

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP & YOI Askham Grange

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

28 July–7 August 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
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	17
Section 2. Respect	25
Section 3. Purposeful activity	37
Section 4. Resettlement	43
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	51
Section 6. Appendices	55
Appendix I: Inspection team	55
Appendix II: Prison population profile	57
Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	61

Introduction

HMP and YOI Askham Grange is one of only two women's open prisons in England and Wales. Its primary function is to provide resettlement and through the gate support to women coming towards the end of longer sentences. At the time of the inspection it held 100 women, including three mothers and their babies.

Askham Grange is a small and very well run institution which in the past we have described as outstanding. It prides itself on delivering a decent, caring and resettlement-focused regime where women are encouraged to take responsibility for themselves and others in the prison 'community'. Its ethos is to provide a supportive environment where women can develop confidence and self-esteem, build employability skills and access the community through the temporary release scheme. It continued to do all of these things very well, despite the real threat of closure as part of the NOMS women's estate review.

Women arriving at Askham Grange were well looked after and real care was taken to communicate the ethos of the prison and what was expected in terms of behaviour and participation in the regime. It was a safe prison with very few incidents, and this was built on the participative and supportive relationships fostered between staff and prisoners. Most issues and disputes were dealt with informally between the women held or by staff, although disciplinary measures, when needed, were well managed. Women who are vulnerable for any reason were well cared for and security arrangements were appropriate. There were very few problems related to use of drugs or consumption of alcohol and substance use support, for those who needed it, was good.

The environment was very good and women took real pride in ensuring it was looked after and clean. The food provided was very good, which was particularly notable as this was not the case in other prisons despite the same budget. Women from minority groups felt well supported and most specific needs were being met. The mother and baby unit and nursery provided excellent support to the small number of women who were held with their babies, although as we have said elsewhere, the under-occupancy of these valuable facilities was of concern. Few formal complaints were submitted and when they were, they were taken seriously. Health services were very good and equivalent to those found in the community.

Women were never locked up and access to the pleasant outside areas was very good. Activity provision was of a high standard and met the needs of the population, focusing on building self-confidence and employability skills. All women were required to engage in purposeful activity and this was individually tailored towards their employment goals on release. Excellent vocational work within the prison was supported by the use of release on temporary licence.

Resettlement was at the heart of the prison and embedded in almost all the work being done. Some excellent support was provided in the resettlement pathways, and in particular around maintaining contact with family and friends.

We did have a small number of concerns. A number of women with only a very short time left to serve had recently been transferred to the prison. These women did not have sufficient time left to serve to make best use of the support offered at Askham Grange, and their presence potentially undermined the resettlement ethos of the prison. The prison needed to consider how the needs of the women could be better met. It was not coincidental that during the inspection, the prison released one of these women with no accommodation to go to, the first such release for many months. While we welcomed the focus on getting women back out into the community through release on temporary licence, there were some weakness in the risk assessment processes being used. In addition, staff needed greater focus on wider public protection arrangements to ensure the excellent work being done was not undermined.

Nevertheless, Askham Grange continues to provide outstanding support to the women it holds, and we have again given the prison our highest mark in all four of our healthy prison tests. There is real encouragement that the resettlement work being done will make it less likely that women will offend in the future with, for example, over 40% of women gaining employment on release, and nearly as many going into further education or training. The threat of closure is a real one, and it is not yet clear whether the proposed smaller units in closed women's prisons will be able to replicate the full range of provision available at Askham Grange. The prison in a sense sets a benchmark of what needs to be achieved at these new planned facilities.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

December 2014

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Open prison for sentenced adult and young adult women.

Prison status

Public

Region

Yorkshire and the Humber

Number held

100 on 28 July 2014

Certified normal accommodation

126

Operational capacity

128

Date of last full inspection

30 May–2 June 2011

Brief history

Askham Grange, which consists of a Victorian country house built in the 1880s, became the first open prison for women in January 1947. Extensions and annex buildings were later added and in the mid-1990s, a new mother and baby unit opened.

The prison was led by the same governing governor as at HMP New Hall, a closed women's prison near Wakefield, with which it is twinned. Although largely managed locally, some services were delivered across both sites.

In 2013, the National Offender Management Service announced the closure of Askham Grange and the other women's open prison East Sutton Park as part of its review of the women's estate. At the time of this inspection this decision was subject to judicial review and the future of the establishment remained in doubt.

Short description of residential units

Accommodation in the main house comprised a mix of single rooms and dormitories housing up to a maximum of six residents. The prison's Acorn House, a standalone building within the prison grounds, offered women and their families the opportunity to spend time together overnight in a domestic-like environment in single occupancy rooms. The two annexes for women eligible to work outside the prison or with specific reasons to be alone in a room and the mother and baby unit also offered single rooms. In total there were 45 single and 27 shared rooms but there was no integral sanitation.

Name of governor/director

Diane Pellew

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service provider

Spectrum Community Health Community Interest Company

Learning and skills providers

The Manchester College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Stephen Beyer

About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This report

- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and II respectively.
- A10 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 *Women were positive about escorts although some had been given little notice of their transfer. Support during women's early days at the prison was very good. Women felt safe and there were few incidents. Support for women at risk of self-harm or suicide was good and adult safeguarding processes were in place. Security arrangements were appropriate and women reported few problems with illicit substances. There was little call for formal disciplinary procedures or use of force, which, when used, were well managed. There was no segregation unit. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 Women were positive about escorts, although few had received information about the prison from the sending establishment. Some newly arrived women had not been given sufficient notice of their transfer.

S3 The reception process was systematic and conducted with respect and almost all women said reception staff treated them well. Support for new arrivals was good; the prison had a well used 'buddy' system, which provided new arrivals with information and support to help them settle in. Induction, which took place promptly after a woman's arrival, was detailed, and women said it covered relevant areas.

S4 Askham Grange was a purposeful and safe community. Comprehensive and well understood safer custody arrangements were supported by the positive relationships we observed. No violent incidents had been reported over the previous six months and only a small number of minor incidents involving antisocial behaviour had taken place. Incidents were investigated well and women were offered mediation and appropriate support when necessary. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was used appropriately to deal with less serious infringements of the rules.

S5 One self-harm incident and two assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had been opened in the previous six months. The prison had dealt with these cases well. Multidisciplinary working was evident and we observed many instances of women with vulnerabilities being provided with good support. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) were also well supported. Women had access to private respite accommodation when they required time on their own but it was rarely used. Adult and child safeguarding policies were well developed and there were clear procedures in place to manage women and children at risk.

S6 Security measures demonstrated a common sense and supportive approach. A small but adequate amount of security information was analysed well and information shared promptly with other departments. Access to activities was not inappropriately restricted. Survey and test results pointed to there being little or no availability of drugs or alcohol and a supportive rather than exclusively punitive response when women lapsed, which was rare.

S7 The number of adjudications was very low. Adjudications were generally used for serious offences, such as breaches in release on temporary licence (ROTL) and those relating to drugs. Records showed that comprehensive investigations were undertaken and punishments were appropriate. Use of force was very low – only two incidents had taken place in the

previous six months, one of which involved the use of restraint. There was no segregation unit.

- S8 The prison provided flexible and needs-based clinical treatment. High quality psychosocial support was provided, mainly on a one-to-one basis, and access to community drug and alcohol programmes and groups was good. However, the administration of controlled drugs was delayed at weekends.

Respect

- S9 *Living conditions were very good and outside areas excellent. Relationships were very strong and supportive. Equality and diversity support met the needs of the various groups of women held. Despite some limitations in the provision, women's faith needs were well supported. There were relatively few complaints and the process was well managed. Legal services were very good, as was health care provision. The food was excellent and canteen arrangements were appropriate.*
Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

- S10 Residential units were clean and well maintained, and a range of accommodation was provided. While dormitory accommodation was not ideal, most women were happy living in it. Women had to find their own accommodation after the initial induction process, an arrangement they valued. Showers were clean, although those without natural light or a window had ventilation problems and mould on the ceilings. Adequate cleaning and laundry facilities were available and women took responsibility for cleaning using a rota system. Outside areas were very pleasant.
- S11 Women were positive about their relationships with staff and there was an effective personal officer scheme in place, which prisoners appreciated. Personal officers completed women's case files well and weekly meetings took place to discuss women's progress and provide support, identifying any significant issues. Strong relationships ensured that staff provided the women with effective and meaningful support.
- S12 A responsive and professional staff group ensured that equalities outcomes for women were good. As a result most problems were identified and addressed promptly, without recourse to formal equalities procedures. Investigations into the few discrimination incident reporting forms submitted were impressive.
- S13 In our survey, the responses of disabled, older and gay and bisexual women to a range of questions were similar to other women. Women in these and other protected groups felt well supported. Personal emergency and evacuation plans and care planning could have been better, but we were confident that women would be assisted in an emergency as staff and other women were aware of their needs. The chair lift in the main house did not always work, which meant the education department was not easily accessible. Older and gay women felt they received good support. Although the specific needs of young people could have received more attention, the one young person in the establishment felt well supported. The mother and baby unit (MBU) and nursery were excellent, if under used. The prison had very good multidisciplinary provision for pregnant women, mothers and their children. Despite the challenges of supporting a small but diverse group of women on a part-time basis, faith provision was reasonable.

- S14 The complaints procedure was effective and governance was good. All complaints inspected were completed in a prompt, courteous and respectful manner and women had confidence in the system. Trends and numbers were monitored. Legal support, particularly for women involved in family and child law proceedings, was very good.
- S15 Overall, health services were very good and prisoners were overwhelmingly positive about them. Clinical governance arrangements were good, although the proposed closure of the prison was affecting service development and recruitment. Waiting times for primary care services were short. Pharmacy and dental services were very good. Support for prisoners with severe mental health problems was very good, but there was no specific primary mental health provision.
- S16 The quality and range of meals was excellent and the prison shop was efficiently run and catered for most prisoners' needs.

Purposeful activity

S17 *Women were not locked up and access to outside areas was very good. Leadership and management of learning and skills were very good and appropriately focused on building women's confidence and enhancing employability. Allocation to activities was effective and based on a good assessment of women's needs. A good range of activities, which were relevant for employment, was available. The quality of education and teaching was generally good and achievements were outstanding. The library provided an excellent resource and physical education opportunities were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

- S18 Women were allowed to move freely around the prison for most of the day and were never locked in their rooms. Recreational facilities were good.
- S19 Leadership and management of learning and skills were outstanding and particularly good partnership working between the prison and the education provider took place. Relevant curriculum pathways matched the women's career aspirations very well. Curriculum developments were based on the most recent data and a needs analysis of employment opportunities in the areas where prisoners would have been released. Performance management was rigorous. Quality assurance and self-assessment arrangements made a valuable contribution to quality improvement. The impressive pace of development identified at the previous inspection had been maintained.
- S20 The prison had ample purposeful activity places for the population. All women had an individually tailored timetable, which allowed them to combine work and study that very effectively supported their progress towards their chosen career. The education provider offered a very good range of accredited education and vocational courses. Around a quarter of all women were on distance learning or Open University programmes. The variety of prison work places was very good. The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) was not available because connections with external systems were insufficient. However, alternative provision met most of the women's needs.
- S21 Teaching was outstanding overall. The best classes involved all women in discussions and sharing experiences, while maintaining pace and focus. Teachers were very supportive, boosting women's confidence and self-esteem and helping prisoners with additional needs. The use of interactive whiteboards was very good as were facilities for vocational training.

The prison established excellent links between work activities and education to help learners make rapid progress.

- S22 Achievement of qualifications was outstanding and had been consistently high over the previous four years. Written work was of a particularly good standard. The women enjoyed their studies and made excellent gains in confidence and self-esteem. In many work areas women were given a lot of responsibility and received minimal supervision, which led to excellent skills development. Attendance at education and vocational classes was good. The library was outstanding; access was very good, most women used it regularly and it promoted reading well.
- S23 The gym was well managed and offered prisoners excellent access seven days a week. The range of activities was good. No qualifications were available through the gym, but prisoners could attend external colleges if they wanted to work towards one. All prisoners received a thorough induction prior to attending the gym. This included a 'self-declaration' of health concerns that was carefully checked against existing records. Healthy living was well promoted. Gym-based activities endorsed a positive body image.

