before passing it on. In our custody record analysis, one detainee had been sick on his clothes while in detention and his girlfriend had been contacted to bring in some new clothes before his release; it was unclear if any replacement clothing had been provided to him during his detention.
- 7.41** A range of vegetarian and non-vegetarian microwave meals were available. However, there was no food preparation area; these meals were heated in a microwave oven located on a windowsill in the back office. Staff told us that if a detainee was held for a long period, fresh meals could be purchased from local food outlets. Tea, coffee and water were available and regularly offered. In our custody record analysis, 24 (80%) detainees had not been offered a meal while in custody. Six of these had been held overnight, including one for over 12 hours and one for over 19 hours.
- 7.42** There was no exercise yard but staff said that they would allow a detainee who wanted fresh air into a caged area next to the entrance to the custody suite, where they could sit on a bench.
- 7.43** The suite had a reasonable supply of books and magazines. These materials had been donated by staff but there was nothing suitable for younger readers and, with the exception of one magazine, were in English only. In our custody record analysis, only two detainees had been offered reading materials.
- 7.44** Staff told us that they would allow social visits in exceptional circumstances.

Recommendations

- 7.45** All detainees held overnight, or who require one, should be offered a shower, which they should be able to take in private.
- 7.46** Suitable alternative clothing should be available in the custody suite at all times.
- 7.47** Detainees, particularly those held for more than 24 hours, should be offered exercise in an exercise yard that is fit for purpose.

Housekeeping point

- 7.48** Detainees should be offered suitable refreshments and food to meet their needs.

Section 8. Individual rights

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are informed of their individual rights on arrival and can freely exercise those rights while in custody.

Rights relating to detention

- 8.1** Custody sergeants asked arresting officers to provide a full explanation of the circumstances of, and reasons for, the arrest before authorising detention. Sergeants told us that they were confident in refusing detention when the circumstances did not merit arrest, and were able to provide details of such cases.
- 8.2** Staff told us that voluntary attendance was used as an alternative to custody. However, the force did not collate or monitor the numbers involved, so we were unable to confirm the success of this practice.
- 8.3** We saw detainees being booked in promptly on their arrival into the custody suite. We observed one detainee being transferred from GBA custody to police custody in order to be charged, fingerprinted, photographed and have DNA taken. This transfer was held up because of procedural delays and resulted in the detainee being held in custody for longer than necessary. In our custody record analysis, the average length of detention was only five hours 46 minutes. Three detainees had been held for between 12 and 20 hours, eight for between six and 12 hours, and 19 detainees for less than six hours.
- 8.4** The force had previously adhered to the PPACE definition of a child, which meant that those aged under 17 were provided with an AA but those aged 17 were not, unless they were otherwise deemed vulnerable. Following a judicial review which took place in the UK in April 2013, the force had started to offer 17-year-olds the services of an AA, but they only asked them to attend if the detainee agreed to this. This practice differed from the amendment made to PACE,⁷ the equivalent UK legislation, which requires an AA to be provided for all persons under 18 years of age.
- 8.5** Custody sergeants told us that they would involve family members or friends to act as AAs for young people or vulnerable adults whenever possible. The force did not issue family members with any guidance on carrying out this role but a brief notice was displayed on the wall at the booking-in desk. When it was not possible to contact a family member or friend, the police used a scheme involving volunteers which provided AAs both for young persons and vulnerable adults on a 24/7 basis. Staff were complimentary about this service and we saw one of the volunteers attending the police station within 30 minutes of being contacted.
- 8.6** In our custody record analysis, one detainee had indicated that they needed help because of a learning difficulty. This detainee had not been provided with, or assessed by, a health care professional to verify whether they needed an AA. All five young people in our sample had had an AA present when being informed of their rights, and the longest wait for an AA had been one hour 15 minutes.
- 8.7** A professional telephone interpreting service was available to assist in the booking-in of non-English-speaking detainees, and a speakerphone was provided for this purpose. A language identification poster enabled these detainees to indicate their native language. Staff said that a

⁷ Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984

good face-to-face interpreting service was available for interviews and we saw a Russian interpreter attending the suite shortly after being contacted. In our custody record analysis, only one detainee had required an interpreter and they had attended within 30 minutes of being contacted.

- 8.8** In our custody record analysis, four (13%) detainees had been recorded as being foreign nationals but their nationality had not been noted. There was no field on the custody record to record that the detainee had been given their legal rights, and we were unable to confirm that this had taken place.
- 8.9** During booking-in, staff gave detainees a detailed leaflet summarising their rights and entitlements, which was available in 16 foreign languages. For detainees speaking other languages, their rights and entitlements were explained to them via the telephone interpreting service. The rights and entitlements were not available in an easy-read pictorial format version or in Braille. One of the face-to-face interpreters was available to provide a sign language interpreting service, and staff were aware of this.

Recommendations

- 8.10** **The processes involved in accepting detainees on transfer from Guernsey Border Agency for charging and processing should be streamlined to ensure that detainees do not remain in custody for longer than necessary.**
- 8.11** **Appropriate adults (AAs) should be contacted to support all young persons under the age of 18 years and vulnerable adults.**

Housekeeping points

- 8.12** An information leaflet should be available to provide guidance to family members or friends acting as AAs.
- 8.13** The custody record should include the detainee's nationality and whether they have been given their legal rights.
- 8.14** Information about detainees' rights and entitlements should be available in a range of formats to meet specific needs.

Rights relating to PACE

- 8.15** We saw detainees being told that they could read the PPACE codes of practice during the booking-in process, and two copies were available for issue.
- 8.16** All detainees were offered free legal representation but the poster informing detainees of this was available only in English. In our custody record analysis, all but two of the detainees in our sample had been offered access to legal advice. In total, four (14%) detainees had accepted the offer of legal representation, and had waited longer than an hour for their advocate to arrive. We saw detainees who had declined the services of an advocate being advised that they could change their mind at any time, and that an advocate would be contacted on their behalf. Although two interview rooms were available, face-to-face and telephone consultations with advocates took place in the medical room (see paragraph 7.30 and recommendation 9.7). We saw an advocate being allowed to read the full paper copy of their client's custody record without having to request it.

- 8.17** In our custody record analysis, only nine (32%) detainees said that they wished to have someone informed of their arrest. In six of these cases, the detention logs showed that the nominated person had been contacted; in the remaining three it was unclear whether this contact had been made.
- 8.18** Reviews of detainees in custody were undertaken by operational inspectors. In our custody record analysis, of the nine (32%) detainees who had required an initial PPACE review while in detention, six had been conducted on time and two had been late or delayed for operational reasons. The six timely reviews had been completed while the detainees were sleeping but records showed that they had been reminded of their rights and entitlements when they woke up. One detainee who had been detained for over 10 hours had not received any reviews.
- 8.19** The handling and processing of DNA and forensic samples was managed well and an effective process ensured the prompt collection of samples.
- 8.20** Custody staff told us that the local magistrates' court would not accept detainees after 1pm on weekdays, with some limited flexibility on a daily basis. The court did not routinely sit on Saturdays, so detainees who were refused bail on a Friday had to remain in custody until the following Monday morning. These timings contributed to detainees remaining in custody for longer than necessary.

Recommendation

- 8.21** **The Head of Law Enforcement should engage with the Royal Court of Guernsey to ensure that detainees are not held in police custody for longer than necessary.**

Housekeeping points

- 8.22** Legal advice posters in a range of languages should be displayed.
- 8.23** All custody records should indicate when a detainee's right to have someone informed of their arrest has been fulfilled.
- 8.24** PPACE reviews should be carried out on time.

