

Report on an announced inspection of

**HMP/YOI Feltham
(Feltham B – young adults)**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

28 July–8 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 2015

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	9
About this inspection and report	11
Summary	13
Section 1. Safety	21
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	43
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	57
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix III: Prison population profile	73
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	77

Introduction

Our last inspection of HMYOI Feltham B in March 2013 was one of the most troubling we had undertaken for some time. Against all of our healthy prison tests, outcomes were poor or not sufficiently good. We called for a radical rethink of Feltham's role. This inspection found the prison and NOMS had responded positively to our findings. Feltham B still faces significant challenges, particularly a high level of staff vacancies, but in a period when outcomes in many other establishments have been declining, Feltham B has improved significantly in almost every area. Our last inspection recommended that:

“NOMS (The National Offender Management Service) should carry out an urgent review of the viability of Feltham, as it is currently constituted, as a suitable location for large numbers of young adult prisoners. Alternatives for their location, and safer and more constructive management should be considered.”

In response to this recommendation, NOMS took the decision that young adults who were remanded or those serving very short sentences should no longer be held at Feltham B and most young adults in these categories are now held in London adult local prisons. As we have reported elsewhere, the management of these young adults in the adult estate still causes us considerable concern but there is no doubt Feltham B is more stable as a result and outcomes are much better for those young men serving longer sentences who continue to be held there. The improvements we have found are not simply a result of the change in Feltham B's role. Managers and staff on the site deserve great credit for the work they have done.

Feltham B was now much safer than it had been before. Reception arrangements had improved. Levels of violence had reduced considerably and were now comparable with similar establishments. In the six months before the previous inspection there was an average of about 215 fights and assaults a month; in the six months before this inspection the average had fallen to 98. At our last inspection 42% of prisoners told us they had felt unsafe at some time in Feltham B; at this inspection the number had fallen to 24%. The number of ACCTs (case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm) opened in the six months before each inspection had fallen from more than 140 to 54. Of course, these figures are still objectively high and the report indicates areas where further improvements are needed to respond to violence and support prisoners at risk, but the improvements already made are a major achievement. Drug use was very low and support for those with substance misuse issues was generally good.

At the previous inspection we were extremely concerned about the unprecedented frequency with which batons were drawn and/or used. Batons had been drawn 108 times in the 12 months before our previous inspection but just six times in the six months before this inspection. The use of force overall, while still high, had also fallen, as had the number of formal adjudications and the use of segregation. In view of these improvements in safety, some security measures were now disproportionate but because of the establishment's recent history, we supported the establishment's approach of making changes cautiously and ensuring they were embedded before proceeding further. Some reception and induction arrangements needed adjustment to take account of the prison's new role.

The improvements in safety reflected improvements in relationships between staff and prisoners. Prisoners reported positive engagement with staff and we witnessed some examples of this. However, this was still a work in progress. A small number of uniformed staff were still dismissive and disinterested and this undermined the work of their colleagues. Some prisoners complained with some justification that they were treated like children. Work on equality and diversity had been impacted by staff shortages. Prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim prisoners were less positive than white and non-Muslim prisoners. Monitoring was not sufficiently comprehensive but it was clear that prisoners from black and minority backgrounds were disproportionately involved in disciplinary processes. It was unacceptable that young adult Muslim

prisoners were unable to use the mosque for prayers. Eight foreign national prisoners were held beyond the end of their sentence; at the time of this inspection one had been held for a completely unacceptable two years after the end of his sentence. Prisoners told us they did not have confidence in the discrimination complaints system and this reflected weaknesses in the complaints system as a whole. The number of complaints had risen dramatically since the last inspection and there was no analysis of why this was so or underlying trends. Investigations into complaints about staff were not robust enough.

The physical environment had much improved although we still found areas that were grubby and in a poor state of repair. Cells were cleaner and with much less graffiti – prisoners were expected to keep them so and held accountable if they did not. Health services had improved since the last inspection but there were some weaknesses in medicine management. Prisoners with diabetes were not permitted to keep blood testing kits or insulin pens in their cells and so could not monitor their own health and manage it accordingly. There were no individual assessments to balance security and health risks involved. There was good support for prisoners with a range of mental health problems and there was excellent training of prison staff about mental health awareness. The Albatross unit provided a good therapeutic environment but during the inspection the disruption caused by the presence of one very challenging young man adversely affected the care of others on the unit. Transfers to secure hospitals took much longer than the two week target because of delays in external assessments and funding issues.

The provision of purposeful activities had improved but from a very low base and there was still much more to be done. Ofsted judged that the leadership and management of learning and skills were good and the prison made effective use of the resources it had available. But there were simply not enough activity places to meet the needs of the population and this was particularly unacceptable in an establishment whose function now was essentially a training prison for young men. Fully employed prisoners could have about eight hours out of their cells on weekdays. The half of the population who only had part-time activities were locked in their cells for about 20 hours a day and the 10% of the population who were unemployed only had about two hours out of their cells during the week.

The quality of the activities available had improved and good progress was being made on tackling the significant remaining weaknesses. The appointment of a special education needs coordinator and an additional learning support tutor had helped tutors to better support prisoners but provision was insufficient to meet demand. Literacy and numeracy were crucial to a prisoner's future progress and while achievements in these areas had improved they were still too low. The promotion and delivery of English and mathematics in all lessons required improvement. Vocational training was good. Good use was made of prisoners who were 'red bands' or trusted orderlies. This gave them the opportunity to gain worthwhile experience that should have been accredited. With careful supervision and governance, the use of red bands could have been usefully extended to other areas such as meeting new arrivals at reception. Gym facilities were good and there was a well-stocked library but staffing shortages restricted access.

Resettlement and offender management had not been sufficiently adapted to Feltham B's new role. Prisoners were now spending longer at Feltham B so offender management services needed greater priority. This was hampered by the fact that so many prisoners arrived at Feltham B without a completed OASys assessment which should have identified what was needed to address their behaviour and manage their risks. Without an OASys assessment a sentence plan could not be completed and so prisoners' opportunity to progress was obstructed. The backlog of OASys assessments needed to be addressed at a regional or national level. National changes to offender management systems and the start of the new National Probation Service all contributed to weaknesses in offender management at the time of the inspection. Public protection arrangements were not sufficiently rigorous and it was particularly concerning that weaknesses in community-based offender management meant that prisoners' multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels were sometimes identified only just before they were released, which compromised planning to manage their risks. There were few offending behaviour programmes to directly address prisoners' behaviour.

Practical resettlement services were generally better, although resettlement agencies struggled to find some young men accommodation on release and there was too little work to help them address debt and money issues. Work to help prisoners develop and maintain family relationships had improved and increased but was still limited. The prison made effective use of well-managed release on temporary licence (ROTL) to prepare prisoners for release. During the inspection, young men left the prison with staff to take part in an overnight Duke of Edinburgh Award exhibition – something that would have been impossible to manage at the time of our last inspection.

The report of our last inspection of Feltham B stated it was one of the most concerning we had recently published. In contrast, this report describes much greater progress than we have recently seen elsewhere. This is, in part, a consequence of strategic decisions about Feltham's role but it is also largely due to the skilled and determined work of managers and staff. There is still much to do and the management of young adults in other parts of the prison estate is still a major concern. In addressing these wider issues, much can be learnt from Feltham's decline and subsequent improvement.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

January 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Feltham B accommodates 18-21 year old convicted young men.