Resettlement

S24 *Resettlement was embedded throughout the prison. There was a good understanding of resettlement priorities and the provision was well thought out. ROTL was used well to support resettlement but some aspects of risk assessment needed to be stronger. Offender management arrangements were reasonable but there were delays in some assessments being completed and some public protection processes needed improvement. The recent arrival of women on short-term sentences meant their needs were often not met. Support for indeterminate sentence prisoners was good. Work to facilitate contact with children and families was excellent, as was the support provided in most of the resettlement pathways. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

- S25 The resettlement ethos of the prison was based on constructive partnerships between prisoners, staff and community organisations. Resettlement work with women started on arrival in reception and continued throughout the time they spent at the prison. ROTL was used proportionately to support resettlement aims, but the National Offender Management Service needed to review urgently the requirement in the new ROTL instructions for women moving from closed to open conditions to have a three month lie down period.
- S26 All prisoners had an allocated offender supervisor and were seen promptly after arrival. Prisoners had good access to offender supervisors and were positive about the support they received to help them achieve their sentence plans. The quality of offender assessment system (OASys) documents was generally good. However, assessments were not routinely reviewed following a prisoner's arrival in open conditions, even for those identified as posing a high risk of harm to the public. Home detention curfew (HDC) applications were processed on time.
- S27 Although good progress had been made to implement new ROTL instructions, the governance of risk assessment and decision-making processes needed improvement.
- S28 There were no formal public protection processes and staff lacked an awareness of multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA). Weekly offender management boards and ad hoc emergency case conferences were used to manage prisoners with emerging risks, but a more formal approach was required.

- S29 Most allocations were appropriate, but some prisoners who were transferred because of overcrowding at other establishments had very little time left to serve and were inappropriately allocated to Askham Grange. These women experienced some adverse outcomes as a result. We also felt that they had a potentially destabilising effect on the regime. Support for indeterminate sentence prisoners was good and parole processes were carefully managed.
- S30 In our survey prisoners were positive about most resettlement services. A very good range of family interventions, delivered by a dedicated team, was available. Personal officers and the family support worker helped women maintain and re-establish contact with family, while the family support service provided an innovative programme of work, including the impressive Acorn House and mother and baby unit. Prisoners were very positive about the visits experience but we were disappointed that the incoming phone lines had been removed.
- S31 Reasonable support was available for women who had experienced domestic abuse or rape. However, offender supervisors did not have sufficient awareness of human trafficking, and support for prisoners who had been involved in prostitution was not well promoted.
- S32 Accommodation advice was available through offender management unit (OMU) drop-in sessions and peer advisers. The vast majority of women had suitable accommodation to go to when they were released. However, it was becoming more challenging to find accommodation when more women were arriving with little time left to serve.
- S33 Women received good support and preparation before ROTL or release. The prison used very good partnership links to provide women with a variety of work placements. In the previous 12 months 43% of women gained employment and 39% participated in further education or training on release.
- S34 Pre-release health and substance misuse support was very good. Reasonable benefit and debt advice was available through Jobcentre Plus and the Stepchange Debt Charity, although not all women could open a bank account.
- S35 Women could participate in some offending behaviour programmes in the community, and offender supervisors could provide a range of one-to-one interventions. However, some women's needs remained unmet.

Main concerns and recommendation

- S36 Concern: ROTL risk assessment processes were not fully compliant with the most recent NOMS instructions and there was no up-to-date policy. Managers did not have a sufficient understanding of MAPPAs processes. OASys assessments and MAPPAs management levels were not always reviewed when women were transferred to open conditions and some risk assessments did not focus sufficiently on identified areas of risk. There were no effective management systems to monitor key OMU processes and more rigorous governance was required to guard against complacency and ensure that risks to public safety were effectively managed.

Recommendation: There should be clear guidance on the risk assessment processes required to support the work of the OMU, which the senior management team should carefully monitor.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

I.1 *Women said escort staff treated them well and that they felt safe during the journey. Some women were only informed of their transfer on the day. Too many of those who were transferred had only a short time left to serve, sometimes only a few days.*

I.2 Most women's journeys to Askham Grange were no more than two hours long. Many travelled in secure vehicles. They were never handcuffed, but cellular vehicles were unsuitable for women judged suitable for open conditions. Escort vans were clean and carried refreshments. Women said escort staff treated them well and that they felt safe, although uncomfortable, during the journey. Women were escorted promptly from the vehicles to reception.

I.3 Some women had only been told by the sending establishment they were being transferred to Askham Grange on the morning of their transfer and they therefore did not have time to let friends and family know. The prison had produced a helpful pamphlet describing the prison and its facilities, which had been distributed to other female prisons, but we only found one woman who had seen it.

Recommendation

I.4 **Women judged suitable for open conditions should not have to travel in cellular vehicles.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

I.5 *Reception was clean and carefully arranged and processes were completed promptly and respectfully. Peer supporters offered new arrivals information and support. All women said they felt safe on their first night. Induction started the day after arrival and most women said it covered everything they needed to know.*

I.6 The reception process was conducted promptly and respectfully. Strip-searches did not take place and 97% of women said reception staff treated them well against a comparator of 77%. Women always arrived with their property.

- 1.7** The reception area was clean and organised. A comfortable waiting room had a television, information posters and leaflets. New arrivals were offered a drink and introduced to peer supporters known as buddies, who welcomed them, introduced them to prison routines and acted as a guide for the first 24 hours.
- 1.8** All new arrivals were interviewed privately in reception and any immediate concerns were identified. All women saw a nurse in the health care unit during the reception process. There were no showers in reception, but all women could have a shower once they had been allocated a bed in one of the induction rooms. A hot meal was always available regardless of a woman's time of arrival. Women who smoked were offered a reception pack, as it could be several days before they could purchase items from the canteen, but nothing similar was available for non-smokers.
- 1.9** Women were initially allocated to a six-bed dormitory, which was clean and well prepared. In our survey, 100% of women said they felt safe on their first night. Women were interviewed in private by an induction officer on the day of their arrival to allay any fears and identify special requirements. All women were offered a free telephone call. Telephone credit was transferred from the previous prison the next working day.
- 1.10** The induction programme started the day after arrival and took approximately seven days to complete. This included orientation tours of the prison and an introduction to most aspects of prison life and the support offered. Women were very positive about the information they received. In our survey 82% of women against the comparator of 64% said that the course covered everything they needed to know about the prison.

Housekeeping point

- 1.11** Non-smokers should be offered a reception pack.

Safe and supportive relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.12** *Askham Grange was a safe community and we observed good relationships between women and staff from all disciplines. Staff encouraged women to support each other. There had been no violent incidents. Incidents involving antisocial behaviour were investigated well and women were offered appropriate support. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme promoted and acknowledged positive behaviour.*

- 1.13** The open environment helped create a safe community and the prison evidently had a caring culture. Relationships between the women and staff from all departments were excellent and were fundamental to the supportive ethos of the prison. Staff encouraged women to support each other and a range of peer supporters provided a valuable service. Safer custody policies were comprehensive and staff understood them well. In our survey, fewer women than the comparator said they felt unsafe. There was very little evidence of victimisation by staff or prisoners.

- I.14** A custodial manager and officer were responsible for the daily operation of safer custody strategies and women could contact them easily. Staff from all departments and Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) attended a quarterly safer custody committee meeting. It considered all relevant aspects of safety and the improvement plan showed that the few issues that had been identified were addressed.
- I.15** There had been no violent incidents and only 12 incidents of antisocial behaviour in the previous six months, all of them minor and generally consisting of disagreements between women. Staff investigated them well to prevent matters from escalating and becoming more serious. Women were offered support, including mediation, and perpetrators were monitored appropriately. Exit surveys were carried out and analysis showed that the prison was generally safe.
- I.16** The IEP scheme worked well and women knew what behaviour was required of them. The focus was on promoting and acknowledging positive behaviour and encouraging women to take responsibility for themselves. Staff rarely needed to warn women about poor behaviour. Prisoners told us that when they received warnings, staff explained the reasons for them and what they had to do to improve their behaviour. We found many positive comments in individual prisoners' records. Reviews were well documented and all aspects of a woman's circumstances and behaviour were taken into account before she was promoted or demoted.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

I.17 *The number of self-harm incidents was very low. Multidisciplinary working was evident and we saw women being offered support at an early stage. Listeners were well supported and the Samaritans offered additional help. Women had access to private accommodation when they required time on their own.*

- I.18** There had only been one incident of self-harm in the previous six months and two open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm. Women were managed well through a multidisciplinary approach.
- I.19** All the women we spoke to knew who to go to for help when they were in crisis and we saw women supporting one another as well. Staff from all disciplines intervened at an early stage when women had difficulties to prevent matters from becoming more serious. We observed some excellent care for a newly arrived woman who had not expected to be sent to Askham Grange and felt very unhappy. We were assured that other women who appeared to be at risk would be looked after appropriately.
- I.20** Four Listeners provided women in crisis with a valuable service; they said staff supported them well. They could move around the prison freely and women knew who they were. Our survey suggested that women had less access to Listeners than in comparator prisons, but women told us they were not prevented from speaking to Listeners whenever they wanted

to. The prison had a good relationship with the Samaritans whose staff attended the prison on a monthly basis.

- I.21** Women could use private accommodation in the main house, referred to as ‘the bedsit’, when they needed ‘time out’. The room was adequately furnished and women could bring their own possessions. They had the same access to staff and facilities as elsewhere in the prison. However, it was used rarely.

Good practice

- I.22** *The ‘bedsit’ provided women with space when they needed a break from normal accommodation or prison life or required peace and quiet.*

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

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.23** *Adult and child safeguarding policies were well developed and clear procedures were in place to manage women at risk. No safeguarding referrals had been made in the previous six months. The prison was represented on the local safeguarding adults board.*

- I.24** The prison had well developed safeguarding policies for adults and children, as well as appropriate child protection arrangements, and was represented on the local safeguarding adults board. Health care staff had been trained in safeguarding, and procedures for managing women at risk were detailed. No adult safeguarding referrals had been made, but staff were clear about their responsibilities should the need arise.

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.25** *Proportionate security measures ensured that the environment was safe and supported resettlement aims. An adequate volume of security information was analysed promptly and shared with other departments. Objectives to address areas requiring attention were set and monitored at the security committee meeting. There were few, if any problems, with drugs or alcohol.*

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.26** Security measures were proportionate and demonstrated a common sense and supportive approach that backed resettlement aims. A small but adequate amount of security information (352 reports in the previous six months) was analysed well and intelligence was shared promptly with other departments. Links with the safer custody team and offender management unit were strong. Areas requiring attention, such as release on temporary licence (ROTL) and minor antisocial behaviour, were identified at the security committee meeting. Longer-term objectives were set, actions followed up and issues resolved. All searching was intelligence-led and no strip-searches had been carried out.
- I.27** The security department contributed to assessments for women's access to activities and work, ROTL applications, home detention curfew and parole reports. Access to activities was not inappropriately restricted.
- I.28** The department had good links with the police and there were adequate procedures in place to protect women from illegal conduct or misconduct by staff. Women were confident about making a complaint about staff and appropriate action was taken to deal with such complaints.
- I.29** No women were subject to closed visits; one was under close supervision during visits based on drug-related intelligence from her previous prison. This was due to be reviewed after one month to see if the restrictions needed to continue.
- I.30** Few women returned to closed conditions – 13 since January 2014. Prison managers made every effort to keep women in open conditions if it was safe to do so by offering additional support when needed. Managers kept in touch with women who had to return to a closed prison. There had only been one incident of a woman absconding in the previous 12 months; Askham Grange staff had visited her to find out the reasons for her behaviour and if there were any lessons to be learned.
- I.31** Our survey findings, the women we spoke to and mandatory drug testing (MDT) results indicated little or no drug or alcohol availability in the prison. On the rare occasion when a problem did occur, staff adopted a rehabilitative rather than an exclusively punitive approach, and worked with the women to find a solution.

Good practice

- I.32** *The routine practice of keeping in touch with women who were transferred back to closed conditions provided them with excellent support and made it easier for them to return to Askham Grange in the future.*

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.33** *Adjudications were generally reserved for more serious offences and were not conducted frequently. Quality assurance was carried out and monitoring undertaken at quarterly meetings. Use of force was very low. There was no segregation unit. Women returning to closed conditions did so promptly and were not separated while awaiting transfer.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.34** The number of adjudications was very low. In the previous six months 41 adjudications had been conducted in informal surroundings with an appropriate staff gender balance. Adjudications were generally used for serious offences against prison rules, such as breaches of ROTL and positive drug tests, and none had been referred to the independent adjudicator. Our own observations and records showed that women could state their case and contact legal advisers and that adjudicators conducted comprehensive investigations. Punishments were appropriate.
- I.35** Quarterly adjudications meetings took place and a range of data was considered. Identified trends, such as a rise in ROTL breaches over the previous few months, were considered and action was taken to address them; reviews of prisoners' adjudication tariffs were undertaken regularly. The deputy governor reviewed half of all the adjudications and lessons learned were shared at these meetings.

The use of force

- I.36** Use of force was very low with only two incidents in the previous six months. One of these involved the use of restraint. Documentation showed that force was used appropriately and as a last resort. Governance arrangements were appropriate.