Rights relating to treatment

- 8.25** Detainees were not told how to make a complaint and no information about the complaints procedure was displayed in the custody suite. Custody staff said that if a detainee wished to make a complaint, they would either tell the duty inspector or request the detainee to attend at the front desk of the police HQ on release. However, all staff agreed that if the complaint was about an assault, the detainee would be seen by a health care professional and that any injuries sustained would be photographed.

Recommendation

- 8.26** **Detainees should be given information about how to make a complaint and, unless there is a good reason not to do so, complaints should be taken while they are still in custody.**

Section 9. Health care

Expected outcomes:

Detainees have access to competent health care professionals who meet their physical health, mental health and substance use needs in a timely way.

Governance

- 9.1** The police service commissioned the Guernsey forensic medical examiner (FME) service to provide medical services to the custody suite. An inspector was responsible for monitoring service delivery and contract management. Custody staff and FMEs said that working relationships were positive.
- 9.2** There were seven FMEs in the practice but only one female, which limited the choice available to detainees. Female police officers were available to chaperone as required. FMEs were speciality trained or in training; they supported each other and received leadership from a lead FME. The contract acknowledged and supported the training needs of FMEs.
- 9.3** FME medical records were stored in the FME practice health centre in accord with good practice principles associated with the Data Protection Act.
- 9.4** The medical room was of a reasonable size, but a poor shape, and there was no toilet attached. There was natural light and an examination lamp. It was unsuitable for purpose as it did not comply with minimum standards of infection control; for example, the sink drain was not offset and there were no hand-washing instructions. Fixtures and fittings were unsuitable; for example, the seating comprised garden chairs and the desk had an excessively scratched top. There was no work surface suitable for the preparation of forensic samples. As the room was always open and used for multiple purposes (see also paragraph 7.30), it was repeatedly contaminated but underwent no regular deep cleaning.
- 9.5** The custody suite contained an emergency bag of essential medical equipment, an automated external defibrillator (AED) and an oxygen supply. Drugs for emergency use were securely stored but accessible. We were told that the equipment was checked regularly, although it was excessively dusty. All custody staff underwent resuscitation training, including on the use of the AED.

Recommendations

- 9.6** **Detainees should be able to choose the gender of the forensic medical examiner who treats them.**
- 9.7** **The medical room should comply with relevant standards of infection control and contemporary standards for forensic sampling. It should not be used for other purposes.**

Patient care

- 9.8** The police told us that the FMEs nearly always achieved the target of attending the custody suite within 60 minutes of being called. In our sample of four cases, the average attendance time had been 56 minutes, with a range of 44 to 71 minutes. Detainees were treated

respectfully and sensitively, and expressed satisfaction following consultations. Custody officers were satisfied with the FME service.

- 9.9** There was a comprehensive approach to medical assessment. Completed assessments were appended to the custody record and a carbon copy was retained by the FME. Medical entries were handwritten and we were told that some were illegible. We were told of one incident where a medicine had been administered incorrectly owing to the misinterpretation of a handwritten prescription. Records we sampled were legible and clinical practice was of a high standard. Custody staff said that, if necessary, they would ask an FME to explain what had been written. Local interpreters and professional telephone interpreters were available to assist with medical assessment.
- 9.10** Subject to authentication, detainees' medicines could be continued in custody. The police made reasonable attempts to collect prescribed medications from detainees' homes. The FME prescribed and supplied from police stock.
- 9.11** Stock medicines were stored in a secure metal cabinet in a room behind the custody desk. The cabinet contained general stock and controlled drugs, and was not secured to the wall. The systems for medicine stock control, management and usage were insufficiently robust; for example, there was no record of regular checking of controlled drug stock or of disposal of discarded controlled drugs. A refrigerator was used to store medicines but there was no record of temperature checking. Some stored medicines were out of date and we found some insulin that belonged to a patient who had left custody several months earlier (see main recommendation B20).
- 9.12** We saw an FME dispensing tablets into a clearly labelled plastic bag and giving it to the custody sergeant for safe keeping, to be administered at prescribed times. Detainees' personal medications were stored securely with their property and administered by custody staff as prescribed by the FME. Opiate substitution therapy was not available in police custody, although symptomatic relief and nicotine replacement therapy were given.

Recommendation

- 9.13 Medical records should be printed rather than handwritten.**

Substance misuse

- 9.14** Drug referral workers from Drug Concern (a charitable organisation) were available by telephone. They visited the custody suite during office hours and followed up detainees who had been in custody out of hours. Detainees were also offered the opportunity to engage with Guernsey Alcohol and Drug Action Counsel (GADAC) for therapy. Those under the age of 18 were referred to specialist young people services if indicated.

Mental health

- 9.15** Custody staff had received training in mental health awareness. The police had good strategic and operational partnerships with the Health and Social Services Department.
- 9.16** No mental health professionals visited police custody. Detainees requiring formal assessment under the revised 2010 mental health legislation were seen by the emergency duty team (EDT). Custody officers said that EDT responses were variable and sometimes untimely. There was no liaison and diversion mental health service.

9.17 In 2013/14, section 92 of the Mental Health Act⁸ had been used on 20 occasions; in 40% of these, detainees had been held in police custody. We were told that this situation had improved following revisions to working methods in the previous year.

Recommendations

9.18 Mental health services liaison and diversion advice should be available to the police custody suite.

9.19 Detainees on section 92 of the mental health legislation should not enter police custody unless there are exceptional circumstances.

⁸ The Mental Health (Bailiwick of Guernsey) Law, 2010 Section 92(1) enables a police officer who finds a person in a public place, who appears to him to be suffering from a mental disorder and to be in immediate need of care or control, to remove that person to a place of safety if (s)he thinks it necessary to do so in the interests of that person or for the protection of other persons.

Section 10. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

Main recommendations

- 10.1** Given the level of duplication between police and Guernsey Border Agency custodial work, and the size of the island, joint services should be developed. (B16)
- 10.2** Custody records should be reviewed to ensure that they cover all relevant questions relating to risk and the needs of detainees. (B17)
- 10.3** Observation levels for detainees should be appropriate to keep them safe, and should be recorded in a prominent position on the custody record; this information should be clearly exchanged between staff during the handover. (B18)
- 10.4** Children under 18 years of age should not be held in custody overnight (see recommendation 7.11 and prisoners main recommendations S52) (B19)
- 10.5** Good practice principles and practices in medicines management should be introduced, and assurance systems for the receipt, storage, checking, use and discarding of controlled drugs should be implemented. (B20)

Recommendations

Strategy

- 10.6** The force should review custody procedures and introduce a professional custody policy, accessible to all staff working in custody. (6.9)
- 10.7** There should be a quality assurance process for sampling custody records; this should be corporate, recorded, have an audit trail of feedback and dissemination to staff, and inform refresher training. The process should also include cross-referencing to prisoner transfer forms and closed-circuit television. (6.10)

Treatment and conditions

- 10.8** There should be clear policies about how to manage the diverse needs of detainees, particularly young people and women, with which all staff working in custody should be familiar. (7.9)
- 10.9** Staff should receive up-to-date training before working in custody, including awareness of child protection and safeguarding. (7.10)
- 10.10** Guernsey Police should engage with children's services on every occasion that alternative accommodation is required for a young person, to prevent them from being held in police custody overnight. (7.11)