Prison status

Public

Region

Young people's estate

Number held

410

Certified normal accommodation

522

Operational capacity

522

Date of last full inspection

March 2013

Brief history

The original Feltham was built in 1854 as an industrial school and was taken over in 1910 by the prison commissioners as their second borstal institution. The existing building opened as a remand centre in March 1988. The current HM Prison and Young Offender Institution Feltham was formed by the amalgamation. After our last inspection it was decided to no longer routinely hold remanded young adults at Feltham to stabilise the population.

The establishment is split into Feltham A, which holds children and young people (aged 15-18), and Feltham B, which holds young adults (aged 18-21); this report relates to Feltham B.

Short description of residential units

Kingfisher	–	induction unit, 53 beds
Lapwing	–	normal location, 46 beds
Mallard	–	normal location, 55 beds
Nightingale	–	normal location, 55 beds
Osprey	–	normal location, 55 beds
Partridge	–	normal location, 55 beds
Quail	–	normal location, 55 beds
Raven	–	normal location, 55 beds
Swallow	–	normal location, 55 beds
Teal	–	normal location, 38 beds
Ibis	–	segregation unit

Name of governor

Glenn Knight

Escort contractor

Serco

Health service provider

Provider: Care UK

Commissioner: NHS England

Learning and skills provider

A4E

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Marion Rider

About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This report

- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. 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 *The decision that Feltham should no longer hold remand prisoners had had a positive impact and was contributing to greater stability in the prison. Journey times for new arrivals were short and their reception was mostly positive. Prisoners felt safe on their first night, but induction was fragmented and did not meet the needs of all. The number of violent incidents had reduced significantly and the prison had a good understanding of the risk areas, and there had been an impressive decrease in the use of batons. Support for prisoners in crisis was generally good but care mapping needed to improve. Safeguarding arrangements were developing. Some security and disciplinary procedures were disproportionate, but this was being addressed in a measured way. The segregation unit was a reasonable environment and prisoners there were positive about staff support. Substance misuse services were generally good, and there was little evidence that illegal drugs were a problem.*
Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

S2 *At the last inspection in March 2013, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Feltham were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that nine of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, six had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S3 Most journeys for new arrivals were short and in our survey more prisoners than the comparator were positive about their treatment by escort staff, but too many prisoners did not travel with all their property. The reception environment had improved since the last inspection, and staff were welcoming and the process was swift.

S4 In our survey, more prisoners than at the last inspection said they felt safe on their first night. The first night environment on Kingfisher was good, cells were well prepared, and new arrivals received an appropriately focused first night interview. Their induction started the following day but was rushed, and too many prisoners felt they had not been given sufficient information about the prison.

S5 Since the last inspection, formal arrangements to deal with violence had developed well and the number of fights and assaults had reduced significantly. Fewer prisoners than at the last inspection said that they had been intimidated by other prisoners, and only 12% against the comparator of 20% said that they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. The establishment was good at analysing violent incidents, and the strategy to reduce violence was having a positive effect. Bullying remained evident but the number of incidents had reduced, and the quality of investigation by the antisocial behaviour team into alleged incidents was usually very good.

S6 The analysis of data to understand patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour had improved since the last inspection and was good. The number of prisoners in crisis on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management had reduced, and screening arrangements were good. Although the incidence of self-harm was high, just a few prisoners accounted for a disproportionate number of incidents, which were low level. The Listener scheme (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) was well supported, their role was properly advertised and prisoners had good access to them. Safeguarding arrangements for prisoners at risk (because of disability or illness) were better developed than we normally find.

- S7 Although the physical and procedural security measures did not restrict prisoner access to the regime unnecessarily, some security arrangements, including closed visits and searching, were not always applied proportionately. However, the establishment was focused on this area and applying planned changes in a measured way. A good flow of intelligence informed relevant security objectives, which were monitored effectively. There was an appropriate focus on the challenges presented by gang affiliation, and security information was shared widely and links with the police were good. All the relevant measures indicated that drugs were significantly less widely available at Feltham than similar establishments. Drug use was low and testing arrangements were adequate.
- S8 There was evidence that the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was being used strategically to encourage good behaviour. In our survey, significantly more respondents than the comparator said that the scheme had encouraged them to improve their behaviour. There was a reasonable difference between the levels, but some warnings were petty and inconsistent. The regime for prisoners on basic was unacceptably poor, and prisoners could be demoted to basic following an alleged incident of poor behaviour without a sufficiently thorough investigation of the facts.
- S9 Most adjudication records were adequate but some did not show sufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt. Although recorded use of force remained high, it had fallen since the last inspection. Many incidents did not involve sustained control and restraint, and there was evidence of de-escalation. On our previous inspection, we criticised the high number of occasions when batons were drawn. On this inspection, we found that use had reduced significantly and governance arrangements were now very good. However, records and oversight for use of force generally required improvement – too many reports were incomplete and video recordings of planned incidents were not reviewed. The use of special accommodation was too high, and some stays were very long and not warranted.
- S10 Use of segregation had reduced and stays were not long. It was positive that few prisoners were segregated for seeking protection or for good order. The environment in the segregation unit had improved and was now good, and the cells and exercise yard were clean and well equipped. While there were not enough exercise periods, the regime had improved and was good; prisoners had access to the gym, education, books and in-cell activities. All prisoners we spoke to who had been in the segregation unit said they were treated well by staff, and we observed good staff-prisoner interaction.
- S11 Demand for clinical opiate substitution services was very low, but the overall quality of care was reasonably good. Journey to Recovery (J2R) staff had limited access to prisoners detoxifying in the Albatross inpatient unit, indicating that clinical and psychosocial services needed better integration. Many prisoners with lower levels of need who used J2R told us that the service had been very helpful, and the range of interventions was good.