Segregation

- I.37** There was no segregation unit. When women returned to closed conditions the transfer generally took place promptly. Women were not generally formally segregated prior to being transferred, but if they were distressed or difficult to manage, they could be moved to the bedsit accommodation with staff in attendance.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.38** *High quality psychosocial support was provided, and women had good access to community support. Needs-based clinical treatment was flexible, but controlled drug administration was delayed at weekends.*

- I.39** An up-to-date substance misuse strategy was in place and an annual needs analysis was pending. The substance misuse strategy group met quarterly but did not include a representative from the psychosocial support provider Lifeline.
- I.40** The experienced and committed psychosocial support worker provided easily accessible and high quality support to 34 women, most of whom had experienced alcohol problems in the past. However, there were no arrangements to cover any absences.
- I.41** Interventions mainly consisted of structured one-to-one work. Apart from Alcoholics Anonymous, no groups were running at the prison; however, women could use a wide range of community-based services (see section on reintegration planning, drugs and alcohol). Care

plans were detailed and of a good quality, but there was no formal mechanism for seeking service users' views.

- I.42** Clinical interventions were required infrequently – only four women were prescribed opiate substitute treatment in the previous six months, although during our inspection, there had been an influx of five women requiring methadone, some of whom had little time left to serve (see section on strategic management of resettlement, paragraph 4.4), which brought the number up to nine. Appropriately trained and experienced nurses provided a high level of care, and treatment regimes were very flexible and based on women's needs.
- I.43** We found that clinical and psychosocial support staff shared information well, but joint treatment reviews did not involve prisoners. Controlled drug administration took place in a respectful environment and we observed good staff-prisoner interactions, but at weekends methadone was administered three hours later than on weekdays.

Recommendation

- I.44** **Controlled drug administration should take place at a consistent time throughout the week.**

Housekeeping point

- I.45** Clinical and psychosocial support staff should include women in treatment reviews.

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *The living accommodation was very good. Women were required to choose their own rooms. Bathrooms and laundry facilities were clean and well maintained. The grounds and outside areas were pleasant and very well kept.*
- 2.2** Accommodation was well maintained and included shared dormitories in the main house and single rooms in the more modern annexes. A high proportion of the accommodation was shared, but women did not complain about this and some said that being allocated shared accommodation on arrival was a positive experience during the sometimes difficult transition from closed to open prison conditions. In our survey, 98% of women said that it was normally quiet enough to relax or sleep in their room at night, more than the comparator. All women had keys to their own rooms and lockable storage was also available. Bathing and showering facilities were private and clean, but some had inadequate ventilation resulting in mould on ceilings.
- 2.3** Women valued the support they received from other residents who helped them learn the rules and routines of the establishment when they arrived; they felt safe in all the residential units. After their first few days in the induction dormitory, women identified alternative, vacant accommodation themselves. The women appreciated this as it meant they could share with those with whom they felt comfortable. It also encouraged them to take more responsibility for decision-making, introducing them early on to the prison's ethos.
- 2.4** Laundry facilities were available across the prison. In our survey, 96% of women said they had good access to clean clothes, more than the comparator, and 87% said they normally received clean sheets every week. Cleaning materials were readily available and women were responsible for cleaning their shared and personal living areas. Cleaning rotas were in place, and women covered for others if they were out of the prison at work, on courses or visiting family. This meant that all women played an active part in keeping the environment decent.
- 2.5** There were a number of communal spaces where women could socialise, including outside areas and gardens, which were very pleasant, in good condition and used regularly during association. There were communal rooms in each residential unit and women could visit an onsite coffee shop; it provided staff and prisoners with a good meeting place and gave women who worked there access to valuable training opportunities (see section on learning and skills and work activities, educational and vocational achievements).
- 2.6** In our survey 95% of women reported that applications were dealt with fairly, compared with 77% in similar establishments; 89% said that applications were dealt with within seven days, against the comparator of 68%. Inspectors' observations confirmed that the applications process worked well, women had confidence in it and responses were prompt.

Recommendation

- 2.7 Showers should not have mouldy ceilings and there should be adequate ventilation.**

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

2.8 *Relationships between prisoners and staff were very strong and supportive. Staff were courteous and respectful when they communicated with women. The personal officer scheme was effective and provided women with regular meaningful support.*

- 2.9** In our survey, almost all women were very positive about their relationships with staff from all areas of the prison; 71% against a comparator of 37% said that a member of staff had checked on them in the previous week to see how they were getting on, and 98% said there was a member of staff in the prison to whom they could turn for help if they had a problem.
- 2.10** The personal officer scheme was effective and highly regarded; 97% of those with a personal officer said that they were helpful, compared with only 72% in similar prisons. Personal officers maintained detailed case files and held weekly meetings with women to discuss a range of issues, including sentence planning, employment and access to release on temporary licence (ROTL). This prompted the development of strong personal relationships between officers and prisoners and enabled staff to provide effective and meaningful support when women needed to discuss more personal or sensitive topics. Senior managers also regularly interacted with the women as they moved about the establishment, leading by example.
- 2.11** Women were consulted regularly and on a formal basis, and monthly forums took place during which prison routines and facilities were discussed. Women from each residential unit were represented at these meetings and feedback was provided after decisions were made.

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, age and being pregnant and giving birth.

2.12 *Some strategic arrangements needed updating but this did not have a negative impact on outcomes for the women. A responsive and professional staff group ensured that equalities outcomes were good. Most problems were identified and addressed promptly without recourse to formal equalities procedures. Investigations into discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) submitted were thorough and outcomes fair. Women in protected groups did not feel they suffered discrimination and most felt well supported.*

Strategic management

- 2.13** The equalities strategy and planning arrangements required updating to reflect current practice and needs, but this did not affect outcomes for women. The prison was appropriately managing the transition to a new equalities monitoring system.
- 2.14** A responsive, professional staff group ensured that equalities outcomes for women were good. Equalities work was led by an equalities officer, whom women knew well, and four prisoner equalities representatives. The representative we spoke to felt supported in her role. The women told us that they could easily contact staff, including senior managers. Most issues women raised were addressed promptly outside formal equalities procedures.
- 2.15** Three DIRFs had been submitted in the six months preceding the inspection. The way they were handled was impressive: investigations were thorough, responses well thought through and outcomes fair. Written responses were given to the complainant and the person against whom the complaint was made. Appropriate action was taken when discrimination was found to have taken place, including support for the victim and mediation.
- 2.16** Formal consultation arrangements for protected groups were limited but women's easy access to staff meant this had little impact on outcomes for the women (see paragraph 2.17). The prison could have done more to develop links with and support from external support agencies for protected groups.

Protected characteristics

- 2.17** Support for protected groups was very good. The strong relationships both between staff and other prisoners and staff's knowledge of the women's needs, meant that active steps were taken to support them where and when they needed it. This focus meant that outcomes for nearly all women were good, including those from the protected characteristic groups.

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

- 2.18** In our group discussions, black and minority ethnic women did not report any concerns about unequal treatment on grounds of race and felt well supported. There were two foreign national women, both of whom spoke English. We spoke to one who said her needs were being met. Translation services were available if they were required.
- 2.19** In our survey, responses from those with disabilities, older women and gay and bisexual women were similar to those of other women across a range of indicators. Women in these and other protected groups mostly felt well supported.
- 2.20** Women with disabilities were identified effectively. Formal evacuation and care plans could have been better tailored to the women's specific needs. However, we were confident that the women would be assisted in the case of an emergency because staff and other women were aware of their needs. There was no paid peer support scheme for those requiring additional support, although women reported having access to informal support from peers. The chair lift to the second floor of the main house where the education department was located was often out of order and needed to be replaced. Women with significant mobility issues were located in the annex which was on the ground floor. Older women felt well supported.
- 2.21** The prison could have focused more on the needs of young people from the point of their arrival. However, the only young woman in the prison said that staff and other women supported her well.
- 2.22** A decency policy prohibited behaviour such as kissing. Gay women said they experienced more respectful treatment at Askham Grange than in other prisons and that the support they received was good. They could have friendships that were not assumed to be sexual.
- 2.23** The bright, purpose-built mother and baby unit (MBU) and nursery provided up to 10 women and their children with a safe and stimulating environment. Babies stayed with their mothers for 18 months although this could be extended if it was in the best interests of the child (see section on safeguarding). Only three mothers were living in the unit during our inspection, but the unit manager could not recall an application for a place there being refused in recent years.
- 2.24** Good joint working took place between the MBU and the nursery, which was run by children's charity Barnardo's. Weekly case management meetings included the family social worker, the nursery manager, health care managers and offender supervisors.
- 2.25** All pregnant women had good quality care plans. Where appropriate, care plans contained arrangements for the separation of mother and child after birth, including emotional support. Contingencies were also put in place in case the mother changed her mind about separation.
- 2.26** The nine staff members designated to work in the MBU had received suitable training, including paediatric first aid. Barnardo's staff and the community health visitor provided mothers with advice individually on child care issues. A midwife attended the unit regularly. Mothers in the unit spoke positively about the care and support they received from all staff.
- 2.27** Prison staff working in the unit had chosen to remain in uniform as they had to perform duties elsewhere in the establishment. This was at odds with the overall ethos, which aimed to create a non-institutional environment for babies. Although the facilities in the unit were good, mothers were not allowed to cook fresh meat for their children. We were told this was because of food hygiene concerns.

Recommendations

- 2.28** The chair lift to the second floor in the main building should work reliably.
- 2.29** Prison staff in the MBU should not wear a uniform.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

2.30 *Despite the challenges of providing support to a small but diverse group of women on a part-time basis, faith provision was reasonable.*

- 2.31** A small core team of chaplains worked together with volunteers to meet the women's diverse religious affiliations. A chaplain attended the establishment for two hours each weekday and on Sundays. A chaplain was available via an on-call system outside these hours.
- 2.32** The extent of the provision reflected the small population, but this, together with the fact that women were fully involved in activities, meant it could be difficult to schedule services that women could attend. This was reflected in our survey where only 56% of women said it was easy to attend services, compared with 69% in comparator prisons.
- 2.33** Nonetheless, in other respects the chaplaincy had done well to overcome its operating constraints. It was well organised and there were effective handover provisions. Chaplain's attendance times each day were advertised and they were visible during our inspection. Eighty per cent of women in our survey said it was easy to speak to a chaplain of their own faith in private and 70% of women said their beliefs were respected. All new arrivals were seen promptly by a member of the team.
- 2.34** Pastoral support was good, although the demand for these services was low, reflecting the fact that the prison generally provided a supportive environment.
- 2.35** The multi-faith room was pleasant and facilities for different faith groups were appropriate. Arrangements for Ramadan were adequate, but there had been a lack of clarity about them among some staff and women.

Recommendation

- 2.36** The chaplaincy should review arrangements for Ramadan and ensure they are effectively communicated in future.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

2.37 *There were relatively few complaints and the process was managed well. Women had confidence in the system and were using it appropriately.*

2.38 There had only been 30 complaints in the previous six months. Women used the system for individual issues that could not be resolved informally or through the personal officer scheme.

2.39 Women said they had confidence in the complaints system. In our survey 82% of those who had made a complaint said it was dealt with fairly, compared with only 48% in similar prisons, and 89% said it received a prompt response compared with 53% in comparator establishments. All complaints in our sample were answered respectfully and on time.

2.40 Women were regularly consulted about complaints during monthly residential meetings and quarterly forums. Senior managers scrutinised complaints data to analyse trends and provide quality assurance.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.41 *Legal support was very good, especially for women involved in family and child law proceedings.*

2.42 The family support worker provided women involved in family and child law proceedings with good support. The prison had good contacts with a local family law firm, whose representatives visited the prison to provide initial advice to women free of charge. The family support worker offered to accompany women to legal consultations so that she could explain the legal representative's advice if necessary. If requested, she would also attend legal proceedings with women to provide further support. Offender supervisors directed women to other available legal support. Legal visits could be booked for weekdays and took place in a confidential setting.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.43 *Overall health services were very good and women were overwhelmingly positive about the care they received. Clinical governance was good, although service development and recruitment had been adversely affected by the proposed closure of the prison. Waiting times for services were short. Pharmacy and dental services were very good, as was support for women with severe mental health problems; however, primary mental health provision was inadequate.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.44** Spectrum Community Health Community Interest Company provided primary health services on a nine-month contract basis until December 2014. A planned health needs assessment and proposed service development had been postponed until the prison's future had been determined. Clinical governance arrangements were good. A developing partnership board was not yet fully operational; however, a satisfactory network of governance meetings was taking place in the interim. Working relationships between the provider, prison and the commissioners NHS England Yorkshire and Humberside were good. Lessons learned from adverse incidents were shared and informed service delivery.
- 2.45** Attempts to instigate a service user forum had been unsuccessful, but feedback from regular questionnaires and exit surveys influenced the delivery of services. The women we spoke to were very positive about health provision and in our survey more women were satisfied with the quality of health care than in comparator prisons and compared with our previous full inspection.
- 2.46** Nursing staff were on site from Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm and briefly at weekends to administer supervised medication only (see section on substance misuse, paragraph 1.43). The nursing team had been unable to fill staff vacancies because of the short-term health contract. Vacancies were covered by regular and agency staff. The small experienced team was well motivated, knew their patients well and ensured the quality of the service provided was not adversely affected by the staff shortages.
- 2.47** Nursing staff implemented a comprehensive range of policies, including those on communicable diseases, consent and information sharing. Staff access to training and supervision was good. Training on the health implications of human trafficking was planned. The clinical records we sampled were good, although care planning for women with complex needs had not been formalised.
- 2.48** Health staff were clearly identifiable and we saw them interact well with the women. All new arrivals received comprehensive information on health services, which were easily accessible. All services were provided from the health care department and included twice daily special sick clinics (providing immediate health treatment without the need for an appointment). In our survey more women than in comparator prisons reported that it was easy to see the doctor (91% against 47%) and nurses (95% against 66%).