- 10.11** The police national computer should always be checked for warning markers before a risk assessment is completed and before the detainee is placed in a cell. (7.24)
- 10.12** Prisoner transfer forms should be completed on every occasion that a detainee is moved, in order to share risk information with escorting officers. The form should be updated to include a box in which to record self-harm as a risk. (7.25)
- 10.13** Staff should ensure that detainees being released from custody receive the appropriate support. (7.26)
- 10.14** Strip-searches should not be conducted in cells covered by closed-circuit television unless there is a means of removing the footage from display on the monitors in the custody back office. (7.27)
- 10.15** The force should update the use of force monitoring form, collate use of force data and monitor for proportionality and trends. (7.28)
- 10.16** Cells should be free of potential ligature points. When current resources do not allow these to be removed, a strategy should be put in place to manage the new risks identified. (7.34)
- 10.17** All detainees held overnight, or who require one, should be offered a shower, which they should be able to take in private. (7.45)
- 10.18** Suitable alternative clothing should be available in the custody suite at all times. (7.46)
- 10.19** Detainees, particularly those held for more than 24 hours, should be offered exercise in an exercise yard that is fit for purpose. (7.47)

Individual rights

- 10.20** The processes involved in accepting detainees on transfer from Guernsey Border Agency for charging and processing should be streamlined to ensure that detainees do not remain in custody for longer than necessary. (8.10)
- 10.21** Appropriate adults (AAs) should be contacted to support all young persons under the age of 18 years and vulnerable adults. (8.11)
- 10.22** The Head of Law Enforcement should engage with the Royal Court of Guernsey to ensure that detainees are not held in police custody for longer than necessary. (8.21)
- 10.23** Detainees should be given information about how to make a complaint and, unless there is a good reason not to do so, complaints should be taken while they are still in custody. (8.26)

Health care

- 10.24** Detainees should be able to choose the gender of the forensic medical examiner who treats them. (9.6)
- 10.25** The medical room should comply with relevant standards of infection control and contemporary standards for forensic sampling. It should not be used for other purposes. (9.7)
- 10.26** Medical records should be printed rather than handwritten. (9.13)

- 10.27** Mental health services liaison and diversion advice should be available to the police custody suite. (9.18)
- 10.28** Detainees on section 92 of the mental health legislation should not enter police custody unless there are exceptional circumstances. (9.19)

Housekeeping points

Treatment and conditions

- 10.29** Detainees' ethnicity should be recorded on the custody record to enable police to monitor any patterns or trends. (7.12)
- 10.30** A hearing loop should be available and staff briefed about how to use it. (7.13)
- 10.31** Custody staff should carry anti-ligature knives in the custody suite at all times. (7.29)
- 10.32** There should be thorough daily and weekly maintenance checks which include monitoring the temperature of the suite and the functioning of cell call bells. These should be recorded and quality assured by managers. (7.35)
- 10.33** Cell call bells should not be muted without good reason; when this occurs, all staff should be made aware of it. (7.36)
- 10.34** Fire evacuation drills should be carried out regularly and be recorded. (7.37)
- 10.35** Detainees should be offered suitable refreshments and food to meet their needs. (7.48)

Individual rights

- 10.36** An information leaflet should be available to provide guidance to family members or friends acting as AAs. (8.12)
- 10.37** The custody record should include the detainee's nationality and whether they have been given their legal rights. (8.13)
- 10.38** Information about detainees' rights and entitlements should be available in a range of formats to meet specific needs. (8.14)
- 10.39** Legal advice posters in a range of languages should be displayed. (8.22)
- 10.40** All custody records should indicate when a detainee's right to have someone informed of their arrest has been fulfilled. (8.23)
- 10.41** PPACE reviews should be carried out on time. (8.24)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick
Sean Sullivan
Fiona Shearlaw

Chief Inspector
Team leader
Inspector

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts
Paul Tarbuck
Sharon Monks

Drugs inspector
Health services inspector
Pharmacist

Report C. Inspection visit of Border Agency customs custody suites in Guernsey

Fact page

Task of the agency

Guernsey Border Agency is a public body with various border protection and cross-border crime functions.

Brief history

In 2008, the States of Guernsey Government approved proposals from the Home Department which resulted in Guernsey Customs and Excise, Immigration and Nationality Service merging into one agency to be known as Guernsey Border Agency (GBA). The agency's remit is to protect the Bailiwick's border and tackle drug trafficking, financial crime, money laundering, serious and organised smuggling, and illegal immigration.

On 1 January 2013, the Chief Officer of Police was appointed by the Home Department as the Head of Law Enforcement to provide operational oversight of both Guernsey Police and GBA. This was with a view to aligning the work of the two organisations more closely.

At the time of the inspection, GBA had two custody facilities, which were staffed only on a temporary basis, when a detainee was arrested. We did not inspect the custody facilities at the airport as our invitation was to inspect the main site of New Jetty, which is at White Rock in St Peter Port. The custody facilities are visited on a regular basis by Independent Custody Visitors.

The two designated GBA custody facilities in the Bailiwick of Guernsey were located as follows:

	Number of cells
New Jetty	2
Airport	2

Background and key findings

- C1 In the UK, Border Agency customs custody facilities are inspected jointly by HM Inspectorates of Prisons and Constabulary. These inspections form part of the joint work programme of the criminal justice inspectorates and 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 Inspectorates of Prisons and Constabulary are two of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.
- C2 Guernsey is not covered by OPCAT but the local Independent Custody Visitors provide regular scrutiny of facilities. HMIP was invited by the Guernsey Home Department to undertake inspections of prison, police, court and border agency custody consistent with our inspections.

Strategy

- C3 Joint working had led to an internal review of practice, resulting in the formation of a working group between the police and GBA to influence change, including plans to develop joint custody facilities.
- C4 Custody facilities were used only for detainees suspected of swallowing drug packages; in all other cases, police facilities were utilised.
- C5 Custody staff were trained for the role but received little written guidance about what was expected of them when working in custody. Quality assurance arrangements needed to improve.

Treatment and conditions

- C6 The custody cells were clean and decent, and free of graffiti.
- C7 We did not see any detainees being booked in but arrangements for doing so appeared appropriate, and staff seemed mindful of relevant diversity issues.
- C8 Custody records were paper based and were inadequate; they did not cover all relevant questions related to risk, and did not adequately focus on the needs of women or make clear the observation levels for vulnerable prisoners. Pre-release risk assessments were not completed.
- C9 Use of force was not monitored to ensure proportionality or to identify trends.
- C10 Basic care was provided to detainees, although aspects of the use of paper suits were disrespectful.

Individual rights

- C11 Individual rights and legal requirements were generally adhered to, although complaints were not easily facilitated. Detainees were moved to the police custody suite for charging. Appropriate adult (AA) provision was reasonable. Interpreting services were adequate.

Health care

- C12 The medical services appeared appropriate but medical records were not printed, leading to the potential for error. There was good availability of equipment for use in medical emergencies.

Main recommendations

- C13 **Given the level of duplication between police and Guernsey Border Agency (GBA) custodial work, and the size of the island, joint services should be developed.**
- C14 **Custody records should be reviewed to ensure that they cover all relevant questions relating to risk and the needs of detainees.**

Section 11. Strategy

Expected outcomes:

There is a strategic focus on custody that drives the development and application of custody-specific policies and procedures to protect the well-being of detainees.