Respect

- S12** *The prison was cleaner than at our last inspection, but the residential units still needed some improvements. Staff-prisoner relationships had improved but were variable. There were examples of very good engagement and most staff interacted positively but a small number remained disrespectful. Arrangements for equality and diversity work had also improved, but support for prisoners from some minority groups was weak. Faith arrangements were generally good, except for some provision for Muslim prisoners. The health services were reasonable and improving. Many prisoners were critical about the food, but we found that the meals, as well as the prison shop arrangements, were adequate. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S13** *At the last inspection in March 2013, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Feltham were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 34 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that 13 of the recommendations had been achieved, nine had been partially achieved, 11 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S14** There had been some environmental improvements, including to the grounds, since the last inspection. Most cells were reasonably clean and graffiti-free, but some cells were poorly ventilated, dirty and inadequately furnished. In some units, showers were dirty, telephones were broken and flooring was dirty, cracked and worn. Although the application system had been improved, only a third of prisoners in our survey said that applications were dealt with quickly.
- S15** In our survey, some responses about staff-prisoner relations were better than the comparator; we observed improvements since the last inspection, most staff we observed interacted positively and there was some very good engagement. However, staff-prisoner relations were still variable, a small number of uniformed staff appeared dismissive and disinterested and some young adults complained with justification that they were treated like children. Personal officer work was inadequate and did not support prisoners sufficiently. Prisoner consultation arrangements were reasonably good and responsive.
- S16** Equality work had improved in some respects but still required further development. Identification of prisoners from some protected characteristic groups and promotion of equality required improvement. Equality and diversity consultation arrangements were reasonable but were too often ad hoc. Some areas of monitoring for equal treatment had been out of range for black prisoners for some time and had not been explored adequately. The number of discrimination complaints had increased but many prisoners were unaware of the process or had no confidence in it. The investigation of a minority of such complaints that we sampled lacked rigour. Too many foreign nationals were detained on immigration grounds alone after they had completed their sentence, and progress on clarifying their status was too slow. In our survey, Muslim prisoners were less positive than non-Muslims across several indicators of respectful treatment, and we found some staff lacked cultural awareness of this group. There was good identification of prisoners with disabilities, but not all received adequate support. Support for gay or bisexual prisoners required improvement.
- S17** In our survey and structured groups, prisoners were mostly positive about the chaplaincy, and faith provision was good. Preparations for Ramadan at the time of the inspection were generally good, but weekend food arrangements were inadequate.
- S18** Prisoner confidence in the complaint system remained poor but the number of complaints had increased. The responses we sampled were generally good – they showed direct engagement with prisoners, were mostly polite and addressed the issue raised – but were

not always prompt. Complaints about staff were generally not investigated thoroughly enough, and responses were often too dismissive. Although there were no trained legal services staff, the provision was now adequate for the population.

- S19 Health care governance was reasonable overall, and non-attendance rates at primary care clinics had reduced significantly since our last inspection. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparators said they had good access to a doctor and nurse, although we found that they could get a routine appointment without much delay. Prisoners with long-term conditions, such as asthma and diabetes, were supported, but diabetics were not able to keep their insulin pens or blood-testing equipment in possession. The Albatross inpatient unit offered a positive therapeutic environment with an excellent programme of activities and good work by clinical and discipline staff, but the temporary presence of a very challenging prisoner had caused disturbance and disruption to other inpatients. There was an effective mental health referral pathway and a wide range of therapeutic interventions providing good support to prisoners with mental health needs, including those with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) or on the autistic spectrum.
- S20 In our survey and focus groups, prisoners were negative about the food. However, the food we saw was adequate in quality and quantity, was served at a reasonable time and now served from the servery (rather than dropped off at cell doors). Some new arrivals could wait up to 10 days to use the prison shop, which was unacceptable and could lead to debt. Prisoners could not shop from catalogues. Prisoner consultation about catering and the prison shop was good and responsive.

Purposeful activity

S21 *There were insufficient activity places, although those available were managed well. Time out of cell required improvement, especially for prisoners not fully engaged in activity. The strategy for learning, skills and work had led to improvements since the last inspection, and these were continuing. Learning support had increased, but it was insufficient to meet demand. Vocational teaching was generally good, as were achievements. Achievements in English and mathematics had improved considerably, but from a very low base. The library was well resourced but there were no computers for prisoners. The gym offered a balance of recreational PE and vocational courses. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S22 *At the last inspection in March 2013, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Feltham were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that six of the recommendations had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved, two had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S23 Fully employed prisoners could have about eight hours a day out of their cell on weekdays, but the majority of prisoners, who worked or attended education part time, had about four to five hours a day. Time out of cell for the 10% of prisoners who were unemployed was very poor, at about two hours per weekday. At roll checks during the core day we found about 20% of the population locked in their cells, although this was too many, it was an improvement from the 45% we found locked in at the last inspection.
- S24 The head of learning and skills and the learning provider provided very clear strategic direction that had helped the prison to make good improvements in tackling weaknesses found at the last inspection. Quality improvement arrangements were sound but the lesson observation process was not rigorous enough. Managers understood what they had to do to improve the provision further. The appointment of a special education needs coordinator

and an additional learning support tutor had helped teachers to support prisoners better, but was still insufficient to meet demand.

- S25 There were not enough activity places, but those available were well used. The range of courses were insufficiently challenging for many prisoners. The prison did not provide any distance learning or Open University courses. Teaching, learning and assessment in education were judged to require improvement, although they had improved significantly since the last inspection.
- S26 The planning of lessons was mostly effective. However, the use of individual learning plans to set specific and measurable targets for prisoners to achieve required improvement. Support for English and mathematics in education classes required improvement to develop the skills of all prisoners, although in vocational training, such support was good and occupationally relevant. Teaching and learning in vocational training were good, as were outcomes in most vocational areas. Success rates in English and mathematics had improved considerably but still required further improvement. Prisoners demonstrated high standards of work and skills in classroom sessions and vocational training. The library was well stocked with an appropriate range of age-related materials and promoted learning, but no computers were available for prisoners in the library.
- S27 The promotion of physical education and healthy living was very good. The gym had improved, prisoner access was fair and equitable, and the range of activities and qualifications was very good. Gym staff had established impressive links with external organisations, including professional football and rugby clubs who supported the training and development of prisoners' sporting skills.

Resettlement

S28 *The offender management and resettlement services required development. The change of population profile had set new challenges but staff were addressing these. There was a significant offender assessment system (OASys) backlog and a variation in quality. Most prisoners knew their offender supervisor. Sentence plans were variable and too many prisoners did not have one. Public protection arrangements were weak. Opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL) were improving. Resettlement pathway provision was generally good, but with some notable exceptions. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S29 *At the last inspection in March 2013, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Feltham were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, six had been partially achieved, two had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S30 Offender management and resettlement services were going through transition, and the change in population and appointment of some new staff meant that there was insufficient focus on offender management. The resettlement, public protection and offender management policies were up to date. Each covered key issues, and an action plan with targets was monitored through the monthly reducing reoffending strategy meeting. There were good links to the wider community, but there were some problems in obtaining information from probation offender managers.
- S31 Most prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor, and in our survey more than double the comparator knew who their offender supervisor was. Offender management unit (OMU)

staff were generally enthusiastic and motivated and keen to develop the service. However, there was a significant backlog of OASys assessments and over half the population had none or one that was out of date, and too many prisoners arrived without a completed OASys.