- 2.49** Rooms did not comply with infection control standards; however, the environment was generally good and resembled a community GP surgery. All consultations were held in private. Regular contract cleaning had improved the cleanliness of the unit.
- 2.50** All nursing staff were trained in life support and had good access to appropriate well maintained emergency equipment. Custodial staff had access to defibrillators including paediatric pads. A reasonable proportion of staff was trained in emergency life support.
- 2.51** Pregnant women had good access to community midwifery services. The NHS over-40 health screening to identify the risk of cardiovascular disease had been introduced alongside regular clinics for older women. Women had good access to all community screening programmes, except for bowel cancer screening, which was being addressed. They could also obtain barrier protection, immunisations, vaccinations and screenings for blood-borne viruses. Access to mobility aids and specialist support was good.
- 2.52** The complaints system was confidential, although most issues raised were promptly resolved informally. The two formal complaints received since April 2014 were from family members and received an appropriate response. Health promotion was good and included comprehensive smoking cessation and weight management services.

Recommendation

- 2.53** All clinical areas should comply with infection control guidelines.

Housekeeping point

- 2.54** Women with complex health needs should have formal care plans that are reviewed regularly.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.55** Nurses saw all new arrivals promptly for a comprehensive health screening, and made any necessary appointments. Liaison with community services was good. All women attended a group 'wellbeing' session a few weeks after their arrival to discuss how to achieve and maintain good health, followed by individual support if required.
- 2.56** Women requested services by application or by attending the health department. The range of services available was appropriate and waiting times were short. Nurses with specialist training provided regular clinics for lifelong conditions. The three GP clinics a week included good access to a female GP, and out-of hours GP provision was good. The rate of non-attendance at booked appointments was extremely low at less than 5%.
- 2.57** Children resident in the MBU were treated in the prison health department, but their health records were on paper rather than on the electronic prison clinical system which was appropriate. A health visitor visited every month and made additional visits when required. The mothers we spoke to were happy with the care their children received. Discipline staff had access to agreed birth plans for pregnant women to ensure continuity of care (see section on equality and diversity, protected characteristics, from paragraph 2.23).
- 2.58** Women could attend hospital appointments easily and cancellations were rare.

Pharmacy

- 2.59** Lloyds Pharmacy supplied medicines promptly. A pharmacist visited every week to check faxed prescriptions against the originals. All medicines, including controlled drugs were stored in an orderly and secure manner in the dispensary. The controlled drug records we examined had been completed. The register recording stock methadone arriving at the prison did not comply with current requirements, but a compliant register was introduced during the inspection.
- 2.60** A pharmacy technician monitored medicine stock levels every week; refrigerator temperatures were monitored every day. Medicine alerts were managed effectively. Appropriate reference books were available. There was an adequate range of supporting policies, but the out-of-hours policy needed to be reviewed.
- 2.61** Women ordered repeat medicines through the application system and those we spoke to were happy with the service. Women usually received patient information leaflets with their medicines and additional leaflets were available if required. The pharmacist offered medicine use reviews, but the uptake was very low.
- 2.62** Nurses administered medicines three times a day during the week and administration records were good. Medicine administration was private and respectful. Women had all their medication except controlled drugs in possession and appropriate risk assessments were reviewed regularly.
- 2.63** Nurses used patient group directions (PGDs), which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine, to administer vaccinations and other injections to patients, but not all PGD forms had been signed by all the relevant staff. Nurses could issue a good range of over-the-counter medication without a prescription. Safe systems were in place for women to obtain paracetamol and antacids out of hours.
- 2.64** The medicines management committee met quarterly, but GPs were not sufficiently involved and prescribing data was not discussed in enough detail.

Housekeeping points

- 2.65** All policies and procedures should be reviewed regularly to ensure they are up to date.
- 2.66** All relevant nursing staff should read and sign the PGD forms.
- 2.67** The medicines management committee should include all key stakeholders and the agenda should include prescribing data.

Dentistry

- 2.68** The prison had a weekly dedicated clinic at a local dental practice and an additional monthly dental hygienist clinic. Waiting times for routine appointments was good at four to six weeks. Women had excellent access to emergency dental appointments. Medication prescribed by the dentist was collected from a nearby pharmacy to ensure there was no delay in starting treatment. In our survey, more women than the comparator said it was easy to see the dentist (67% against 17%) and that the quality was good (89% against 39%).

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.69** Working relationships between prison and mental health staff were effective. Discipline staff had reasonable access to mental health awareness training and generally demonstrated a good awareness of mental health issues.
- 2.70** There was no specific primary mental health service. The GP supported women with mild to moderate mental health needs. Women were referred to community counselling services for support if required, although waiting times were long. The local Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) programme, which supports people suffering from depression and anxiety disorders, would not accept prison referrals. Although fewer women in our survey reported emotional or mental health problems than the comparator (24% against 41%), there was still a need for an onsite primary mental health service.
- 2.71** Women with severe and enduring mental health problems received support from a forensic mental health nurse one day a week and through a regular psychiatrist clinic. They also had access to community clinical psychology services provided by Leeds and York Partnership Mental Health Trust. During our inspection the team was supporting four patients using the care programme approach (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness). Care planning, recording and liaison with other prison departments and community services were very good. Appropriate liaison with women's families took place with their consent.
- 2.72** No-one had been transferred to community mental health facilities or to closed prison conditions due to mental health problems since our last full inspection.

Recommendation

- 2.73** **Women with mild to moderate mental health problems should have access to a full range of mental health support.**

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.74** *The quality and range of meals was excellent, but self-catering facilities needed improvement.*

- 2.75** Women ate together in a pleasant dining room, and were very positive about the food – 94% of women in our survey compared with 60% of women in similar prisons said the food was good or very good. This was remarkable given the prison budget for food was similar to most other prisons, where standards were usually much lower. In our groups, black and minority ethnic women said that their requirements were met. Almost all food was freshly cooked and the catering manager felt that this helped maintain the high quality. The pre-select four weekly menu cycle offered women a varied and balanced diet.

- 2.76** Arrangements to ensure that evening meals were reserved for women working in the community sometimes failed, and the system required better control. If women forgot to reserve a meal, they could make a sandwich in the kitchen, but this needed to be better advertised among staff and women.
- 2.77** The kitchen and servery were clean and well maintained. Food was stored, cooked and served appropriately. About eight women worked in the kitchen, although this sometimes fell to as few as four.
- 2.78** Self-catering facilities in the residential units were inconsistent. Apart from the MBU, where the facilities were extensive, but where there were restrictions about what food could be prepared (see section on equality and diversity, paragraph 2.27), the best provision was in the Acorn House; it had a fridge, a toaster and a microwave. Given the long sentences some women were serving, more could have been done to help women prepare for independent living.

Recommendation

- 2.79 Extensive self-catering facilities should be available.**

Good practice

- 2.80** *The quality of the food and use of fresh produce was excellent.*

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.81** *The prison shop was efficient and catered for most women's needs, but prisoners could not make catalogue purchases.*

- 2.82** In our survey, 68% of women said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs against a comparator of 53%. In our groups, black and minority ethnic women complained about a lack of variety and cultural products.
- 2.83** Canteen processes were efficient and items were issued on a weekly basis. The national product list was reviewed regularly in consultation with the women. This process was led by a resident. Women could not order any items from catalogues.
- 2.84** There were no substantial delays in new arrivals receiving their orders; in our survey 50% of respondents said that they had access to canteen when they first arrived, compared with only 29% in other similar establishments.

Recommendation

2.85 The more negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic women about the range of goods available should be investigated and addressed.

Housekeeping point

2.86 Women should be able to make purchases from a range of catalogues.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

Women are able, and expected, to engage in activity⁴ that is likely to benefit them.

3.1 *Women were not locked in their rooms and had good access to the facilities provided.*

3.2 Women were allowed to move freely around the prison building and grounds for most of the day and were never locked in their rooms. They were expected to be in their rooms between 11pm and 6am. There were good recreational facilities and activities in the prison.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.3 *Leadership and management of learning and skills were outstanding and appropriately focused on building prisoners' confidence and enhancing their employability skills. The allocation of women to activities was highly effective and based on a very good assessment of their needs. A good range of activities, relevant to employment on release, was available. The quality of taught sessions was outstanding, as were learners' achievements. The library provided an excellent resource and physical education opportunities were good.*

3.4 *Ofsted⁵ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

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

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.

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>.

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.5** Leadership and management of learning and skills were outstanding and partnership working between the prison and the education provider was particularly good. The provision offered curriculum pathways that matched the women's career aspirations very well and contributed to successful resettlement. The prison focused on ensuring that curriculum developments were based on the most recent data on employment opportunities in the areas where women were being released.
- 3.6** Performance management was rigorous and managers used it to identify promptly the action required to address shortfalls. Progress in achieving challenging targets was appropriately monitored to raise the standard of outcomes for all women. Quality assurance and self-assessment arrangements were sound and made a valuable contribution to quality improvement. The impressive pace of development identified previously had been maintained. The education and vocational training provision provided by The Manchester College was outstanding.
- 3.7** The prison offered ample purposeful activity places that occupied women fully. Learning and skills made a significant contribution to the women's successful resettlement. Most women worked independently to a high standard and offered or received good mutual support though formal and informal peer mentoring. Allocation was effective, fair and based on a comprehensive detailed analysis of women's previous experience and career goals. Pay rates were equitable and did not discourage women from participating in any of the activities.

Provision of activities

- 3.8** Initial assessment was very good. All new arrivals attended an introduction to training and employment session that informed them well about the range of activities available. Detailed information about their previous experience, aspirations, and what teaching methods worked best for them, was collected through questionnaires and a one-to-one interview. Where woman's English and mathematics attainment was not known, they were given an appropriate diagnostic assessment to determine their level. This information was then collated in the National Careers Service skills action plan to identify women's support needs and inform their allocation to activities.
- 3.9** The prison had 115 full-time equivalent purposeful activity places and 97% of the prison population was involved in full-time activity at any one time. At the time of inspection, the remaining prisoners were either retired or excused from participation because they had recently given birth. An individually tailored timetable allowed women to combine work and study, which supported their progress towards their chosen career on release.
- 3.10** The prison had 75 full-time equivalent work places that included varied roles in the kitchens, laundry and gardens, as well as cleaning and driving. Additional orderly work included duties in prison departments such as education, the library and the main visitor reception. Typically, 82% of women undertook accredited training while working.
- 3.11** The Manchester College offered accredited education and vocational courses including: information and communications technology (ICT) and functional skills in English and mathematics from entry level to level 2; business administration, hairdressing and customer service at levels 1 and 2; nail technology and cleaning services at level 2; and barista training at level 1. In addition, the prison provided vocational training in horticulture at level 1 as well as units at level 3 in hair and beauty. Waste management and hobby craft sessions, including beading and card-making, were offered but did not lead to accredited qualifications.

- 3.12** During our inspection, 54 women were attending education classes on a part-time basis. Twenty-three women were following distance learning or Open University programmes for which they received support from the education department. Two prisoners were attending local further education colleges to complete level 3 qualifications. In addition, 32 women were on release on temporary licence (ROTL) as part of the Resettlement to Work scheme; 20 were in unpaid community placements and 12 were in paid work. An enterprise partnership with the charity Together Women Project allowed women to work for local companies in areas such as bookkeeping, market research and social media management.
- 3.13** The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) was not available because connections with external systems were not sufficient. Many women could access the internet through local libraries and a service on a bus that visited the prison. In addition, supervised individual internet access was available in the prison. However, these arrangements did not address all women's needs.