- 11.1 GBA custody facilities were used for detainees suspected of 'plugging' or swallowing packages containing drugs. This involved detaining and monitoring detainees for a period of time until the package was retrieved using specially designed toilets known as 'specimen isolation units'. In all other cases, GBA staff accompanied detainees to police facilities where they interviewed them.
- 11.2 A joint internal review of custody by GBA and the police had led to the introduction of a joint custody working group, which met regularly and was working hard to influence change. As a result of this group meeting, custody was now a standing item on the agenda at the joint senior management team (GBA/police) meeting.
- 11.3 There was a plan to build new premises to accommodate both GBA and the police, which would include joint custody facilities; however, this was at a very early stage in its development. The agency believed that the current capacity of its custody estate restricted its operational practices. In addition to transferring detainees to police headquarters (HQ) for charging and processing purposes as directed by law officers, they had negotiated for detainees who were not suspected of swallowing drugs packages to be taken directly to the police station for booking in. This meant that the agency did not have to source custody officers to open up its custody facilities, and that it made use of the police staff and custody facilities, which were open 24/7. In return, GBA allowed the police the occasional use of their custody facilities at both New Jetty and the airport, provided that they provided the staff to operate them.
- 11.4 The suite was staffed by officers trained in custody work, who were drawn from other duties to act as custody officers (COs) when required for this role. When a detainee was held in the suite, a minimum of two staff were on duty, with one member of staff conducting constant observations on the detainee at all times. This member of staff was not required to be a CO but had to have undergone gaoler awareness training to fulfil this role. Refresher training had recently been introduced, jointly for GBA and police staff, with nine out of 10 of the trained COs having received it.
- 11.5 Recent negotiations at a strategic level with the Health and Social Services Department had resulted in the implementation of a joint policy to protect children accompanying arrested persons with no relatives residing in the area. At a practitioner level, there was no custody user group where staff or partner organisations could discuss issues relevant to custody. Independent custody visitors visited the custody suite monthly and the agency was responsive to issues raised.
- 11.6 The custody record system in use was paper based but a computerised system, both for GBA and the police, was under development (see also section on treatment and conditions). However, no date had been set for its implementation and there was no plan for how it would be introduced to the two agencies.
- 11.7 Quality assurance checks were established and a sample of custody records was peer reviewed by a member of staff from the professional services team. However, these checks were not conducted against a qualitative template to ensure consistency. Feedback was provided to SOs, who in turn fed back any learning points to individual members of staff and

COs on their teams. These checks did not include cross-referencing to prisoner transfer forms or closed-circuit television (CCTV) footage.

- 11.8** Adverse incidents that occurred in custody were recorded and reviewed by managers to identify learning points. These learning points were disseminated to all staff, including 'congratulatory' feedback to staff members who had been identified as dealing with incidents particularly well. 'Lessons learnt' nationally were circulated to all COs and gaolers.

Recommendations

- 11.9** The agency should review custody procedures and introduce a professional custody policy, accessible to all staff working in custody.
- 11.10** There should be a quality assurance process for sampling custody records; this should be corporate, recorded, have an audit trail of feedback and dissemination to staff, and inform refresher training. The process should also include cross-referencing to prisoner transfer forms and closed-circuit television.

Section 12. Treatment and conditions

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are held in a clean and decent environment in which their safety is protected and their multiple and diverse needs are met.

Respect

- 12.1 Cellular vehicles were used to transport detainees, and the one we inspected at New Jetty was clean but cramped. Staff indicated that they adopted a risk-assessed approach to transportation and that, where possible, a detainee would be transported seated on the rear bench seat, alongside escorting officers.
- 12.2 Staff we spoke to appeared confident in acting as COs, even though they did not carry out this role frequently.
- 12.3 The custody suite booking-in desk was fairly high, which could have impeded communication with detainees, as staff were seated at an elevated position. We did not see any detainees at the desk but we were told that they were booked in one at a time, with other detainees waiting in the holding room nearby.
- 12.4 The custody staff we spoke to had an understanding of diversity. They told us that when female detainees were held in custody, it was ensured that at least one female staff member was on duty at all times. A choice of feminine hygiene products was available and staff indicated that these would be routinely offered to female detainees. Female detainees were not routinely asked if they were pregnant as this question did not feature on the custody record, the expectation being that detainees would volunteer this information. In our custody record analysis of seven cases, we saw a consent form which detainees had to sign to agree to having an X-ray, intimate examination and urine test while in custody; this form also asked female detainees if they could be pregnant.
- 12.5 Staff had received child protection and safeguarding awareness training. We were told that children remained with their parent/carer at all times and that they waited together in the holding room while children's services arranged accommodation as needed. There were no young persons aged 17 years or under in our custody record sample.
- 12.6 There were no specific adaptations for older people or those with disabilities in the suite, although the bed plinths were of a reasonable height and the mattresses were of good quality and firm. There were no adapted shower or toilet facilities and no hearing loop was available.
- 12.7 The custody suite had a copy of the Bible and the Qur'an. There was also a prayer mat with an embedded compass, to determine the direction of Mecca.
- 12.8 Detainees being booked in were not routinely asked if they had any dependants who would be affected by their detention, as this question was not included on the custody record.

Housekeeping points

- 12.9 A hearing loop should be available and staff briefed about how to use it.

12.10 Staff should be made aware of the procedures for searching transgender detainees.

Safety

12.11 Custody staff said that they were usually given advance notification when a detainee was being brought to the suite, which gave them an opportunity to make sure that they were ready to operate the facility. All detainees were risk assessed on arrival into custody. Staff indicated that escorting officers sometimes carried out police national computer (PNC) checks before arriving at the suite, and that this information was then utilised in the risk assessment and telephoned through to the police control room. We were told that if no PNC check had been carried out beforehand, it was the responsibility of COs to ensure that this was done before the risk assessment was completed. In our custody record analysis, it was clear from the risk assessments that the PNC had been checked for only four of the seven detainees we sampled, and that the information retrieved had been used for only one of these. In the remaining three records, it was unclear if the information from the PNC had been used or relevant. None of the custody staff we spoke to had been trained to access the PNC.

12.12 Custody records were paper based and were inadequate; they were not always legible and did not cover all relevant questions related to risk or the needs of detainees. They did not include a question about whether this was the detainee's first time in custody, which meant that this information was not included in the risk assessment.

12.13 In our custody record analysis, the risk assessments did not always explicitly state the level of observation that detainees had been placed on. It was clear from two records that the detainees had been placed on constant observation via CCTV, as they had been suspected of having drugs concealed. For the remaining five detainees in our sample, the observation level was not stated, although none had had any identified risks. They had all been detained for less than five hours and been in at least hourly contact with staff.

12.14 Each cell was monitored by CCTV and detainees were informed of this via a notice that was given to them. There were also CCTV monitoring signs displayed in the cells.

12.15 Staff did not carry anti-ligature knives but a number of these were kept in the custody back office.

12.16 Prisoner transfer forms were completed for detainees being moved from GBA custody to police HQ for charging and processing purposes. This form allowed risk information to be shared between agencies but there was nowhere to record self-harm as a risk. Our custody record analysis showed that a detainee had been transferred to hospital without a prisoner transfer form being completed, and it was unclear how escorting staff had been made aware of the risks associated with this detainee. COs confirmed that they did not complete prisoner transfer forms for detainees attending hospital.