- S32 Although a better response than at the last inspection, fewer than half the respondents in our survey said they had a sentence plan, and there was a significant variation in the quality of sentence plans and OASys assessments. Offender supervisor contact with prisoners was reasonably frequent, although in most cases its focus was unclear. However, there were some notable exceptions, and we saw some good work in motivating and encouraging prisoners to progress. Although case supervision and quality assurance had improved since the last inspection, more skills development of offender supervisors was needed.
- S33 Work to develop ROTL for prisoners was very good, as were the processes to assess their suitability. Public protection arrangements were generally appropriate, and the monthly interdepartmental risk management board was well attended from across the establishment. However, despite laudable efforts from the OMU, there were problems with identifying prisoners' multi agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) risk levels from community offender managers before their release.
- S34 The range of resettlement pathway services was good, although they lacked integration. Planned pre-release meetings involving service providers and OMU staff were more likely in complex and high risk cases, but such meetings were too infrequent.
- S35 Good accommodation support was provided by St Mungo's, the homelessness charity. All prisoners were offered support on arrival and before release. However, around 5% of young adults were released with no fixed accommodation, although all were offered some support if required before release. The prison did not know the extent of prisoners' debt and debt-related problems. Some organisations, including St Mungo's and the New Horizon youth service, offered some support, but there was no formal or structured debt service. Prisoners could open bank accounts before their release, and the education department ran a monthly finance programme.
- S36 The quality of the careers service provided by Prospect Careers, a contractor for the National Careers Service, was good. All prisoners could use the virtual campus, enabling internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities, which was available at every classroom computer, but this was not used to good effect. The prison had excellent links with a wide variety of outside employers.
- S37 Pre-release health care arrangements were effective, and included timely links with community mental health teams before release for those with mental health care needs. Resettlement opportunities for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems were good, with pre-release harm reduction sessions and access to the RAPt (Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners) trust national network of community support.
- S38 The visitors' centre offered a positive environment for visitors, with good support from the children's charity Spurgeons. The number of family visits had increased since the last inspection. The visits hall was a reasonable environment, although staffing of the children's play area was limited, and the only refreshments available were through a vending machine. The 'building bridges' programme to improve relationships between young adults and their families offered good support, but there was insufficient provision to support family engagement.
- S39 The prison was due to start the thinking skills programme and the Resolve programme, working with violent prisoners, over the following months, which were appropriate for the population. The lack of information from OASys meant it was difficult for the prison to

identify wider offending behaviour needs that required interventions, and there was no structured one-to-one work by offender supervisors to address offending behaviour. However, the Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme, while not accredited, was delivered four times a year, and restorative justice conferences between prisoners and their victims were held where appropriate.

Main concerns and recommendations

S40 Concern: There were too few activity spaces for the population. The majority of prisoners worked or attended education part time only, and 20% of the population were locked in their cells during the core day.

Recommendation: There should be more opportunities for prisoners to participate in full-time purposeful activity.

S41 Concern: The prison had not yet fully adapted its resettlement provision to reflect its new role after the loss of remand prisoners. Offender management services did not have sufficient priority. There was a large OASys backlog in part because many prisoners arrived at the prison from other establishments without one. The quality of assessments and offender supervisor contact was variable. Too little work was done to address prisoners' behaviour and attitudes. Co-ordination with other establishments and services was not fully effective.

Recommendation: There should be a new resettlement and offender management needs assessment, which is repeated at regular intervals and should inform a revised resettlement and offender management strategy, allocation of resources and, co-ordination with other establishments and services.

S42 Concern: Over half the population did not have an up-to-date OASys assessment or sentence plan, and those that did varied too much in quality and focus. Too many prisoners were transferred to Feltham without an OASys. The quality of assessments was variable, as was offender supervisor contact with prisoners, and there was not enough focus on work to address offending behaviour.

Recommendation: The prison should identify and meet the resettlement and offender management needs of all prisoners.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1** *Most journeys for new arrivals were short and prisoners were positive about their treatment by escort staff. Too many prisoners arrived without all their property.*
- 1.2** Most prisoners were transferred to Feltham from local prisons in London and journeys were short. Arriving vans did not wait for long periods outside the gate or reception. More prisoners than the comparator said that escort staff treated them well (63% against 57%), and the escort staff we observed were courteous to prisoners.
- 1.3** Many prisoners said the escort vehicles were dirty, and while the vans we saw were clean they contained considerable graffiti. Prisoners told us that they were offered food and drink by escort staff, and the vans we saw carried sandwiches and water.
- 1.4** Too many prisoners reported that they did not travel with all their property and staff in reception confirmed this. This caused practical difficulties and anxiety for some prisoners.

Recommendation

- 1.5** **Prisoners arriving at the prison should travel with all their property.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.6** *The reception had improved, staff were welcoming and the process was swift. New arrivals had an appropriate first night interview, felt safe during their first night and the first night environment was good. Induction started the following day but was rushed, and too many prisoners felt they had not been given sufficient information about the prison.*
- 1.7** The reception area had improved since the previous inspection and was large, clean and welcoming. Feltham no longer received remand prisoners from courts and, as a result, reception was far less busy than when we last visited. Much of the first night process took place in the first night centre, which meant that new arrivals spent very little time in reception. Reception staff were courteous to prisoners, and were able to identify concerns about new arrivals and convey these to staff on the first night centre.

- I.8** In our survey, 85% of prisoners said that they were searched in a respectful way on arrival, which was higher than the comparator of 76% and 71% at the last inspection. All prisoners transferring in from other prisons were strip-searched, which was inappropriate in the absence of supporting intelligence (see repeated recommendation I.37).
- I.9** All new arrivals went to Kingfisher, the first night centre/induction unit. The environment there had improved since the last inspection and was good. Communal areas and first night cells were clean, well equipped and graffiti-free. In our survey, 82% of prisoners, compared with 68% in 2013, said they felt safe on their first night, and we found a relaxed atmosphere on the unit.
- I.10** Staff on Kingfisher interviewed arrivals and completed comprehensive cell sharing risk assessments. First night interviews also took place in a private room and any issues referred to the relevant staff. There were appropriate telephone interpreting arrangements to deal with the small number of new arrivals with little or no English.
- I.11** On their first night, all prisoners saw health care staff and Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) and could make a free telephone call, but they had restricted access to showers and no routine access to shop packs, which compounded long waits to receive their first shop orders (see paragraph 2.86). There was no peer support for new arrivals in reception or on the first night centre, which was a gap. Night staff received an adequate handover from day staff about the new arrivals, but there were no longer enhanced checks of the new prisoners.
- I.12** Although induction was planned for prisoners arriving on Tuesdays and Thursdays, new arrivals came to Feltham throughout the week. As a consequence, the planned five-day induction programme did not take place; instead induction started the day after reception and was condensed into one day. Many prisoners we spoke to said they were not given sufficient information about prison life. Staff from most of the departments involved did not complete the induction records, which made the induction 'passports' (documents recording prisoners' support needs and services received throughout their time at Feltham) of little use. After new arrivals completed their induction programme, they had limited time out of cell on Kingfisher.

Recommendation

- I.13** **The induction should enable prisoners to fully understand all aspects of the prison, and all prisoners should be kept fully occupied while they are on the induction unit.**