Recommendations

- 3.14 Waste management and hobby craft sessions should offer accredited qualifications where this will enhance women's future employability.**
- 3.15 Women should be able to develop their internet skills and knowledge by researching and applying for opportunities to enhance successful resettlement.**

Quality of provision

- 3.16** Teaching was outstanding overall. The best classes successfully involved all learners in discussions and sharing experiences, while maintaining pace and focus. Women participated enthusiastically and made very good progress. Tutors demonstrated a very good knowledge of their subject areas and boosted learners' confidence and self-esteem. They also provided very good individual support to learners with additional needs.
- 3.17** Tutors made good use of interactive whiteboards to liven up presentations and encouraged women to use them too, which helped them become familiar with the technology. Occasionally the pace of delivery in other classes was slow and learners were not sufficiently challenged. However, even in these cases, they remained well involved and gained confidence through participating in group work. Learning was very effectively enhanced through the use of appropriate resources in classrooms and training areas.
- 3.18** Lesson plans were well developed and tutors used them to deliver consistently high quality teaching tailored to the individual. All tutors received a useful 'learner summary', which outlined the outcomes of a woman's induction, enabling them to anticipate and address individual needs. Individual learning plans were used well in ICT and hair and beauty programmes.
- 3.19** Vocational training facilities were very good. For example, in hairdressing, women worked in a realistic salon environment, providing other women with a wide range of hair and beauty treatments. Links with industry were good, and several women had job interviews arranged prior to release. The salon also offered a weekly evening session to enable trained hairdressers to maintain their skills and keep up with industry practices. Horticulture offered women very good gardening and plant nursery work facilities, as well as the opportunity to achieve industry-recognised accreditation.

3.20 Women could combine work and learning activities in their weekly timetable, which enabled them to put theory into practice in realistic employment situations. For example, women on the professional cookery course were allocated part-time work in the kitchens, and those on the industrial cleaning course worked as cleaners on the wings. This helped them make rapid progress and improved their self-confidence. Relevant short courses in employability, customer service and self-employment ran alongside vocational courses and provided women with good individual coaching.

Education and vocational achievements

3.21 Women's achievement of qualifications was outstanding and had been consistently high over the previous four years. The achievement of those who had learning difficulties and other disabilities was the same as for other learners. The gap in performance between other groups of learners was minimal.

3.22 Learners enjoyed their studies, were motivated to succeed and spoke very highly of the quality of education and support they received. Their written work was of a particularly good standard. Portfolios were well structured and contained detailed learning plans and assessment records. In marked work, tutors made supportive comments but also indicated where improvements were required.

3.23 The prison, which mostly offered classes to level 2, used ROTL well to allow women to access a wider curriculum or higher level courses. They made significant gains in self-esteem and developed independent working skills. For example, in waste management, horticulture, the library and barista coffee shop (see section on residential units), women managed and delivered a high standard of service with minimal supervision, providing them with excellent employment experience. Attendance at education and vocational classes was good.

Library

3.24 The library was outstanding. Located in an attractive room at the centre of the main prison building, the range of stock was excellent and comprised 3500 items, 800 consisting of audiovisual material. Stock was carefully chosen and regularly reviewed to meet the needs of the prison population. Borrowers could also access the full catalogue of the Explore York Libraries and Archives Service, and obtain items through inter-library loans.

3.25 Access to the library was very good. Two part-time library staff, one a professional librarian, managed the library, alongside three prisoner library assistants. The library was open for more than 20 hours a week, including lunchtimes, evenings and weekends. It was exceptionally well used: around 90% of women borrowed books in the month prior to our inspection.

3.26 All women received a detailed library induction. Reading was well promoted. Library staff organised the Six Book Challenge reading scheme every year, a reading group met monthly, and popular authors had visited the prison to talk about their work. The Storybook Mums project had enabled 24 women to record a story on CD for their children over the previous year.

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

3.27 *The gym was well managed and prisoners had access to it seven days a week. The variety of activities provided was good. No qualifications were offered by the gym as women attended external colleges instead. Women received a thorough induction prior to attending the gym, which included a declaration of their own health concerns, which was carefully checked against existing records. Healthy living was well promoted. Gym-based activities promoted a positive body image.*

3.28 Management of the gym was very good and women could use the facilities from early morning to late evening, seven days a week. The facilities and equipment, including the cardiovascular and weight machines, were maintained to a high standard. Activities included circuit training, yoga, aerobics and exercise regimes to tone muscles and develop flexibility. In addition, women could participate in walking and running in the prison grounds, as well as rehabilitation activities for physical injury in a dedicated suite. Free weights were available but only used under the close supervision of one of the two qualified physical education (PE) instructors who attended the gym on Monday and Friday. Four orderlies supervised the gym in their absence and took pride in ensuring it was clean and tidy. The communal showers and changing areas were good.

3.29 Staff were well qualified and experienced. Orderlies were suitably qualified and usually undertook their role to prepare for a career in health and fitness on release. No qualifications were offered in the gym; however, women could undertake accredited training by attending local further education colleges.

3.30 Typically 36% of the prison population used the gym regularly, although this excluded the popular walking and running circuit. Women received a thorough induction prior to attending the gym, which included a declaration of their own health concerns that was carefully checked against existing records. Healthy living was well promoted and good use was made of diet plans and peer support to address weight loss. Gym-based activities promoted a positive body image.

3.31 The gym was very widely advertised and PE staff worked well with other prison staff to involve the more reluctant women. Surveys of gym use and prisoners' needs had been effectively used to introduce a wider range of activities.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.1** *Resettlement was at the heart of the prison, and provision was appropriate. There were good links with a wide variety of community organisations. The threat of closure was creating uncertainty, which potentially threatened resettlement outcomes. Good use was made of release on temporary licence (ROTL) to support women's resettlement aims.*
- 4.2** Constructive partnerships between prisoners, staff and community organisations underpinned the resettlement ethos of the prison. Women told us that the focus on release began as soon as they arrived at the prison, and that the regime continuously promoted the independence and self-determination the women needed on release. Women received support through the prison's links with a wide variety of community-based organisations. They used these services while on temporary release, although staff from some organisations visited the prison.
- 4.3** The resettlement strategy was based on National Offender Management Services (NOMS) priorities. It also took into account local business planning processes, a learning and skills needs assessment and an independent questionnaire prisoners filled out themselves. The strategy seemed appropriate and had a particular focus on employability, reintegration planning and contact with children and families. Weekly meetings supported each of these areas of work. The resettlement strategy failed to use offender assessment system (OASys) data, such as information on women's progress towards achieving their sentence planning targets.
- 4.4** The population of the prison was changing. It had been operating at about 80% of its full capacity for over a year, and there were now more women who had little time left to serve. We were told that staff in other prisons no longer encouraged women to go to Askham Grange because of the threat of closure and because they wanted to develop their own resettlement regimes (see section on offender management, allocation). It was also likely that some women did not want to transfer to the prison because of the uncertainty.
- 4.5** ROTL was used widely and proportionately to support resettlement aims despite the introduction of more rigorous NOMS instructions on the scheme in May 2014. The number of women taking day release at weekends had decreased by two thirds between February 2014 and July 2014, while the number of women on resettlement overnight release had remained broadly similar. One third of the population was released for either community work or paid employment each week (see section on learning and skills and work activities, provision of activities, paragraph 3.12).

- 4.6** Women were being disproportionately affected by a new national requirement for prisoners to spend three months in open conditions before they could be granted ROTL. We met a woman who could not have ROTL for three months when she arrived, despite having received regular ROTL at a closed prison for many months prior to her transfer. This discouraged women from moving to open conditions and disrupted some resettlement plans. Managers had identified this issue and were seeking clarification from policy makers.

Recommendations

- 4.7** **OASys data, including information on prisoners' progress towards achieving their sentence planning objectives, should be used to assess the effectiveness of the prison's resettlement strategy.**
- 4.8** **NOMS' policy on suspending ROTL for three months after transfer to open conditions should be reviewed to reflect the structure of the women's prison estate.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

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

- 4.9** *All women had an offender supervisor and most valued them. Most offender management work was good. Offender supervisors shared information appropriately and were skilled in risk assessment. Prisoners could contact them easily. However, management oversight of OASys, multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) and ROTL processes was not sufficient to assure us that risks to the public were well managed. Some women were inappropriately allocated to Askham Grange. Support for women on indeterminate sentences was good.*

- 4.10** The offender management unit (OMU) was appropriately resourced, and the mixed team of staff worked cooperatively to support women and share expertise. In our survey, 100% of women said they had an offender supervisor and more than in comparator prisons said that someone was working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets. Each woman had an interview with her offender supervisor soon after her arrival, and basic details about her resettlement needs were shared electronically for staff around the prison to use. Offender supervisors shared detailed contact logs in the same way. Women could contact offender supervisors easily, either at planned appointments, on application or by attending twice-weekly drop-in sessions.
- 4.11** OASys assessments were not always reviewed promptly following a woman's transfer to open conditions, even for women identified as posing a high risk of harm to the public. This meant that sentence planning targets and risk management plans might in some cases no longer have been appropriate (see section on public protection).
- 4.12** However, the completed OASys work we examined was generally good; analysis and sentence plan targets were appropriate and risk of serious harm screenings and risk management plans were accurate and up to date and appropriately addressed risks in both custody and the community. Home detention curfew decisions were made on time and

almost all were successful. The violent and sexual offenders register was used well to share information with other criminal justice agencies.

- 4.13** Applications for ROTL were considered at weekly offender management boards. Those we observed demonstrated a detailed knowledge of individual women, a good awareness of risks, appropriate management responses and a genuine focus on resettlement needs. Good consultation took place with offender managers prior to each release. Although some progress had been made to implement new ROTL instructions, systems to consult personal officers and the security department routinely were not yet effective. Some risk assessment documents did not focus sufficiently on previously identified areas of risk, and were not always updated prior to ROTL boards. Overall risk assessment processes were not yet fully compliant with the most recent NOMS instructions, and there was an urgent need for an up-to-date ROTL policy in line with the latest guidelines about risk assessment processes. Senior managers were not sufficiently aware of these shortcomings.
- 4.14** Despite these procedural concerns, we did not find any cases where we felt that ROTL had placed the public at risk (see main recommendation S36). The size of the prison, the knowledge staff had about individual women and the excellent relationships guarded against this.

Public protection

- 4.15** No women were subject to telephone or mail monitoring during our inspection. We were told this happened exceptionally for intelligence purposes, or to monitor restraining orders.
- 4.16** Too many staff, including some managers, lacked a sufficient understanding of MAPPA, resulting in inaccurate and incomplete records. Data from June 2014 suggested that about 30% of prisoners were potential MAPPA cases, and that none of the women presented a very high risk of harm; however, no up-to-date data was available. Despite this significant burden of risk, there was no inter-departmental risk management team, and management oversight was too weak to assure us that MAPPA levels were up to date or that suitable risk management processes were in place for all. Some MAPPA nominals (those potentially subject to MAPPA arrangements on release) went on ROTL without an agreed MAPPA level (see paragraphs 4.13 and 4.14, and main recommendation S36).

Recommendation

- 4.17** **The prison should adopt a local public protection policy that ensures that all MAPPA cases are correctly identified, reviewed when women are transferred to open conditions and monitored by a multi-agency meeting.**

Allocation

- 4.18** Most allocations were appropriate, but in the previous few months, some women with very little time left to serve had been sent to Askham Grange to relieve overcrowding elsewhere. Staff believed that some prisons preferred to retain those with longer sentences to support their own resettlement regimes. Some women told us that they had waited a long time to be transferred to Askham Grange for the same reason. The new arrivals could not benefit from the reintegration facilities available to longer-stay residents and their short-term focus had a potentially destabilising effect on other prisoners and on the regime.

- 4.19** The inappropriate transfers also disrupted resettlement plans, with potential adverse outcomes. During our inspection, a prolific offender on a four-year sentence was transferred to Askham Grange with 10 days left to serve. She had not yet secured accommodation for her release and required ongoing support for drug dependency. Arrangements for a key worker from her home in North Wales to collect her from prison had to be hastily rearranged, causing the woman distress.
- 4.20** Four women had successfully applied for a move to closed conditions in the previous six months to ensure they were released as close to home as possible.

Recommendation

- 4.21 Women should only be transferred to Askham Grange to support their resettlement plan.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.22** One quarter of the population was serving an indeterminate sentence and almost all were very positive about the support they received from personal officers and offender supervisors. Formal sentence planning boards for women on indeterminate sentences were held every six months. Parole processes were up to date.
- 4.23** Indeterminate sentence prisoners had no regular opportunities for extended visits, but those with children could apply to use the Acorn House, where they could stay overnight with their family (see paragraph 4.33). Others were eligible for ROTL.
- 4.24** Overall, women on indeterminate sentences were pleased with the resettlement services available. Those with jobs in the community had to manage their finances and arrange transport.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.25** *Offender supervisors helped women identify their resettlement needs and put them in touch with specialist providers. Women received excellent support to maintain or re-establish contact with children and family members, both from personal officers and the family support team. Reasonable help was available for those who had experienced domestic abuse or rape, but victims of human trafficking and those who had been involved in prostitution were not identified well or supported adequately. Accommodation services were reasonable. Work to support women to obtain work or access training on release was very good, as was health and substance misuse support. Finance, benefit and debt advice was reasonable. A variety of offending behaviour programmes could be arranged for women, but not all women's needs were met before release.*

- 4.26** All women received help on arrival to identify their resettlement needs. Only those subject to OASys documents had a formal pre-discharge interview with their offender supervisor. However, in our survey, women were very positive about the resettlement support they

received, and in our groups they knew whom to contact if they needed help with a range of resettlement issues.