12.17 Pre-release risk assessments were not included in any of the custody records in our sample. Four of the detainees had been released home from custody, two of whom had had no risk identified on release; for the remaining two, the custody records contained insufficient detail about release arrangements. We were told that the custody records had recently been amended to include a pre-release risk assessment but there had been no guidance to staff on how to complete it.

12.18 A list of support agencies was available for issue to detainees on release but this was available only in English.

- 12.19** In our custody record analysis, none of the detainees had been strip-searched on arrival into custody. One detainee had been searched later, after they were observed not washing intimate parts of their body. The custody record clearly stated that the search had been requested and authorised. We were told that strip-searches would not take place in any area monitored by CCTV.
- 12.20** Staff said that they would only use handcuffs and/or leg restraints if indicated by a risk assessment. In our custody record analysis, no detainees had been placed in restraints during their detention.
- 12.21** The use of force was recorded in the pocket notebook of the officer concerned and in the detainee's custody record. However, the agency did not have a use of force monitoring form, to allow them to identify if force had been used proportionately or if there were any patterns or trends, although we were told that there were plans to introduce one.
- 12.22** Staff were in the process of being trained in the use of batons and incapacitant spray, and there were plans to deliver this training jointly with the police in the future.

Recommendations

- 12.23** **Observation levels for detainees should be appropriate to keep them safe, and should be recorded in a prominent position on the custody record.**
- 12.24** **Prisoner transfer forms should be completed on every occasion that a detainee is moved, in order to share risk information with escorting officers. The form should be updated to include a box in which to record self-harm as a risk.**
- 12.25** **Staff should ensure that detainees being released from custody receive the appropriate support.**
- 12.26** **GBA should update the use of force monitoring form, collate use of force data and monitor for proportionality and trends.**

Physical conditions

- 12.27** The custody suite was clean, bright and well maintained. The cells had natural light, and no graffiti, but did not contain toilet or hand-washing facilities. Staff told us that faults in the suite were reported through the custody manager and that there were good maintenance arrangements.
- 12.28** Documented checks of the suite were carried out twice weekly but the checklist did not tell staff what to look for – for example, if the cell call bells were working and if the temperature was appropriate.
- 12.29** Custody staff told us that they had not been involved in any fire drills. A fire drill notice and suite layout plan was displayed on a noticeboard in the custody back office but this included no instructions on how to evacuate the premises safely. Staff were unaware of a fire evacuation policy.

Housekeeping points

- 12.30** There should be thorough maintenance checks which include monitoring the temperature of the suite and the functioning of cell call bells. These should be recorded and quality assured by managers.
- 12.31** Fire evacuation drills should be carried out regularly and be recorded.

Detainee care

- 12.32** All cells contained a mattress and a pillow, which were in good condition. Blankets were issued when the cells were occupied.
- 12.33** There was no replacement clothing, other than one-piece paper suits which were used to prevent detainees reaching parts of their body. All detainees using the specimen isolation units (SIU) had to lower their paper suits to the waist in order to use the toilet, which meant that they were effectively naked. They were required to be observed in this process by two members of staff; however, staff kept the door to the toilet closed while it was in use, to maintain detainees' privacy. One detainee in our custody record sample had been transported to hospital in a paper suit, but they had been given their shoes and coat.
- 12.34** There was a clean shower in the room with the SIU. This was not screened as any detainees suspected of swallowing drugs were supervised (by a CO of the same gender) while taking a shower. Cotton towels were available and there was a good stock of toothbrushes, toothpaste, soap, shampoo, deodorant, razors and shaving gel. In our custody record sample, two detainees had been held for more than 24 hours and had taken a shower, after which they had been provided with fresh paper suits.
- 12.35** The kitchen area was clean and contained a microwave oven which was used to prepare frozen 'ready' meals. Staff told us that if a detainee was held for a long period, fresh meals could be purchased from local food outlets. A range of hot and cold drinks was available. Detainees were asked when they had last eaten and a meal was provided accordingly. Our custody record analysis indicated that meals were available outside of designated mealtimes, and two detainees had been provided with fresh fruit.
- 12.36** There was no exercise yard but staff said that they would allow a detainee to walk around, supervised by at least three members of staff, in the Car Hall when it was closed. In our custody record analysis, we came across two detainees who had been allowed access to the Car Hall; as they had been dressed in paper suits, they had been provided with their outer clothing.
- 12.37** The suite had a reasonable supply of books and magazines but these were in English only and there was nothing suitable for younger readers. In our custody record sample, two detainees had been provided with reading materials.
- 12.38** Staff told us that social visits could take place, depending on the stage of a detainee's investigation and provided that they were authorised by the CO.

Recommendation

- 12.39 Detainees should be able to use the toilet with some level of decency.**

Housekeeping point

- 12.40** There should be a range of reading material for detainees, including young people, non-English speakers and those with limited literacy.

Section 13. Individual rights

Expected outcomes:

Detainees are informed of their individual rights on arrival and can freely exercise those rights while in custody.

Rights relating to detention

- 13.1** Custody officers said that they would clarify the reasons for detention with arresting officers to confirm that they were appropriate. They were aware they could refuse detention if there was insufficient evidence to warrant an arrest but none we spoke to had done so.
- 13.2** GBA staff did not charge their detainees, as law officers had directed that this should be carried out by the police. We saw one detainee being transferred from GBA custody to police custody in order to be charged and processed. This transfer was held up because of procedural delays and resulted in the detainee being held in custody for longer than necessary. In our custody record analysis, the average length of detention was nine hours 50 minutes; four detainees had been held for less than six hours and one for less than an hour.
- 13.3** The agency had previously adhered to the PPACE definition of a child, which meant that those aged under 17 were provided with an AA but those aged 17 were not, unless they were otherwise deemed vulnerable. Following a judicial review in the UK in April 2013, the agency had started offering 17-year-olds the services of an AA but they only asked them to attend if the detainee agreed to this. This practice differed from the amendment made to PACE,⁹ the equivalent UK legislation, which requires an AA to be provided for all persons under 18 years of age.
- 13.4** COs told us that they would involve family members or friends to act as AAs for young people or vulnerable adults whenever possible. The agency did not issue family members with any guidance on carrying out this role. When it was not possible to contact a family member or friend to act as an AA, the agency used either social services or a scheme involving volunteers which was operated by the police, providing a 24/7 service both for young persons and vulnerable adults. In our custody record analysis, two adult detainees had asked to have an AA attend but the reason for this request had not been recorded. In both cases, the detainee's mother had attended and been present for interview, but the detainee's rights and entitlements and risk assessments had not been repeated in the presence of the AA.
- 13.5** A professional telephone interpreting service was available to assist in the booking-in of non-English-speaking detainees, and a speakerphone was provided for this purpose. A language identification poster enabled these detainees to indicate their native language. Staff said that a good face-to-face interpreting service was available for interviews
- 13.6** During booking-in, staff gave detainees a detailed leaflet summarising their rights and entitlements, which was available in French, German, Portuguese and Latvian. For detainees speaking other languages, their rights and entitlements were explained to them via the telephone interpreting service. The rights and entitlements were not available in an easy-read pictorial format version or in Braille.

⁹ Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984

Recommendations

- 13.7** The processes involved in transferring detainees to Guernsey Police for charging and processing should be streamlined to ensure that detainees do not remain in custody for longer than necessary.
- 13.8** Appropriate adults (AAs) should be contacted to support all young persons under the age of 18 years.