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.14** *Since the last inspection, formal arrangements to deal with violence had developed well and the number of fights and assaults had reduced significantly. The new behaviour document, which included violence reduction, was relevant, and based on a proper analysis of the pattern of violence. Bullying remained evident but the quality of investigation into alleged incidents was usually very good. Managing antisocial behaviour and supporting victims had become embedded but there was still an over-reliance on the small antisocial behaviour team to deal with individual cases.*
- I.15** The number of violent incidents at the prison had more than halved since the previous inspection. In the previous six months, about 98 fights and assaults a month were recorded compared with about 215 in the same period before the 2013 inspection. Assaults on staff had significantly reduced from an average of about seven to less than two a month.
- I.16** A full review of the behaviour management strategy following our last inspection had led to a new behaviour management policy document, which included violence reduction. Its content was relevant and based on a detailed analysis of the patterns of violence in the prison. It was clearly supported by other local policies and procedures, such as the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and security reporting systems. It had been further informed through consistent consultation with prisoners.
- I.17** Managing antisocial behaviour through individual support plans (ISPs) had embedded since the last inspection. As at the last inspection, the nominated antisocial behaviour team (ASBT) continued to be effective in coordinating interventions, such as one-to-one work, professional counselling and mediation.
- I.18** The Star project – a London-based collaboration between mental health and youth justice, funded by NHS England and delivered by the South London and Maudsley Mental Health Trust – also provided relevant interventions, such as thinking skills courses, designed for disruptive young people (16-21) with poor behavioural control.
- I.19** We found that allegations of violence, particularly bullying, were treated consistently and investigated promptly. Formal support for victims of violence had improved, but residential officers still relied too much on the small ASBT to manage nearly all individual cases.
- I.20** The security department was effective at identifying young adults who needed to be separated from each other, usually as a result of external gang activity. The ‘known conflict’ (keep apart) list was well managed and helped to deal with prisoners with known gang affiliations (see also security section).
- I.21** Staff supervision had also improved and was helped by CCTV cameras on all residential wings. Prison officers regularly patrolled landings, and their engagement with prisoners was better than we found at the last inspection (see also section on staff prisoner-relationships). The change in the population from remands to convicted prisoners had also helped to stabilise the prison.

- I.22** Most prisoners had positive perceptions of their safety. In our survey, only 12% of respondents, against the comparator of 20%, said that they felt unsafe now and 24%, against 40% and 42% at the last inspection, said that they had felt unsafe at some time.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.23** *The numbers of case management documents for prisoners in crisis had reduced. While the level of self-harm was high, just a few prisoners accounted for a high proportion of incidents. The quality of documents was reasonably good but some staff entries lacked depth and care mapping was often inadequate. Reviews were timely but attendance was sometimes limited.*

- I.24** As at the last inspection, the safer custody committee was effective in monitoring the implementation of the suicide and self-harm prevention strategy across the prison. The collection and analysis of information was very good, and this was used to identify trends and patterns of behaviour, as well as to develop the strategy and update the continuous improvement action plans.
- I.25** There had been about 65 separate incidents of self-harm in the previous six months. This level was about the same as we found at the last inspection and, as then, a small number of prisoners (about 25) accounted for a high number of incidents, nearly all of them minor.
- I.26** There had been 54 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm opened in the previous six months – a significant reduction from the 140-plus at the last inspection. There were only three open documents at the time of inspection. The level of inactivity among prisoners in crisis that we had criticised in 2013 had reduced, and engagement by staff had improved. There was evidence that activities were prioritised for prisoners on ACCTs, and the time that they could spend out of their cells had also improved. Staff entries in ACCT documents usually showed a dynamic response to meeting prisoner needs, and many indicated detailed observations. However, some were cursory and lacked depth. Case reviews were timely but attendance by staff who knew the prisoner was inconsistent, and care mapping did not always deal with identified needs.
- I.27** There were seven Listeners at the time of our inspection, three located on the induction unit, which seemed adequate to deal with demand. Those we met said that they felt supported by staff, and that most valued their work. There was also a free direct telephone line for prisoners to contact the Samaritans during the day. The Listener suite on Lapwing was clean and well furnished but seldom used.

Recommendation

- I.28** **Case management and review arrangements for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

I.29 *The prison had formed links with the local authority safeguarding board. A safeguarding policy had been published but staff training had not yet begun.*

I.30 The prison had developed a policy, in consultation with the local community safeguarding board in Hounslow, to deal with prisoners at risk because of disability or illness. There were screening procedures, and assessments of risk for new arrivals included cell sharing risk assessments, initial identification of disability and health care interviews. There were clear protocols covering the action that staff should take if they became aware of any abuse or injury to a prisoner at risk while they were in custody. These protocols were monitored by the local safeguarding board and at monthly safer custody meetings.

I.31 The prison had good links with the local safeguarding board to review current practices. Up-to-date local advice about safeguarding adults was accessible through the safer custody committee and the head of safeguarding. The governor chaired a quarterly safeguarding meeting, attended by key staff and the local authority, covering a range of safeguarding data and issues at both Feltham sites. Safer custody meetings took place monthly, chaired by the deputy governor, and were well attended. Separate data for children and young adults were presented to enable informed discussions to take place. The weekly meeting facilitated by the antisocial behaviour (ASBT) was an effective forum for discussing young people of particular concern and agreeing actions (see also section on violence reduction).

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

I.32 *The physical and procedural security measures did not restrict prisoner access to the regime unnecessarily, but some security arrangements were not always applied proportionately. Good use was made of prisoners who were 'red bands' or trusted orderlies. A good flow of intelligence informed relevant security objectives, which were monitored, and the focus on gang affiliation was appropriate. Security information was shared widely and links with the police were good. Drug use was low and testing arrangements were adequate.*

I.33 The security team worked across both sites at Feltham. The prison had good links with the police and was appropriately focused on the challenges presented by gang affiliation.

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).

Measures to deal with conflict included a well-managed ‘keep apart’ list that was developed with information from prisoners. On the whole, this measure worked well, although some applications were disproportionate, such as the routine restrictions on attending communal worship (see paragraph 2.35). Good use was made of prisoners who were ‘red bands’ or trusted orderlies. Although the physical and procedural security measures did not restrict prisoner access to the regime unnecessarily, the application of closed visits, searching and close supervision of prisoner movements were no longer proportionate given the change in population. For example, prisoners were routinely strip-searched in reception and some (including those on enhanced level) after visits (see paragraph 1.8), and they had routine searches moving on and off units and exercise yards; cells were also routinely searched, with no supporting intelligence to justify this. In view of the establishment’s recent history it was right to make changes cautiously, but during the inspection the establishment made some changes that were required, and had credible plans to change further aspects.

- I.34** The monthly security meeting was well attended by staff from across the prison and normally chaired by the security governor or deputy governor. The meeting discussed and analysed information from intelligence reports, which informed relevant security objectives. The security team had received 841 intelligence reports in the previous six months from the young adults site and shared areas. The reports were quickly analysed by trained security analysts. Security intelligence was well communicated promptly through weekly briefings and emails.
- I.35** The average random positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to May 2014 was 1.2%. For five of the six months, the rate had been 0%. The number of drug finds was very low. In our survey, only 13% of respondents, against the comparator of 22%, said it was easy to get drugs in the prison, and only 5% against 10% that it was easy to get alcohol. Significantly fewer prisoners than at the last inspection, 3% against 7%, said they had developed a drug problem while in the prison. The MDT suite was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped.

Recommendations

- I.36** **Closed visits should only be applied where there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits.** (Repeated recommendation 1.55)
- I.37** **Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion.** (Repeated recommendation 1.56)

Incentives and earned privileges

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.38** *There was some evidence that the IEP scheme was being used strategically to encourage good behaviour. The regime for some prisoners on basic was unacceptably poor, and prisoners could be demoted following an alleged incident of poor behaviour without a thorough enough investigation of the facts.*

- I.39** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme offered reasonable differentials between levels, and in our survey, 59% of respondents said that the scheme had encouraged them to improve their behaviour, against the comparator of 45%.
- I.40** There was evidence that the scheme was used strategically to support interventions to deal with antisocial behaviour, and prisoners on the basic level had individual behaviour support plans. Those on basic for patterns of poor behaviour could attend activities, but those on it for single acts of violence were excluded. Some prisoners on basic could spend a maximum of only one hour a week out of cell for access to telephones, showers and domestic periods and half an hour a day for exercise. We were also concerned that prisoners were demoted to basic following an alleged single incident of poor behaviour without a thorough enough investigation of the facts. At the time of inspection, seven prisoners were on basic for alleged acts of violence.