- 4.27** For most women, ROTL was a key part of the reintegration process, particularly for re-establishing family ties and gaining employment experience. Offender supervisors and personal officers prepared women for the challenges of ROTL.
- 4.28** Women who were former 'looked after' children and who were eligible for support as a result were identified on arrival by offender supervisors and subsequently received assistance to maintain contact with their allocated worker.
- 4.29** Women could launder stored clothing before their release and obtain holdalls and travel information.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.30** A good range of family interventions and services was delivered by a team of well trained prison-based specialists managed by Barnardo's family support team. The strategic management of work with children and families was good and a well developed action plan and regular team meetings were in place. The family support team monitored its work and submitted regular reports to the prison's children and families pathway lead staff member.
- 4.31** A family support worker assessed all women on arrival as part of their induction and identified their specific needs. A drop-in service was available for women who wished to access the service at a later stage. The family support worker provided excellent support to an average of 35 women a month through one-to-one casework. The team had worked with 122 women in the previous 12 months. Casework focused on areas such as family and relationship breakdown, bereavement, domestic violence and abuse, debt and benefits, lost contact, adoption procedures and contact with children. This work complemented the support available from personal officers and offender supervisors, who liaised regularly with the family support team about women's relationships with their children and families. In our survey 90% of women said that staff at Askham Grange helped them maintain contact with their family and friends, against a comparator of 57%.
- 4.32** The family support team had delivered three 10-week Strengthening Families, Strengthening Communities parenting programmes in the previous 12 months; 15 women took part in each course.
- 4.33** The Acorn House on the edge of the prison grounds gave women the exceptional opportunity to spend the night with their children in a comfortable and positive setting. Organised by the family support worker, the facility also offered women the space to attend family contact meetings, including extended family visits and final contact visits. Women who could not be considered for ROTL could use the facility to re-establish and maintain relationships with their children. Seventy-two family visits and 67 professional and assessment visits had taken place at the Acorn House in the previous 12 months.
- 4.34** Women were positive about visits – they started on time and were easy to book. An average of 107 of prisoners' family and friends attended every week. Visits took place every Saturday and Sunday in the clean, bright and spacious dining hall where there were good facilities for both teenagers and younger children. Women could also take their visitors to a large outside area where they could eat together. Many women saw their families regularly during ROTL so did not book prison visits. A prison visitor scheme was available for women who did not receive visits from family or friends. A well managed Email A Prisoner scheme was also available.

- 4.35** Access to telephones was good but women could no longer receive incoming calls; video-conferencing for prisoners and their families was also unavailable.

Good practice

- 4.36** *The Acorn House provided women with an excellent opportunity to have overnight visits from their children in a pleasant and domestic-like situation.*

Victimisation, abuse and vulnerability

- 4.37** Offender supervisors routinely checked if new arrivals had experienced abuse, rape or domestic violence. Women could contact independent domestic violence advocate services locally, which offered bespoke support and talking therapies. Other counselling, including specialist bereavement counselling, was also available.
- 4.38** Offender supervisors did not routinely ask women about their involvement in prostitution and the support available was not well promoted. However, the substance misuse psychosocial support worker helped women who had been involved in prostitution to obtain specialist support from a community agency at the prison or during ROTL. She had good links with health care staff who were also sometimes able to identify women who required support.
- 4.39** Offender supervisors did not have a sufficient understanding of human trafficking. The prison had recognised the need to make improvements and information for staff had been drafted, but not yet published. Health care staff were due to receive training on human trafficking.

Recommendation

- 4.40** **Women should be encouraged to disclose all forms of abuse and victimisation or their involvement in prostitution and should be able to obtain appropriate support easily.**

Accommodation

- 4.41** In our survey, more women than at comparator prisons knew where to go for help with accommodation on release. Accommodation advice was mainly available through an offender supervisor in the OMU. There were also two housing peer workers, but they had not received any specific housing training. Although they had access to telephones, they did not use the internet to carry out research into the availability of accommodation nationally or current housing law. On release, the vast majority of women had somewhere suitable to go to, although it was becoming more challenging to find accommodation with more women with little time left to serve arriving at the prison. During our inspection one of these women had been released without accommodation for the first time for some time.

Recommendation

- 4.42** **Housing peer workers should receive specific training.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.43** The prison ran an accredited employability skills programme to improve women's interview, presentation and job application skills, as well as their knowledge of the law about disclosing their offences. Women had to complete this programme before beginning paid work in the community. In addition, they could attend a course to prepare for self-employment, and the Princes Trust offered advice on starting a business.
- 4.44** The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Careers Yorkshire and the Humber through their agent Prospects was good. The adviser was readily available and offered women helpful support in applying for work and education opportunities. Jobcentre Plus also helped women make job applications.
- 4.45** The prison's positive partnership links provided women with a wide range and variety of work placements through ROTL. In the previous six months, 59 women had been released on 618 licences. In the previous 12 months, 43% of women were released into employment and 39% participated in further education or training after release.

Health care

- 4.46** All women were seen the day before their release to complete a letter addressed to their GP. The nurse forwarded all relevant test results and immunisation records. Women were given appropriate health promotion literature. Nurses ensured women on supervised medication left with adequate supplies or prescribing in place. Women receiving in-possession medication were appropriately responsible for ensuring they had sufficient medication for their release.
- 4.47** There was no palliative or end-of-life policy and no-one had required these services since our previous inspection. The team said that the low demand meant they could manage each case individually, informed by national guidance.
- 4.48** The mental health in-reach team started discharge planning early for women with severe and enduring mental health problems to ensure continuity of care after release.

Recommendation

- 4.49** **The prison should develop links with local palliative and end-of-life services and have an agreed pathway on palliative and end-of-life care to ensure prompt appropriate action is taken.**

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.50** Appropriate joint working arrangements had been established: the psychosocial support worker shared client care plans with health services and the OMU, and attended sentence planning boards. Women could participate in a wide range of drug and alcohol support groups in the local community such as Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, self-management and recovery training meetings, a women's group and a structured drug rehabilitation day programme. Good links had been developed with drug intervention programme teams across the country so that post-release support could be arranged.

Good practice

- 4.51** *Women's access to a wide range of drug and alcohol support groups in the local community and to a structured drug rehabilitation day programme helped them to deal with their substance misuse problems on release.*

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.52** Women could easily obtain financial and debt advice through staff from the StepChange Debt Charity, who visited the prison every month. A Jobcentre Plus representative provided benefits advice. Only those in paid employment in the community could open bank accounts.

Recommendation

- 4.53** **All women preparing for release should be able to open a bank account.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.54** Most offending behaviour needs should have been met in closed conditions. Some interventions, including the Thinking Skills Programme, an anger management course and a programme to enhance self-esteem were available in the community. In addition, offender supervisors had the skills to deliver a range of one-to-one interventions, such as victim awareness. Despite this, in almost half our offender management sample, women had not undertaken sufficient offending behaviour work before moving to the prison, although if still necessary this could be included in licence conditions for completion in the community.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendation

To the governor

- 5.1** There should be clear guidance on the risk assessment processes required to support the work of the OMU, which the senior management team should carefully monitor. (S36)

Recommendations

To NOMS

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.2** NOMS' policy on suspending ROTL for three months after transfer to open conditions should be reviewed to reflect the structure of the women's prison estate. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.3** Women should only be transferred to Askham Grange to support their resettlement plan. (4.21)

Recommendations

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.4** Women judged suitable for open conditions should not have to travel in cellular vehicles. (1.4)

Substance misuse

- 5.5** Controlled drug administration should take place at a consistent time throughout the week. (1.44)

Residential units

- 5.6** Showers should not have mouldy ceilings and there should be adequate ventilation. (2.7)

Equality and diversity

- 5.7** The chair lift to the second floor in the main building should work reliably. (2.28)
- 5.8** Prison staff in the MBU should not wear a uniform. (2.29)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.9** The chaplaincy should review arrangements for Ramadan and ensure they are effectively communicated in future. (2.36)

Health services

- 5.10** All clinical areas should comply with infection control guidelines. (2.53)
- 5.11** Women with mild to moderate mental health problems should have access to a full range of mental health support. (2.73)

Catering

- 5.12** Extensive self-catering facilities should be available. (2.79)

Purchases

- 5.13** The more negative perceptions of black and minority ethnic women about the range of goods available should be investigated and addressed. (2.85)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.14** Waste management and hobby craft sessions should offer accredited qualifications where this will enhance women's future employability. (3.14)
- 5.15** Women should be able to develop their internet skills and knowledge by researching and applying for opportunities to enhance successful resettlement. (3.15)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.16** OASys data, including information on prisoners' progress towards achieving their sentence planning objectives, should be used to assess the effectiveness of the prison's resettlement strategy. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.17** The prison should adopt a local public protection policy that ensures that all MAPPA cases are correctly identified, reviewed when women are transferred to open conditions and monitored by a multi-agency meeting. (4.17)

Reintegration planning

- 5.18** Women should be encouraged to disclose all forms of abuse and victimisation or their involvement in prostitution and should be able to obtain appropriate support easily. (4.40)
- 5.19** Housing peer workers should receive specific training. (4.42)
- 5.20** The prison should develop links with local palliative and end-of-life services and have an agreed pathway on palliative and end-of-life care to ensure prompt appropriate action is taken. (4.49)
- 5.21** All women preparing for release should be able to open a bank account. (4.53)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

5.22 Non-smokers should be offered a reception pack. (1.11)

Substance misuse

5.23 Clinical and psychosocial support staff should include women in treatment reviews. (1.45)

Health services

5.24 Women with complex health needs should have formal care plans that are reviewed regularly. (2.54)

5.25 All policies and procedures should be reviewed regularly to ensure they are up to date. (2.65)

5.26 All relevant nursing staff should read and sign the PGD forms. (2.66)

5.27 The medicines management committee should include all key stakeholders and the agenda should include prescribing data. (2.67)

Purchases

5.28 Women should be able to make purchases from a range of catalogues. (2.86)

Examples of good practice

5.29 The 'bedsit' provided women with space when they needed a break from normal accommodation or prison life or required peace and quiet. (1.22)

5.30 The routine practice of keeping in touch with women who were transferred back to closed conditions provided them with excellent support and made it easier for them to return to Askham Grange in the future. (1.32)

5.31 The quality of the food and use of fresh produce was excellent. (2.80)

5.32 The Acorn House provided women with an excellent opportunity to have overnight visits from their children in a pleasant and domestic-like situation. (4.36)

5.33 Women's access to a wide range of drug and alcohol support groups in the local community and to a structured drug rehabilitation day programme helped them to deal with their substance misuse problems on release. (4.51)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Gary Boughen	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Fionnuala Gordon	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Rachel Murray	Research officer
Helen Ranns	Research officer
Colette Daoud	Research trainee
Njilan Morris-Jarra	Research trainee

Specialist inspectors

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Majella Pearce	Health services inspector
Simon Denton	Pharmacist
Noor Mohammed	Pharmacist
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Steven Oliver-Watts	Ofsted inspector
Jenny Daley	Offender management inspector
Helen Davies	Offender management inspector
Sue McGrath	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	1	97	98
Recall	0	2	2
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0
Remand	0	0	0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	0	0
Total	1	99	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	0	0
Less than 6 months	0	3	3
6 months to less than 12 months	0	5	5
12 months to less than 2 years	0	7	7
2 years to less than 4 years	1	29	30
4 years to less than 10 years	0	33	33
10 years and over (not life)	0	5	5
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	8	8
Life	0	9	9
Total	1	99	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 20		
Under 21 years	1	1
21 years to 29 years	17	17
30 years to 39 years	25	25
40 years to 49 years	25	25
50 years to 59 years	23	23
60 years to 69 years	8	8
70 plus years	1	1
Please state maximum age here: 70		
Total	100	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	1	97	98
Foreign nationals	0	2	2
Total	1	99	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Female closed		4	4
Female open	1	95	96
Total	1	99	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	1	84	85
Irish	0	1	1
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	1	1
Other white	0	1	1
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	1	1
White and black African	0	2	2
White and Asian	0	0	0
Other mixed	0	2	2
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	0	0
Pakistani	0	3	3
Bangladeshi	0	1	1
Chinese	0	0	0
Other Asian	0	0	0
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	1	1
African	0	1	1
Other black	0	0	0
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	0	0
Other ethnic group	0	0	0
Not stated	0	1	1
Total	1	99	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	0	
Church of England	0	33	33
Roman Catholic	0	23	23
Other Christian denominations	1	13	14
Muslim	0	5	5
Sikh	0	0	0
Hindu	0	0	0
Buddhist	0	1	1
Jewish	0	2	2
Other	0	2	2
No religion	0	20	20
Total	1	99	100

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0%	22	22
1 month to 3 months	0	0%	15	15
3 months to 6 months	0	0%	19	19
6 months to 1 year	1	1%	28	29
1 year to 2 years	0	0%	15	15
2 years to 4 years	0	0%	0	0
4 years or more	0	0%	0	0
Total	1	1%	99	99

Sentenced prisoners only

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

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	0	0
1 month to 3 months	0	0	0	0
3 months to 6 months	0	0	0	0
6 months to 1 year	0	0	0	0
1 year to 2 years	0	0	0	0
2 years to 4 years	0	0	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person			
Sexual offences			
Burglary			
Robbery			
Theft and handling			
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences			
Other offences			
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
Total			

Appendix III: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

Questionnaires were offered to all prisoners.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 28 July 2014 the prisoner population at HMP & YOI Askham Grange was 99. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 93⁶ prisoners.