Housekeeping points

- 13.9** An information leaflet should be available to provide guidance to family members or friends acting as AAs.
- 13.10** Information about detainees' rights and entitlements should be available in a range of languages and formats to meet specific needs.

Rights relating to PACE

- 13.11** Detainees were advised of the PPACE codes of practice during the booking-in process and a copy was available for issue.
- 13.12** All detainees were offered free legal representation but the poster informing detainees of this was available only in English. In our custody record analysis, all detainees had been routinely offered legal advice; all had initially declined this offer, but two had subsequently changed their minds and requested an advocate after being detained for up to four hours. Advocates had been contacted immediately and attended for interview. Two interview rooms were available, which were used for both telephone and face-to-face consultations with advocates. COs told us that advocates were given a photocopy of their client's custody record on arrival.
- 13.13** Detainees were told during the booking-in process that they could inform someone of their arrest. In our custody record sample, three detainees had accepted this offer; one who had initially declined had later been allowed to speak to their partner on the telephone.
- 13.14** Reviews of detainees in custody were undertaken by SOs. In our custody record analysis, two of the detainees had required a PPACE review while in detention, and both of these had been conducted face to face and on time. For all reviews, the custody log recorded that the detainee had been informed that the reviewer was independent of their case.

Housekeeping point

- 13.15** Legal advice posters in a range of foreign languages should be displayed.

Rights relating to treatment

- 13.16** COs said that if a detainee wished to make a complaint, they would note the complaint in the custody record, and on release would issue them with a leaflet detailing the complaints process. This account differed from that described by managers, who said that the SO would be notified and the complaint noted while the detainee was in custody. However, all staff agreed that if a complaint was about an assault, the detainee would be seen immediately by a

health care professional. A copy of the complaint information leaflet was displayed on the wall in the booking-in area but this was to the rear of the booking-in desk, in an area that detainees could not access.

Recommendation

- 13.17 Detainees should be given information about how to make a complaint and, unless there is good reason not to do so, complaints should be taken while they are still in custody.**

Section 14. Health care

Expected outcomes:

Detainees have access to competent health care professionals who meet their physical health, mental health and substance use needs in a timely way.

Governance

- 14.1** GBA commissioned the Guernsey forensic medical examiner (FME) service to provide medical support to the custody suites at the port and airport. It was unclear how the contract was monitored. FMEs had attended in response to 24 calls between November 2012 and January 2014, inclusive.
- 14.2** There were seven FMEs in the practice but only one female, which limited the choice available to detainees. Female custody officers were available to chaperone as required. FMEs were speciality trained or in training; they supported each other and received supervision from a lead FME. FME medical records were stored in the practice health centre in accord with good practice principles associated with the Data Protection Act.
- 14.3** The medical room was small and sparsely furnished but clean. There was no medical equipment; we were told that FMEs brought equipment with them. There were first-aid supplies in the custody suite, and these were subject to regular checking.
- 14.4** Custody staff had been trained in first aid and the use of an automated external defibrillator (AED). The custody suite contained an AED and airway support equipment, including oxygen. Equipment was regularly checked. Intubation equipment (breathing equipment associated with hospital emergency resuscitation) was included in a 'toolkit'. This equipment requires advanced competency for use and was inappropriate for this setting. Custody staff said that in emergency situations, St John Ambulance provided a rapid paramedic response – on a recent occasion arriving within five minutes.

Recommendations

- 14.5** **Detainees should be able to choose the gender of the forensic medical examiner who treats them.**
- 14.6** **Equipment for use in an emergency should be adequate for maintaining life until a paramedic arrives; superfluous equipment should be removed.**

Patient care

- 14.7** On arrival at the custody suite, detainees were subject to a medical risk assessment as part of the initial assessment. There was an additional medical proforma for use by FMEs. The completed forms were appended to the custody record and a carbon copy was retained by the FME. Medical entries were handwritten, and we were told that some were illegible. Custody staff said that the FMEs were generally responsive and supportive, and that, if necessary, they would ask them to explain what had been written. The records we sampled were legible, and showed that treatment and advice had been appropriate. Local interpreters and professional telephone interpreters were available to assist with medical assessment.

- 14.8** Custody staff said that FMEs always attended within the 60-minute target time. In our analysis of five custody records, the average response time had been 35 minutes (with a range of 24 to 47 minutes).
- 14.9** Detainees who brought personal medications with them were seen by the FME, who would re-prescribe as appropriate, and a fresh supply of medications would be obtained. Detainees' personal medications were stored securely and administered by custody staff as prescribed by the FME.
- 14.10** A limited range of stock medications was kept on site. A cupboard in the custody suite was used to store generic medicines. A second cupboard in the GBA office (where staff were present 24 hours a day) was used to store controlled drugs. There were good records of the checking and usage of drugs, and there was an auditable system for disposal of discarded drugs. The register used for checking controlled drugs was unconventional.
- 14.11** There were no mental health or substance misuse services available to the custody suite, although the FME could make referrals to local services as appropriate.

Recommendation

- 14.12 Medical records should be printed rather than handwritten.**

Housekeeping point

- 14.13** Advice should be sought from the Health and Social Services Department about the correct controlled drugs register to be used.

Section 15. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

Main recommendations

- 15.1** Given the level of duplication between police and Guernsey Border Agency (GBA) custodial work, and the size of the island, joint services should be developed. (C13)
- 15.2** Custody records should be reviewed to ensure that they cover all relevant questions relating to risk and the needs of detainees. (C14)

Recommendations

Strategy

- 15.3** The agency should review custody procedures and introduce a professional custody policy, accessible to all staff working in custody. (11.9)
- 15.4** There should be a quality assurance process for sampling custody records; this should be corporate, recorded, have an audit trail of feedback and dissemination to staff, and inform refresher training. The process should also include cross-referencing to prisoner transfer forms and closed-circuit television. (11.10)

Treatment and conditions

- 15.5** Observation levels for detainees should be appropriate to keep them safe, and should be recorded in a prominent position on the custody record. (12.23)
- 15.6** Prisoner transfer forms should be completed on every occasion that a detainee is moved, in order to share risk information with escorting officers. The form should be updated to include a box in which to record self-harm as a risk. (12.24)
- 15.7** Staff should ensure that detainees being released from custody receive the appropriate support. (12.25)
- 15.8** GBA should update the use of force monitoring form, collate use of force data and monitor for proportionality and trends. (12.26)
- 15.9** Detainees should be able to use the toilet with some level of decency. (12.39)

Individual rights

- 15.10** The processes involved in transferring detainees to Guernsey Police for charging and processing should be streamlined to ensure that detainees do not remain in custody for longer than necessary. (13.7)

- 15.11** Appropriate adults (AAs) should be contacted to support all young persons under the age of 18 years. (13.8)
- 15.12** Detainees should be given information about how to make a complaint and, unless there is good reason not to do so, complaints should be taken while they are still in custody. (13.17)

Health care

- 15.13** Detainees should be able to choose the gender of the forensic medical examiner who treats them. (14.5)
- 15.14** Equipment for use in an emergency should be adequate for maintaining life until a paramedic arrives; superfluous equipment should be removed. (14.6)
- 15.15** Medical records should be printed rather than handwritten. (14.12)