Recommendation

- I.41** **The regime for prisoners on basic level should be improved, and include daily association, purposeful activity and access to showers and telephones.**

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.42** *The use of all forms of discipline had fallen although some were still high. Most adjudication hearings were conducted fairly and charges were fully investigated. Use of force had fallen but was still high, although most incidents did not involve sustained control and restraint and there was evidence of de-escalation. Records and quality assurance for the use of force required improvement, and the use of special accommodation was not always warranted. The segregation unit environment and regime had improved and it had good staff-prisoner relationships.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.43** There had been 618 adjudications during the previous six months. The number of adjudications had fallen since the last inspection and was now lower than at similar prisons. This fall reflected the change in population and a reduction in violent incidents. The majority of adjudication records we examined were adequate and showed that hearings were conducted fairly and charges were investigated, although some did not show sufficient enquiry before a finding of guilt. Most punishments were proportionate to the offence, and the governor quality assured the adjudication records. The prison collated and used data on adjudications to identify trends and patterns.
- I.44** We were concerned to find continuing use of unofficial punishments, including the loss of gymnasium, association or in-cell power, without proper managerial authority or oversight.

The use of force

- I.45** Although the use of force was still high, with 222 incidents in the previous six months, it was positive that the number of incidents had fallen since the last inspection. Most incidents did not involve sustained use of control and restraint. The number of incidents where batons had been drawn, which we had criticised in the last inspection, had reduced dramatically, from 108 to six over the previous six months, and none had been used since November 2013. The focus on staff training and introduction of a weekly baton use and multi assailant assault review meeting chaired by the governor were positive. We were assured that batons were only used in extreme circumstances as a defensive mechanism.
- I.46** Too many of the use of force reports we sampled were incomplete, with many lacking officer reports and injury to prisoner (F213) forms. Use of handcuffs and relocation to the segregation unit were not routine. All planned interventions were filmed but recordings were not reviewed to learn lessons. Those we watched showed that incidents were generally well managed with an appropriate focus on de-escalation.
- I.47** Special accommodation had been used four times in the previous six months. Although all uses were properly authorised, some stays were too long (including up to 45 hours) and not all were warranted.

Recommendations

- I.48 Use of force reports should be complete and fully justify the need for force.**
- I.49 Any occasion in which special accommodation is used should be kept under continuous review and be for the shortest possible time.**

Housekeeping point

- I.50** Video recordings of planned incidents should be reviewed and learning points shared.

Segregation

- I.51** The segregation unit was on Ibis and used to accommodate young men and boys from both Feltham sites. The environment on the unit had improved since the last inspection and was now good. Cells and communal areas were clean, well equipped and graffiti-free. The regime had also improved and, while there were not enough exercise periods, was now better than we normally see. Prisoners on Ibis had access to the gym, education, books and in-cell activities. It was positive that prisoners arriving on to the unit were not routinely strip searched.
- I.52** The use of segregation had fallen since the last inspection, with 170 young adults segregated in the previous six months; stays were not long, at an average of three days. Use of segregation for good order remained low and only one prisoner had been segregated for his own protection in the previous six months. Segregation reviews were timely but authorising documentation was often poor and targets were sometimes not set. There were no young adults on the segregation unit during the inspection but prisoners who had been held on Ibis said they were treated well by staff, and we observed good interaction between staff and the boys held on Ibis.

- I.53** There had been 15 occasions (involving six prisoners) where young adults had been held in the segregation unit while on an open ACCT in the previous six months. In all cases, an enhanced case review was held and chaired by a senior manager to ensure the segregation was appropriate.
- I.54** The prison had introduced formal reintegration planning for prisoners in the segregation unit and most returned to normal location in Feltham.

Recommendation

- I.55 Segregation review documentation should be completed thoroughly and include meaningful targets.**

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

I.56 *Assessments for some prisoners with substance misuse needs were delayed. Prisoners found the psychosocial services very helpful. Demand for clinical services was very low but the quality of care was reasonably good, although some nursing staff lacked relevant training. Use of the psychiatric unit for all detoxifications was inappropriate and lacked full integration with psychosocial services.*

- I.57** Clinical services were provided by Care UK, and psychosocial services by Journey to Recovery (J2R), a combined KCA drug, alcohol and mental health services (formerly Kent Council on Alcohol) and Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) team. The drug strategy committee met bimonthly, with good representation from across the establishment. The drug strategy document had been updated with an action plan, but there was no up-to-date needs analysis.
- I.58** Some new arrivals experienced delays in access to J2R, partly due to staff shortages and partly to the late arrival of case files from sending establishments. In the previous six months, the average waiting time between referral and assessment was 7.2 days against a target of five days. Once assessed, prisoners received interventions relevant to their individual need.
- I.59** Many prisoners who had used J2R told us that the service had been very helpful once their care plans started. The range of interventions was good, with innovative work to encourage prisoners to engage in recovery-focused group work. Prisoner access to Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous fellowship meetings was facilitated through the 'Spirit of Recovery' service, which ran one-to-one pre-group preparation sessions.
- I.60** Prisoners needing clinical treatment were normally taken to the Albatross inpatient unit, which had two beds allocated to clinical drug treatment. At the time of the inspection, there were no young adults receiving this treatment. In the six months to May 2014, five prisoners had undergone opiate substitution treatment – one had been reduced and the other four maintained. The overall quality of care was good. However, some nursing staff were insufficiently well trained, and the prison needed to review the appropriateness of the Albatross unit for detoxification for all but the most complex cases.

- I.61** Regular clinical reviews and input from a visiting consultant were important factors that ensured positive outcomes for prisoners. However, the J2R team had restricted contact with prisoners on the Albatross unit, although they were involved in multidisciplinary team meetings to discuss individual cases.

Recommendations

- I.62** **Clinical substance misuse and Journey to Recovery services should improve joint work and provide fully integrated care.** (Repeated recommendation I.90)
- I.63** **The use of the Albatross inpatient unit for opiate or alcohol detoxification should be assessed for each patient, and the appropriateness of treatment on normal location for non-complex cases should be considered, especially once clinical stabilisation is achieved.**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

2.1 *There had been improvements in the environment. Many communal areas were cleaner than at the last inspection, graffiti had been removed from some cells, and the condition of the grounds had also improved. However, areas in some units were grubby, showers were dirty, telephones broken and flooring was cracked and worn. Cells were poorly ventilated, and some were dirty and had broken furniture. Although the application system had been improved, few prisoners said that applications were dealt with quickly.*

2.2 The general condition of residential units had improved, and there was a refurbishment programme covering painting and minor repairs on all units – one unit was closed for refurbishment during the inspection. Most communal areas on residential wings were cleaner than we found at the previous inspection. The large open association areas on each unit were generally clean and free from graffiti, and reasonably equipped with pool tables and other games. The condition of the prison grounds had also improved and was reasonably good. However, other areas remained grubby. Flooring was cracked and broken, some walls were stained, and showers on nearly all the units were dirty.