We received a total of 92 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 99%. One respondent returned their questionnaire blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
Annexe	12
Acorn Unit	13
H2	46
H3	18
Mother and baby unit	3

⁶ Surveys were not distributed to one prisoner who was attending court and five prisoners who were on ROTL on the day of the survey.

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP & YOI Askham Grange.

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 significant⁷ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Askham Grange in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other women's training and open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in three women's training and open prisons since April 2011.
- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Askham Grange in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP & YOI Askham Grange in 2008.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between responses of prisoners who consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other and those who consider themselves to be heterosexual.

⁷ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

Section I: About You

Q1.2	How old are you?			
	Under 21	1	(1%)	
	21 - 29.....	17	(19%)	
	30 - 39.....	24	(26%)	
	40 - 49.....	23	(25%)	
	50 - 59.....	19	(21%)	
	60 - 69.....	6	(7%)	
	70 and over	1	(1%)	
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?			
	Yes	89	(99%)	
	Yes - on recall.....	1	(1%)	
	No - awaiting trial.....	0	(0%)	
	No - awaiting sentence	0	(0%)	
	No - awaiting deportation.....	0	(0%)	
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?			
	Not sentenced	0	(0%)	
	Less than 6 months	5	(6%)	
	6 months to less than 1 year	7	(8%)	
	1 year to less than 2 years	6	(7%)	
	2 years to less than 4 years	23	(26%)	
	4 years to less than 10 years	29	(33%)	
	10 years or more	4	(4%)	
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	8	(9%)	
	Life.....	7	(8%)	
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)			
	Yes	3	(3%)	
	No.....	88	(97%)	
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?			
	Yes	91	(100%)	
	No.....	0	(0%)	
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?			
	Yes	91	(100%)	
	No.....	0	(0%)	
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?			
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	78 (87%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	0 (0%)
	White - Irish	2 (2%)	Asian or Asian British - other	0 (0%)
	White - other.....	1 (1%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean.	1 (1%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - white and black African	2 (2%)
	Black or black British - African	1 (1%)	Mixed race - white and Asian	0 (0%)
	Black or black British - other	0 (0%)	Mixed race - other.....	2 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	0 (0%)	Arab.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	2 (2%)	Other ethnic group	0 (0%)

Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi..... 1 (1%)

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

Yes 1 (1%)
No..... 89 (99%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None.....	16 (18%)	Hindu	0 (0%)
Church of England	36 (40%)	Jewish	1 (1%)
Catholic	23 (26%)	Muslim	4 (4%)
Protestant.....	2 (2%)	Sikh	0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination	4 (4%)	Other.....	2 (2%)
Buddhist	1 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/ Straight 78 (87%)
Homosexual/Gay..... 4 (4%)
Bisexual..... 8 (9%)

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

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

Yes 2 (2%)
No..... 88 (98%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes 68 (75%)
No..... 23 (25%)

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

Yes 41 (45%)
No..... 50 (55%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?

Less than 2 hours 50 (55%)
2 hours or longer 39 (43%)
Don't remember 2 (2%)

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

My journey was less than two hours 50 (55%)
Yes 35 (38%)
No..... 6 (7%)
Don't remember 0 (0%)

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

My journey was less than two hours 50 (55%)
Yes 11 (12%)
No..... 30 (33%)
Don't remember 0 (0%)

Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?

Yes 60 (67%)

No..... 25 (28%)
 Don't remember 5 (6%)

Q2.5 On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?
 Yes 81 (89%)
 No..... 9 (10%)
 Don't remember 1 (1%)

Q2.6 On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?
 Very well..... 53 (58%)
 Well..... 32 (35%)
 Neither 4 (4%)
 Badly..... 1 (1%)
 Very badly 1 (1%)
 Don't remember 0 (0%)

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 83 (90%)
 Yes, I received written information 12 (13%)
 No, I was not told anything 1 (1%)
 Don't remember 2 (2%)

Q2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?
 Yes 88 (97%)
 No..... 3 (3%)
 Don't remember 0 (0%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1 How long were you in reception?
 Less than 2 hours 87 (96%)
 2 hours or longer 3 (3%)
 Don't remember 1 (1%)

Q3.2 When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?
 Yes 84 (93%)
 No 5 (6%)
 Don't remember 1 (1%)

Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?
 Very well..... 66 (72%)
 Well..... 23 (25%)
 Neither 2 (2%)
 Badly..... 1 (1%)
 Very badly 0 (0%)
 Don't remember 0 (0%)

Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Loss of property 2 (2%)	Physical health 11 (12%)
Housing problems..... 8 (9%)	Mental health..... 6 (7%)
Contacting employers 1 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners 0 (0%)
Contacting family 8 (9%)	Getting phone numbers 2 (2%)
Childcare 1 (1%)	Other 3 (3%)
Money worries..... 6 (7%)	Did not have any problems 55 (62%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal 6 (7%)	

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	27 (30%)
	No.....	8 (9%)
	Did not have any problems	55 (61%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco.....	61 (66%)
	A shower	34 (37%)
	A free telephone call.....	71 (77%)
	Something to eat.....	64 (70%)
	PIN phone credit.....	49 (53%)
	Toiletries/ basic items	45 (49%)
	Did not receive anything	2 (2%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain	64 (73%)
	Someone from health services.....	78 (89%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	46 (52%)
	Prison shop/ canteen	44 (50%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	7 (8%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you	69 (78%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	52 (59%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	68 (77%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	68 (77%)
	Health services	77 (88%)
	Chaplaincy	70 (80%)
	Not offered any information.....	5 (6%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	92 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	2 (2%)
	Within the first week.....	87 (96%)
	More than a week.....	2 (2%)
	Don't remember	0 (0%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	2 (2%)
	Yes	72 (80%)
	No.....	13 (14%)
	Don't remember	3 (3%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment.....	7 (8%)
	Within the first week.....	65 (72%)
	More than a week.....	12 (13%)
	Don't remember	6 (7%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to...						
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	29 (33%)	16 (18%)	3 (3%)	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	38 (43%)
	Attend legal visits?	22 (26%)	13 (15%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	47 (55%)
	Get bail information?	11 (14%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	63 (78%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	Not had any letters.....						26 (29%)
	Yes.....						19 (21%)
	No.....						44 (49%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	Yes.....						57 (64%)
	No.....						4 (4%)
	Don't know.....						28 (31%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		Yes	No	Don't know			
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	86 (96%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)			
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)			
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	77 (88%)	10 (11%)	1 (1%)			
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	89 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)			
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	18 (49%)	4 (11%)	15 (41%)			
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	88 (98%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)			
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	43 (58%)	8 (11%)	23 (31%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	Very good.....						48 (53%)
	Good.....						36 (40%)
	Neither.....						3 (3%)
	Bad.....						2 (2%)
	Very bad.....						1 (1%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know.....						1 (1%)
	Yes.....						62 (68%)
	No.....						28 (31%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?						
	Yes.....						59 (66%)
	No.....						2 (2%)
	Don't know.....						28 (31%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?						
	Yes.....						62 (70%)
	No.....						4 (4%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....						23 (26%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?						
	Yes.....						72 (80%)
	No.....						4 (4%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....						14 (16%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i>	25 (28%)
<i>Very easy</i>	36 (41%)
<i>Easy</i>	13 (15%)
<i>Neither</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Difficult</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (5%)
<i>Don't know</i>	7 (8%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	89 (98%)
<i>No</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Don't know</i>	1 (1%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are applications dealt with fairly?</i>	8 (9%)	77 (87%)	4 (4%)
<i>Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	8 (10%)	62 (81%)	7 (9%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

<i>Yes</i>	70 (81%)
<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Don't know</i>	16 (19%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are complaints dealt with fairly?</i>	62 (70%)	21 (24%)	5 (6%)
<i>Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	62 (72%)	21 (24%)	3 (3%)

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

<i>Yes</i>	4 (5%)
<i>No</i>	77 (95%)

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

<i>Don't know who they are</i>	4 (4%)
<i>Very easy</i>	46 (51%)
<i>Easy</i>	34 (38%)
<i>Neither</i>	6 (7%)
<i>Difficult</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	0 (0%)

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>	3 (3%)
<i>Yes</i>	77 (86%)
<i>No</i>	5 (6%)
<i>Don't know</i>	5 (6%)

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>	3 (3%)
--	--------

Yes	57 (64%)
No.....	24 (27%)
Don't know	5 (6%)

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

Yes	1 (1%)
No.....	90 (99%)

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>	88 (99%)
Very well.....	0 (0%)
Well.....	0 (0%)
Neither	1 (1%)
Badly.....	0 (0%)
Very badly	0 (0%)

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

Yes	85 (93%)
No.....	6 (7%)

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

Yes	88 (98%)
No.....	2 (2%)

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

Yes	65 (71%)
No.....	26 (29%)

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

<i>Do not go on association</i>	8 (9%)
Never.....	3 (3%)
Rarely	7 (8%)
Some of the time	15 (16%)
Most of the time	30 (33%)
All of the time.....	29 (32%)

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

<i>I have not met him/her</i>	7 (8%)
<i>In the first week</i>	72 (79%)
<i>More than a week</i>	10 (11%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (2%)

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

<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	7 (8%)
Very helpful.....	61 (68%)
Helpful	19 (21%)
Neither	3 (3%)
Not very helpful	0 (0%)
Not at all helpful.....	0 (0%)

Section 8: Safety**Q8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?**

Yes 6 (7%)
 No..... 86 (93%)

Q8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?

Yes 4 (4%)
 No..... 88 (96%)

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

Never felt unsafe	86 (98%)	At meal times	1 (1%)
Everywhere	1 (1%)	At health services.....	0 (0%)
Segregation unit	0 (0%)	Visits area	0 (0%)
Association areas	1 (1%)	In wing showers	0 (0%)
Reception area	0 (0%)	In gym showers	0 (0%)
At the gym	0 (0%)	In corridors/stairwells.....	0 (0%)
In an exercise yard	0 (0%)	On your landing/wing	1 (1%)
At work.....	1 (1%)	In your cell.....	1 (1%)
During movement	0 (0%)	At religious services.....	0 (0%)
At education	2 (2%)		

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

Yes 12 (13%)
 No..... 80 (87%)

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

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

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes 6 (7%)
 No..... 84 (93%)

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

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	0 (0%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	0 (0%)
Sexual abuse	0 (0%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated	3 (3%)
Medication.....	0 (0%)
Debt	0 (0%)
Drugs.....	0 (0%)
Your race or ethnic origin.....	1 (1%)

Your religion/religious beliefs	0 (0%)
Your nationality	0 (0%)
You are from a different part of the country than others.....	1 (1%)
You are from a traveller community	0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation	0 (0%)
Your age.....	0 (0%)
You have a disability.....	0 (0%)
You were new here.....	1 (1%)
Your offence/ crime	0 (0%)
Gang related issues.....	0 (0%)

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

Not been victimised.....	77 (87%)
Yes.....	6 (7%)
No.....	6 (7%)

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 (2%)	41 (45%)	42 (46%)	1 (1%)	5 (5%)	0 (0%)
The nurse	2 (2%)	53 (59%)	32 (36%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
The dentist	10 (11%)	19 (22%)	40 (45%)	7 (8%)	10 (11%)	2 (2%)

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 (3%)	62 (67%)	26 (28%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
The nurse	2 (2%)	60 (65%)	25 (27%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
The dentist	18 (20%)	31 (34%)	33 (37%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)

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>	58 (64%)
<i>Good</i>	26 (29%)
<i>Neither</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Bad</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Very bad</i>	1 (1%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes.....	64 (70%)
No.....	28 (30%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	28 (30%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	58 (63%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	5 (5%)
<i>No</i>	1 (1%)

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

Yes.....	22 (24%)
No.....	69 (76%)

Q9.7 Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff.)