Housekeeping points

Treatment and conditions

- 15.16** A hearing loop should be available and staff briefed about how to use it. (12.9)
- 15.17** Staff should be made aware of the procedures for searching transgender detainees. (12.10)
- 15.18** There should be thorough maintenance checks which include monitoring the temperature of the suite and the functioning of cell call bells. These should be recorded and quality assured by managers. (12.30)
- 15.19** Fire evacuation drills should be carried out regularly and be recorded. (12.31)
- 15.20** There should be a range of reading material for detainees, including young people, non-English speakers and those with limited literacy. (12.40)

Individual rights

- 15.21** An information leaflet should be available to provide guidance to family members or friends acting as AAs. (13.9)
- 15.22** Information about detainees' rights and entitlements should be available in a range of languages and formats to meet specific needs. (13.10)
- 15.23** Legal advice posters in a range of foreign languages should be displayed. (13.15)

Health care

- 15.24** Advice should be sought from the Health and Social Services Department about the correct controlled drugs register to be used. (14.13)

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick
Sean Sullivan
Fiona Shearlaw

Chief Inspector
Team leader
Inspector

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts
Paul Tarbuck
Sharon Monks

Drugs inspector
Health services inspector
Pharmacist

Annex: Prisoner survey responses

Main Comparator and comparator to last time

Diversity Analysis – disability, age over 50

Diversity Analysis – foreign national

J Wing Analysis

VP Analysis

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses Guernsey Prison 2014

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Guernsey Prison 2014	Local prisons comparator
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	76	6188
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	6%	6%
1.3 Are you sentenced?	84%	68%
1.3 Are you on recall?	1%	9%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	11%	21%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	3%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	15%	13%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	98%	98%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	98%	96%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	4%	24%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	5%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	1%	12%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	23%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	11%	5%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	40%	32%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	48%	54%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	5%	20%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:		
2.2 Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	33%	37%
2.3 Were you offered a toilet break?	17%	9%
2.4 Was the van clean?	60%	60%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	87%	75%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	82%	67%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	68%	64%
2.7 Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%	4%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	75%	81%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction		
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	56%	45%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	77%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Guernsey Prison 2014	Local prisons comparator
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?	85%	63%
When you first arrived:		
3.4 Did you have any problems?	61%	74%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	10%	14%
3.4 Did you have any housing problems?	8%	21%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting employers?	6%	5%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting family?	27%	31%
3.4 Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	5%	4%
3.4 Did you have any money worries?	20%	23%
3.4 Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	27%	22%
3.4 Did you have any physical health problems?	17%	17%
3.4 Did you have any mental health problems?	18%	21%
3.4 Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	7%
3.4 Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	23%	30%
For those with problems:		
3.5 Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	47%	35%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6 Tobacco?	20%	84%
3.6 A shower?	29%	33%
3.6 A free telephone call?	44%	58%
3.6 Something to eat?	71%	75%
3.6 PIN phone credit?	55%	57%
3.6 Toiletries/ basic items?	73%	61%
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?	22%	45%
3.7 Someone from health services?	80%	69%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	57%	35%
3.7 Prison shop/ canteen?	28%	19%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	54%	47%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	58%	44%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	54%	40%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	53%	42%
3.8 Health services?	64%	50%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	43%	44%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%	73%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	67%	79%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Guernsey Prison 2014	Local prisons comparator
	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		
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	42%	56%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	86%	74%
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?	80%	40%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	78%	56%
4.1	Get bail information?	25%	21%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	49%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	21%	37%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	95%	55%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	98%	79%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	86%	78%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	82%	59%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	48%	33%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	81%	64%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	50%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	83%	23%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	64%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	94%	56%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	51%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	51%	52%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	42%	45%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	85%	76%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	72%	56%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	67%	43%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	51%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	50%	32%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	56%	32%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	21%	19%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	34%	21%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	59%	44%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Guernsey Prison 2014	Local prisons comparator
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%	44%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	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?	33%	35%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff		
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	89%	74%
7.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	87%	72%
7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	48%	28%
7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	22%	18%
7.5 Do you have a personal officer?	96%	43%
For those with a personal officer:		
7.6 Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	65%	67%
SECTION 8: Safety		
8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?	20%	39%
8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	17%
8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	26%	25%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16%	11%
8.5 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	3%	7%
8.5 Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5 Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	14%
8.5 Taken your canteen/property?	4%	6%
8.5 Victimised you because of medication?	0%	5%
8.5 Victimised you because of debt?	0%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	4%
8.5 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%
8.5 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.5 Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.5 Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	6%
8.5 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	15%	5%
8.5 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	4%
SECTION 8: Safety continued		
8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?	33%	28%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Guernsey Prison 2014	Local prisons comparator
	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?	15%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	42%	32%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	69%	24%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	81%	50%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	44%	10%
	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?	83%	43%
9.2	The nurse?	71%	54%
9.2	The dentist?	65%	31%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	77%	38%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	50%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	72%	61%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	28%	36%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	76%	43%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	21%	34%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Guernsey Prison 2014	Local prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	20%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	15%	31%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	6%	13%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	8%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	1%	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?	65%	62%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	81%	58%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	88%	76%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	54%	30%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	36%	29%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	68%	44%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	45%	18%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	86%	43%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	10%	10%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	44%	26%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	30%	8%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	99%	68%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	36%	41%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	71%	55%
	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?	41%	48%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	87%	66%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	48%	54%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	83%	52%
	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?	51%	46%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	41%	32%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	42%	33%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	73%	29%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	43%	37%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	79%	44%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	25%	10%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Guernsey Prison 2014	Local prisons comparator
	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 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	59%	33%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	27%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	18%	32%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	61%	37%
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?	93%	61%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:			
13.2	No contact?	13%	42%
13.2	Contact by letter?	17%	28%
13.2	Contact by phone?	10%	12%
13.2	Contact by visit?	87%	36%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	92%	31%
For those who are sentenced:			
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	96%	38%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	74%	57%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:			
13.6	Nobody?	23%	44%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	61%	32%
13.6	Offender manager?	36%	27%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	27%	11%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	17%	18%
For those with a sentence plan:			
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	66%	58%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	16%	25%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	41%	32%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	32%	13%
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?	26%	29%
13.12	Accommodation?	20%	38%
13.12	Benefits?	20%	40%
13.12	Finances?	9%	24%
13.12	Education?	31%	29%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	42%	45%
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%	47%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) Guernsey Prison 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		14	62	13	62
1.3	Are you sentenced?	87%	83%	71%	86%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	20%	13%	14%	15%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	93%	99%	93%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	99%	93%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	13%	2%	14%	2%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	20%	0%	7%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	7%	0%	0%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			29%	16%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	27%	6%	21%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	42%	43%	39%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	82%	93%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	57%	72%	62%	72%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	94%	86%	93%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	67%	91%	86%	85%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	100%	51%	62%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	87%	79%	77%	81%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	57%	96%	85%	88%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	43%	72%	50%	69%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	60%	85%	79%	80%

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
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	80%	99%	85%	97%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87%	100%	93%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	57%	46%	62%	45%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	71%	85%	85%	82%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	69%	63%	85%	59%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	79%	97%	92%	94%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	42%	77%	38%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57%	50%	85%	45%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	88%	85%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	64%	60%	62%	60%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	55%	60%	77%	56%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	36%	61%	69%	55%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	21%	0%	0%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	85%	91%	100%	86%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	92%	86%	100%	84%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	21%	22%	31%	21%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	95%	100%	95%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	69%	12%	23%	20%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	23%	3%	8%	6%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	79%	15%	39%	22%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	57%	6%	23%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	21%	2%	8%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	21%	3%	15%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	14%	2%	0%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	14%	0%	8%	2%