2.3 Most cells were much cleaner than we found in 2013 and free from graffiti. It was good that there was a clear expectation that boys should keep their cells clean and consequences if they did not. However, many cells were poorly ventilated and cell furniture was often broken. As at the last inspection, toilets were adequately screened in double cells but not in single cells. Staff appeared to enforce the offensive display policy. All cells were fitted with cell call bells, which were answered quickly by officers, and the problems we found in this area at the last inspection had been dealt with.

2.4 Prisoners had good access to a daily shower; in our survey 85% of respondents, against the comparator of 43%, said they could shower daily. Most prisoners could wear their own clothes and there were satisfactory laundry facilities on each unit. Prisoners had some delays in obtaining clothes from their stored property, but the amount they were allowed seemed reasonable. The provision of clean prison clothing was adequate, but staff and prisoners said that it was difficult to get enough clean towels every week.

2.5 We found broken telephones on all the units, although most prisoners reported that access to telephones was reasonably good; in our survey, only 31% of prisoners, against the comparator of 42%, said that they had problems using the telephone. Prisoners could send as many letters as they could afford to, with no restrictions on the number they could receive.

2.6 Management of a new three-copy application system was inconsistent and its implementation across the prison was disorganised, with no reliable way of checking responses or their timeliness.

Recommendations

- 2.7 All cells should be clean, well ventilated and properly furnished.**
- 2.8 All single cells should have adequate toilet privacy screens. (Repeated recommendation 2.12)**

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

2.9 *Relationships between staff and prisoners had improved but they remained too variable. We observed some very good and meaningful engagement but also some dismissive and disrespectful interactions. Young adults felt, with some justification, treated like children. The personal officer scheme was generally ineffective, but prisoner consultations were reasonably responsive.*

- 2.10** In our survey, responses about staff-prisoner relationships were more positive than the comparator. The prison had made considerable efforts to improve relationships between staff and prisoners, but we found a mixed picture. Many prisoners told us that staff were helpful and courteous, and the majority of staff we observed interacted positively, particularly in specialist areas such as the offender management unit (OMU), equalities, segregation unit and education. We saw some very good and meaningful engagement. However, we also saw a small number of interactions, mostly by uniformed staff, that were disrespectful, dismissive and lacked constructive engagement.
- 2.11** Staff generally addressed prisoners by their preferred names or titles and also used these in documentation. Throughout the inspection, prisoners told us that they felt staff treated them 'like children', and we found evidence to support this view. For example, young adults were consistently referred to as 'boys', had their in-cell power turned off if they failed a cell inspection (see also paragraph 1.44), were not permitted to go in to their own cells during association, and could not order tinned food from the prison shop.
- 2.12** The personal officer scheme was understood by staff and prisoners but did not operate effectively; too many prisoners and staff told us that staff had insufficient time to engage with prisoners in a meaningful or supportive way and that much contact was superficial, with little evidence of liaison with sentence planning staff.
- 2.13** There were monthly consultation meetings where prisoners could air their views, with some action taken to address the issues raised.

Recommendation

- 2.14 The prison should continue to give a high priority to developing positive staff-prisoner relationships and ensure they are appropriate to the age and maturity of the population.**

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic³ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

2.15 *The prison had a clear commitment to equality and diversity but more work was required. Initial identification of prisoners from most protected groups was good. Most foreign national prisoners received good support but those with limited or no English were marginalised, and too many detainees were held beyond their sentence. Care and support for prisoners with some disabilities was inconsistent, and support for the few gay or bisexual prisoners was limited.*

Strategic management

- 2.16** The equality team was well resourced and, despite some cross-deployment of the dedicated equality officer, was generally effective and clearly committed to this work. Apart from a foreign national prisoner policy, there was no specific policy on what Feltham would deliver for prisoners from different minority groups..
- 2.17** Monthly equality action team meetings were generally chaired by the governor and were well attended, including external and prisoner representation. Discussion was mostly purposeful and action-focused, and generally covered all the protected characteristics, but the monitoring data considered only covered the treatment of prisoners by race. This data was mostly within an acceptable range or only out of range for a short period, but it showed consistent and clear over-representation of black prisoners in the use of force, adjudications and on the basic regime. These findings were not investigated robustly enough to address any underlying reasons for inequitable treatment.
- 2.18** Since the last inspection, a small group of prisoner equality representatives (currently eight) had been trained and were properly focused on their role, but they were not publicised well enough and many prisoners were not aware they existed. Other displays promoting equality and diversity were limited and inconsistent across the wings.
- 2.19** There were focus groups for prisoners from different minority groups. The chaplaincy facilitated regular groups for prisoners identified as Gypsy, Romany or Traveller, Eastern European and Somali, but comments from these groups was not consistently fed back to the equality team. The equality team facilitated other ad hoc focus groups, but there were no regular forums to allow prisoners from different protected groups to have a consistent voice.
- 2.20** In the previous six months, 63 discrimination incident reports (DIRFs) had been submitted, mostly on race and religion, which was a significant increase since the last inspection. However, many of these were submitted by staff when prisoners alleged they were racist. Many prisoners we spoke to were either unaware of the DIRF system or told us they lacked

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

confidence in it. Responses were signed off by the governor and there was external scrutiny by the Zahid Mubarek Trust. Investigations were mostly thorough, although some complaints about staff lacked rigorous investigation and mainly accepted the account of the member of staff rather than the prisoner.

- 2.21** The prison had good systems for identifying new arrivals from protected groups, in particular those with disabilities, but young adults from Gypsy, Romany and Traveller backgrounds and those who identified as gay or bisexual were often reluctant to disclose this. In our survey, around 3% of prisoners said they were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background but the prison was only aware of four or five individuals, and it knew of only two prisoners who identified as gay or bisexual. The prison had little engagement with outside support agencies for protected groups.

Recommendations

- 2.22** **The prison should identify and address the needs of all groups with protected characteristics, provide regular forums for each group, and promote all aspects of equality and diversity.**
- 2.23** **Investigations into discrimination complaints should be thorough.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.24** Around 70% of the population were from black or minority ethnic backgrounds. In our survey, black and Muslim prisoners reported less favourably than white prisoners in some important areas although this was not repeated to us in group or individual discussions. However, monitoring data showed that prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds were consistently over-represented in disciplinary processes and the prison did not meet some legitimate Muslim prisoners cultural and faith needs.
- 2.25** Almost 20% of the population were foreign nationals. In our survey, they were less positive than British prisoners on several safety indicators. Initial identification of this group was good and all were referred to the Home Office. Home Office staff visited the prison weekly and surgeries/appointments were well attended. There was no independent immigration advice. There was adequate provision of English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) and sufficient foreign language materials in the library. Foreign nationals were allowed a free telephone call each month if they did not receive visits, and around five to 10 prisoners regularly did so.
- 2.26** Eight detainees were held inappropriately under immigration powers after they had served their sentence, the longest since August 2013. Despite prompt communication by the prison with the Home Office, too many decisions to detain foreign nationals were communicated too near to their expected release date, which increased their anxiety and vulnerability (see recommendation 2.31).
- 2.27** Around a third of the population were Muslim, and in our survey they were less positive than non-Muslims across a number of respect indicators. During the inspection we found some lack of cultural awareness for this group by staff, including the observance of Ramadan.
- 2.28** Around 10% of the population declared a disability – mostly learning disabilities – and initial identification of them was good. In our survey, prisoners with disabilities were more negative than those without about access to health staff, problems with mental health issues or

emotional well-being, and threats from other prisoners. Prisoners with learning disabilities received appropriate support from the education department (see also paragraph 3.21).