<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	69 (77%)
Yes.....	14 (16%)
No.....	7 (8%)

Section I0: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?					
	Yes					15 (16%)
	No.....					77 (84%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?					
	Yes					16 (18%)
	No.....					75 (82%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?					
	Very easy.....					2 (2%)
	Easy					4 (4%)
	Neither					4 (4%)
	Difficult.....					2 (2%)
	Very difficult.....					4 (4%)
	Don't know					75 (82%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?					
	Very easy.....					0 (0%)
	Easy					1 (1%)
	Neither					3 (3%)
	Difficult.....					2 (2%)
	Very difficult.....					11 (12%)
	Don't know					75 (82%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?					
	Yes					0 (0%)
	No.....					92 (100%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?					
	Yes					0 (0%)
	No.....					92 (100%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?					
	Did not / do not have a drug problem					77 (84%)
	Yes					14 (15%)
	No.....					1 (1%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?					
	Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....					75 (82%)
	Yes					12 (13%)
	No.....					4 (4%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?					
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help.....					71 (77%)
	Yes					20 (22%)
	No.....					1 (1%)

Section I1: 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	4 (4%)	52 (58%)	28 (31%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)

Vocational or skills training	6 (7%)	42 (49%)	30 (35%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Education (including basic skills)	5 (6%)	47 (53%)	32 (36%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Offending behaviour programmes	29 (34%)	24 (28%)	24 (28%)	6 (7%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)

Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Not involved in any of these</i>	15 (17%)
Prison job	62 (70%)
Vocational or skills training.....	34 (39%)
Education (including basic skills).....	44 (50%)
Offending behaviour programmes	10 (11%)

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	6 (8%)	52 (69%)	13 (17%)	4 (5%)
Vocational or skills training	11 (16%)	49 (70%)	6 (9%)	4 (6%)
Education (including basic skills)	10 (13%)	58 (77%)	5 (7%)	2 (3%)
Offending behaviour programmes	23 (40%)	22 (39%)	7 (12%)	5 (9%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Never</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	12 (13%)
<i>About once a week</i>	20 (22%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	56 (62%)

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

<i>Don't use it</i>	2 (2%)
<i>Yes</i>	82 (91%)
<i>No</i>	6 (7%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	20 (23%)
<i>0</i>	21 (24%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	15 (17%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	21 (24%)
<i>More than 5</i>	10 (11%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	5 (6%)
<i>0</i>	4 (5%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	15 (17%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	21 (24%)
<i>More than 5</i>	43 (49%)

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

<i>Don't want to go</i>	2 (3%)
<i>0</i>	2 (3%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	2 (3%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	7 (9%)
<i>More than 5</i>	66 (84%)

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>	2 (2%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	0 (0%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	5 (6%)

6 to less than 8 hours	9 (11%)
8 to less than 10 hours.....	13 (15%)
10 hours or more	51 (61%)
Don't know	4 (5%)

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?	
	Yes	81 (90%)
	No.....	9 (10%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	7 (8%)
	No.....	82 (92%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	5 (6%)
	No.....	85 (94%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	13 (15%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	22 (25%)
	<i>Easy</i>	23 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i>	4 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	12 (13%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	15 (17%)
	<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>	0 (0%)
	Yes	80 (92%)
	No.....	7 (8%)
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>	7 (8%)
	<i>No contact</i>	15 (17%)
	<i>Letter</i>	30 (35%)
	<i>Phone</i>	23 (27%)
	<i>Visit</i>	41 (48%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	89 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	75 (84%)
	No.....	14 (16%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	14 (16%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	30 (34%)
	<i>Involved</i>	24 (27%)

Neither	8 (9%)
Not very involved	5 (6%)
Not at all involved.....	7 (8%)

Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)

Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	14 (17%)
Nobody.....	8 (10%)
Offender supervisor	47 (56%)
Offender manager	28 (33%)
Named/ personal officer	33 (39%)
Staff from other departments	23 (27%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	14 (16%)
Yes	68 (79%)
No.....	1 (1%)
Don't know	3 (3%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?

Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	14 (16%)
Yes	8 (9%)
No.....	58 (66%)
Don't know	8 (9%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?

Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	14 (16%)
Yes	35 (41%)
No.....	18 (21%)
Don't know	18 (21%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

Yes	10 (12%)
No.....	42 (49%)
Don't know	34 (40%)

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

Yes	55 (64%)
No.....	31 (36%)

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.)

	Do not need help	Yes	No
Employment	24 (29%)	53 (63%)	7 (8%)
Accommodation	35 (41%)	45 (52%)	6 (7%)
Benefits	24 (28%)	55 (64%)	7 (8%)
Finances	27 (34%)	40 (50%)	13 (16%)
Education	27 (33%)	48 (59%)	6 (7%)
Drugs and alcohol	42 (51%)	35 (42%)	6 (7%)

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?

Not sentenced	0 (0%)
Yes	65 (80%)
No.....	16 (20%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Askham Grange 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

Key to tables		HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
	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		92	345	92	76
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	3%	1%	3%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	3%	1%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	14%	5%	14%	10%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	9%	5%	9%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	17%	3%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%	100%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	95%	100%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	10%	29%	10%	9%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	1%	5%	1%	
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	6%	4%	3%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	13%	25%	13%	8%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	19%	18%	5%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	0%	2%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	75%	71%	75%	78%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	45%	46%	45%	45%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	43%	48%	43%	46%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	86%	80%	86%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	27%	7%	27%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	67%	59%	67%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	89%	80%	89%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	94%	77%	94%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	90%	74%	90%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	13%	21%	13%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
	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				
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	97%	90%	97%	95%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	96%	54%	96%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	94%	87%	94%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	97%	77%	97%	84%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	39%	56%	39%	46%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	2%	10%	2%	11%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9%	12%	9%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	1%	1%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	9%	13%	9%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	4%	1%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	6%	14%	6%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	6%	17%	6%	15%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	13%	15%	13%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	6%	20%	6%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	3%	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	2%	10%	2%	12%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	76%	45%	76%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	67%	70%	67%	78%
3.6	A shower?	37%	37%	37%	62%
3.6	A free telephone call?	77%	72%	77%	75%
3.6	Something to eat?	70%	62%	70%	87%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	54%	36%	54%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	49%	42%	49%	
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?	73%	61%	73%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	88%	77%	88%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	53%	53%	53%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	50%	29%	50%	26%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
	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				
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	78%	60%	78%	68%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	59%	50%	59%	57%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	77%	50%	77%	61%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	77%	45%	77%	64%
3.8	Health services?	87%	56%	87%	66%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	80%	55%	80%	61%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	100%	82%	100%	93%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	98%	94%	98%	92%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	82%	64%	82%	84%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	92%	83%	92%	
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?	51%	52%	51%	45%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	41%	48%	41%	39%
4.1	Get bail information?	18%	13%	18%	13%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	22%	38%	22%	30%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	64%	58%	64%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	96%	79%	96%	91%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	99%	100%	100%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87%	87%	87%	92%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	100%	67%	100%	88%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?		49%		
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	98%	73%	98%	80%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	58%	35%	58%	61%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	94%	60%	94%	79%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	68%	53%	68%	35%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	67%	77%	67%	65%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	70%	67%	70%	73%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	80%	71%	80%	73%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	56%	69%	56%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	98%	90%	98%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	95%	77%	95%	90%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	89%	68%	89%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	82%	64%	82%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	82%	48%	82%	61%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	89%	53%	89%	61%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	5%	12%	5%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	89%	54%	89%	81%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	86%	64%	86%	
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	64%	43%	64%	
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	1%	2%	1%	
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?		45%		
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	94%	79%	94%	89%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	98%	81%	98%	97%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	71%	37%	71%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	64%	21%	64%	64%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	92%	88%	92%	95%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	97%	72%	97%	81%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	6%	35%	6%	13%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	4%	13%	4%	3%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	13%	30%	13%	18%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	18%	5%	13%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	4%	1%	1%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	22%	5%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
	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	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	4%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	5%	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	5%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	8%	1%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	3%	0%	
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	6%	27%	6%	14%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	0%	9%	0%	7%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	2%	0%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	3%	15%	3%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	3%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	5%	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	7%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	2%	0%	
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	50%	57%	50%	46%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	91%	47%	91%	73%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	95%	66%	95%	93%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	67%	17%	67%	50%
	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?	99%	53%	99%	76%
9.2	The nurse?	95%	57%	95%	71%
9.2	The dentist?	89%	39%	89%	78%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	95%	46%	95%	72%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	70%	66%	70%	63%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	99%	86%	99%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	24%	41%	24%	19%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	65%	69%	65%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	16%	24%	16%	8%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	17%	22%	17%	10%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	6%	19%	6%	21%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	1%	5%	1%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	3%	0%	0%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	4%	0%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	94%	79%	94%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	77%	89%	77%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	96%	90%	96%	100%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	89%	81%	89%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	84%	47%	84%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	90%	56%	90%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	56%	47%	56%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	71%	89%	71%	65%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	39%	26%	39%	37%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	50%	41%	50%	82%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	12%	25%	12%	17%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	93%	98%	93%	
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	76%	53%	76%	
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	84%	85%	84%	
	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?	83%	71%	83%	
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	86%	90%	86%	
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	89%	76%	89%	
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	60%	84%	60%	
	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?	65%	67%	65%	
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	85%	62%	85%	81%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	91%	55%	91%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	36%	26%	36%	22%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	73%	48%	73%	68%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	71%	84%	91%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	60%	39%	60%	55%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	90%	57%	90%	85%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	8%	28%	8%	16%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	5%	15%	5%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	51%	31%	51%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Askham Grange	HMP Send, HMP Drake Hall, HMP East Sutton Park	HMP Askham Grange 2014	HMP Askham Grange 2008
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 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?	92%	84%	92%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	19%	26%	19%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	38%	43%	38%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	29%	33%	29%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	52%	36%	52%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	100%	90%	100%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	84%	85%	84%	96%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	73%	70%	73%	80%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	12%	32%	12%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	67%	50%	67%	
13.6	Offender manager?	40%	29%	40%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	47%	22%	47%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	33%	21%	33%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	95%	80%	95%	99%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	11%	14%	11%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	49%	26%	49%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	12%	6%	12%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	64%	30%	64%	55%
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?	88%	54%	88%	
13.12	Accommodation?	89%	66%	89%	
13.12	Benefits?	88%	64%	88%	
13.12	Finances?	75%	49%	75%	
13.12	Education?	90%	57%	90%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	86%	67%	86%	
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 the future?	81%	67%	81%	67%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP&YOI Askham Grange 2014

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Consider themselves to 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					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		16	74	26	65
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	3%	0%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	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.)	6%	11%	0%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	1%	0%	1%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	4%	0%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			50%	4%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	3%	4%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	77%	76%	79%	74%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	94%	94%	89%	96%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	88%	90%	89%	91%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	94%	94%	93%	94%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	94%	98%	96%	97%

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				
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	81%	30%	54%	33%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	87%	90%	92%	87%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	100%	100%	100%	100%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	98%	100%	97%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	40%	51%	42%	54%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	100%	95%	100%	94%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%	100%	100%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	82%	96%	93%	94%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	29%	77%	48%	76%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	63%	67%	69%	64%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	93%	66%	96%	59%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	88%	80%	93%	77%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	100%	98%	100%	97%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	80%	82%	89%	79%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	81%	86%	89%	84%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	75%	63%	59%	65%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	1%	4%	0%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	96%	89%	96%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	100%	98%	100%	97%

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				
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	71%	63%	72%	61%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	90%	96%	91%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	18%	4%	11%	4%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	4%	4%	4%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	18%	13%	11%	14%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	12%	4%	7%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	6%	1%	4%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	0%	4%	0%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	13%	5%	7%	6%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	6%	3%	4%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	82%	94%	86%	94%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	88%	96%	89%	97%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	88%	66%	79%	66%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	31%	21%	19%	26%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	6%	6%	0%	9%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	67%	72%	81%	66%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	33%	40%	42%	37%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	40%	51%	46%	52%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	13%	12%	8%	12%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	94%	82%	93%	81%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	19%	40%	22%	39%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	88%	68%	86%	67%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	88%	82%	85%	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)	50%	63%	59%	60%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	13%	5%	4%	9%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	4%	0%	7%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (sexual orientation) HMP&YOI Askham Grange 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		12	78
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	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.)	8%	11%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	1%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	21%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	62%	79%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	92%	94%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	85%	91%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	93%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	100%	96%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	8%	42%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	100%	86%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	100%	100%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	99%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	69%	47%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	92%	96%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	100%	93%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	85%	66%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	62%	67%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	72%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	85%	81%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	92%	99%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	85%	81%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	77%	87%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	69%	64%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	1%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	100%	93%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	100%	98%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	62%	66%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	91%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	15%	5%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	2%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	23%	11%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	8%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	8%	6%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	8%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	92%	93%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	92%	95%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	92%	66%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	39%	22%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	23%	2%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	77%	70%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	50%	37%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	77%	46%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	15%	11%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	77%	85%
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	40%	36%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	67%	73%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	92%	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)	56%	62%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	0%	10%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	6%