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)	29%	0%	8%	5%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	50%	28%	33%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	39%	8%	17%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	8%	2%	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	8%	0%	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	8%	0%	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	15%	0%	8%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	23%	0%	8%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	77%	67%	77%	68%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	92%	79%	100%	77%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	92%	40%	69%	46%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	77%	18%	31%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	8%	16%	23%	14%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	85%	86%	85%	86%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	8%	9%	8%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	50%	42%	39%	43%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	31%	29%	8%	34%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	42%	67%	36%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	77%	73%	39%	81%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	39%	44%	50%	43%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	50%	84%	62%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	23%	25%	8%	27%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	39%	23%	25%	26%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	8%	20%	15%	19%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (Foreign national) Guernsey Prison 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Foreign national prisoners	Non-foreign national 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		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		11	65
1.3	Are you sentenced?	92%	83%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	83%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	83%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	17%	1%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	17%	1%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	25%	17%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	25%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	39%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	84%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	46%	73%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	94%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	83%	86%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	82%	57%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	92%	78%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	91%	87%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	73%	66%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	83%	80%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Foreign national prisoners	Non-foreign national 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?	83%	97%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	60%	46%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	91%	81%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	65%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	82%	96%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	82%	37%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	40%	53%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	82%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	62%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	61%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	60%	57%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	3%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	91%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	100%	85%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	0%	26%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	96%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	18%	20%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	9%	6%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	27%	24%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	9%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	27%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	9%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	27%	0%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Foreign national prisoners	Non-foreign national 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)	18%	3%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	27%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	18%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	9%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	9%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	100%	64%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	100%	78%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	50%	49%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	18%	28%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	9%	16%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	82%	87%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	50%	43%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	50%	27%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	27%	43%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	91%	71%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	50%	42%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	60%	82%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9%	27%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	27%	25%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	18%	18%



Prisoner survey responses Guernsey Prison 2014 - J Wing Analysis

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	J Wing	A, B, E, F, G, H and I Wing
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	31	45
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	6%	6%
1.3 Are you sentenced?	82%	87%
1.3 Are you on recall?	0%	2%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	18%	4%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	0%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	9%	18%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	100%	96%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	100%	96%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	3%	4%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	4%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	0%	2%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	2%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	6%	27%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	13%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	35%	45%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	52%	45%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	6%	4%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	91%	84%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	88%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	62%	73%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	68%	80%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction		
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	46%	65%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	91%	92%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	88%	84%
When you first arrived:		
3.4 Did you have any problems?	67%	55%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	9%	9%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	J Wing	A, B, E, F, G, H and I Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	3%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	27%	26%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	6%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	19%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	37%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	19%	13%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	16%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	3%	11%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	27%	21%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	9%	27%
3.6	A shower?	24%	33%
3.6	A free telephone call?	35%	49%
3.6	Something to eat?	68%	74%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	52%	57%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	71%	76%
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?	19%	25%
3.7	Someone from health services?	76%	82%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	41%	69%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	24%	31%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	57%	52%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	43%	68%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	43%	62%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	37%	64%
3.8	Health services?	57%	68%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	32%	50%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	94%	83%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	62%	70%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	84%	90%
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?	85%	77%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	80%	77%
4.1	Get bail information?	25%	26%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	55%	46%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	J Wing	A, B, E, F, G, H and I Wing
	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		
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	18%	23%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	97%	94%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	81%	92%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	68%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	50%	47%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	76%	83%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	44%	54%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	88%	79%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	55%	70%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	97%	92%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	28%	53%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	35%	62%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	27%	52%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	46%	69%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	16%	25%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	19%	44%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44%	71%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	36%	70%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	3%	4%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	91%	89%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	80%	93%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	53%	45%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	32%	17%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	91%	100%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	6%	30%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	3%	9%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	12%	34%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	3%	25%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	J Wing	A, B, E, F, G, H and I Wing
	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	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	23%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	23%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	0%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	35%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	19%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	21%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	J Wing	A, B, E, F, G, H and I Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	64%	73%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	76%	83%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	44%	45%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	44%	52%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	19%	32%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	30%	17%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	27%	17%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	19%	11%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	9%	4%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	0%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	0%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	48%	60%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	48%	29%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	72%	66%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	43%	46%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	90%	83%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	16%	4%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	42%	46%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	25%	34%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	37%	45%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	33%	48%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	80%	70%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	40%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	90%	72%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	17%	30%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	54%	62%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	26%	27%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	28%	11%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	58%	62%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	87%	96%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	30%	33%



Prisoner survey responses Guernsey Prison 2014 - VP Analysis

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B and H Wing	A, E, G, I and J Wing
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	15	51
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	8%
1.3 Are you sentenced?	88%	83%
1.3 Are you on recall?	6%	0%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	14%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	0%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	6%	17%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	100%	97%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	5%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	5%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	0%	2%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	3%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	47%	12%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	13%	9%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	69%	35%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	31%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	6%	5%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	88%	86%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	100%	77%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	73%	67%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	94%	71%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction		
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	75%	53%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	88%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	94%	83%
When you first arrived:		
3.4 Did you have any problems?	88%	53%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	8%
3.4 Did you have any housing problems?	19%	5%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B and H Wing	A, E, F, G, I and J Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	13%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	38%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	6%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	19%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	53%	19%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	13%	18%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	19%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	19%	5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	31%	21%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	19%	20%
3.6	A shower?	38%	26%
3.6	A free telephone call?	31%	46%
3.6	Something to eat?	88%	67%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	63%	55%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	88%	71%
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?	25%	22%
3.7	Someone from health services?	88%	79%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	81%	52%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	25%	28%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	47%	57%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	94%	49%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	81%	48%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	88%	44%
3.8	Health services?	88%	58%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	53%	40%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	94%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	75%	65%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	94%	85%
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?	75%	82%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	63%	82%
4.1	Get bail information?	7%	29%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	50%	49%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B and H Wing	A, E, F, G, I and J Wing
	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		
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	25%	20%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	93%	96%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87%	86%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	100%	77%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	67%	44%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	81%	81%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	38%	52%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	69%	86%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	73%	62%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	88%	95%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	50%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	38%	42%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	88%	84%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	61%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	7%	25%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	53%	29%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	80%	54%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	69%	55%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	3%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	100%	86%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	100%	84%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	50%	48%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	13%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	95%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	47%	14%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	5%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	63%	17%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	53%	6%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B and H Wing	A, E, F, G, I and J Wing
	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	Threatened or intimidated you?	38%	8%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	13%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	19%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	47%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	27%	34%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	14%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	20%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	13%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B and H Wing	A, E, F, G, I and J Wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	63%	71%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	88%	80%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	33%	45%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	69%	44%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	47%	22%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	0%	27%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	0%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	0%	19%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	6%	6%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	0%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	2%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	53%	56%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	14%	41%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	81%	65%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	38%	46%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	94%	84%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	6%	10%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	69%	38%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	47%	26%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	67%	36%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	50%	40%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	47%	80%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	38%	45%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	75%	80%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	25%	25%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	53%	60%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	19%	28%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	22%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	53%	62%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	100%	90%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	5%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	7%	38%