- 2.29** There was limited support for gay or bisexual prisoners. Although a free telephone line to an external support agency was available, it was not promoted well and no other support was offered.

Recommendations

- 2.30** The prison should work with relevant external agencies to understand black and minority ethnic prisoners' concerns and any differences in their treatment; they should also implement plans to address these differences.
- 2.31** NOMS should work with the Home Office to ensure that foreign national detainees are held at Feltham only when it is appropriate to do so and for the minimum time possible. (Repeated recommendation 2.42).
- 2.32** Care and support for all prisoners with disabilities should be improved.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.33** *Faith provision was generally good and the chaplaincy supported prisoners very well. Muslim prisoners could not use the mosque. External links with faith groups were good.*

- 2.34** In our survey, responses about respect for religious beliefs and the ease of attending services were better than the comparators, although Muslim prisoners were more negative than non-Muslims about access to services. The chaplaincy covered a range of faiths and was fully integrated into life at Feltham. Prisoners were generally positive about the faith provision and support offered by the chaplaincy.
- 2.35** Corporate worship and ancillary facilities were good and included a separate washing area for the mosque. However, following some indiscipline in the mosque, services were now separated and Muslim young adults had to use the gym for corporate worship while the boys from the other site went to the mosque. Services for all faiths were well attended and prisoners did not have to apply after they had initially registered their faith. However, prisoners on the 'keep apart' list (see paragraph 1.33) were routinely excluded from corporate worship with no robust risk assessment to support this. The chaplaincy facilitated a range of other classes and groups, and had effective links with faith groups in the community.

Recommendations

- 2.36** The faith provision for Muslim young adult prisoners should be improved, including facilitating corporate worship in the mosque.

2.37 Prisoners on the 'keep apart' list should only be excluded from corporate worship following a robust risk assessment.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

2.38 *The number of complaints had risen but prisoners had limited confidence in the system. Most responses were of a good quality but some that concerned staff were not investigated thoroughly enough or responded to appropriately.*

2.39 In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said it was easy to make a complaint, but more than the comparator and at our last inspection said responses were fair. In structured groups, prisoners said they had little confidence in the complaint system. However, the number of complaints had risen dramatically to 535 in the previous six months from 300 in a similar period before the last inspection. There was little strategic analysis of trends or patterns of complaints and consequently no action to address recurring issues. Quality assurance was generally effective. Most of the responses we sampled were of a good standard, but complaints about staff were not always investigated robustly enough.

Recommendation

2.40 The prison should do more to address prisoners' limited confidence in the complaints process especially complaints about staff, which should be properly investigated and responded to.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.41 *The legal services provision was generally adequate, and legal visits arrangements were good.*

2.42 The requirement for legal services had reduced at Feltham because of the stage that most prisoners were at in their sentence. There were no trained legal services staff but some offender supervisors could direct prisoners to legal representatives. The legal visits provision was good, and prisoners told us that staff were generally helpful when they needed to telephone their legal representatives.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

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

2.43 *Health care was reasonable. Prisoners had prompt access to nurses and the GP, and waits for the dentist were satisfactory, but there were long waits for external podiatry services. Long-term conditions were well managed but prisoners were unable to have their insulin and blood-testing equipment in possession. Medicines management was sound. The Albatross inpatient unit was a positive environment but significantly compromised by the presence of one very disturbed individual. Mental health provision was good with a helpful range of supportive interventions.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.44** Care UK provided primary care services with a subcontract to Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Trust (BEHT) for mental health services. There were separate subcontracts for dentist, optician and external services, including podiatry. A quarterly contract meeting with the prime provider, chaired by the commissioners, NHS England, lacked consistent representation from the prison. Internal governance arrangements were good, including appropriate operational, governance and staff meetings. A dynamic risk register was updated weekly. Safeguarding arrangements were good and included a monthly safeguarding forum with representation from the main health providers; the health lead for safeguarding attended the wider prison safeguarding meeting. The prison's health needs analysis required review and did not completely reflect the changed population. Some policies needed review and few were specific to the prison.
- 2.45** Relationships between health staff and prisoners were reasonable overall, although we observed a few examples of limited engagement from some staff. In our survey, only 35% of prisoners, against the comparator of 52%, said that the quality of health care was good. Prisoners could make a health care complaint through the main prison system. Responses did not always address the complaint directly or offer an appropriate apology; a senior health administration assistant spoke to prisoners following a complaint.
- 2.46** The main health centre provided a suitable environment, and the layout and furnishing of the main waiting area reflected the needs of the age group. Some treatment rooms did not comply with infection control requirements. Resuscitation kits, including automated defibrillators, were kept in health care treatment rooms and checked regularly. Not all health care staff, and very few discipline staff, had received practical resuscitation skills training.
- 2.47** Clinical incidents were reported through an electronic database. In the previous 12 months there had been 112 incidents, with about a quarter related to medication. There had been one serious untoward incident involving a serious assault on a staff member.
- 2.48** Health promotion was underdeveloped but there were plans for a research project focused on young men and greater self-reliance about their health. Health literature was displayed and accessible in the main health locations and was applicable to the age group and population, but much was too complex for those with literacy difficulties.

Recommendations

- 2.49** The health needs analysis should be updated to reflect the changed population. There should be a separate confidential health complaints system
- 2.50** All clinical areas and equipment should comply with infection control requirements. (Repeated recommendation 2.63)
- 2.51** All health and discipline staff should receive practical resuscitation skills training, and defibrillators should be available for all staff to use.

Housekeeping point

- 2.52** Health literature should be targeted at the age and literacy level of young adults.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.53** In our survey, only 27% of prisoners, against the comparator of 41%, said they had good access to a doctor, and only 41%, against 61%, to a nurse. However, we found that access to a doctor or a nurse for routine issues was prompt and urgent issues were dealt with quickly.
- 2.54** New arrivals received initial and follow-on screening with appropriate assessment tools, which met medication and referral needs. We saw one young man whose leg was inflamed and it was unclear how long he had waited before getting to see a nurse; there was no reception health screening recorded for him.
- 2.55** Prisoners could request a health appointment using an easy-to-read pictorial application form, and dedicated application boxes were emptied daily by health staff. There was a suitable range of primary care clinics in the main centre. Prisoners were always escorted to the centre by officers, which sometimes resulted in long waits. Out-of-hours medical cover was telephone advice only. There was a robust medical emergency process, and ambulance response times were reasonable.
- 2.56** Prisoners with long-term conditions, such as asthma and diabetes, received suitable support and follow up, but we were concerned by the blanket decision not to allow diabetics to keep their blood-testing equipment or insulin pens in their cells (see pharmacy section) as this might compromise their health by preventing them testing at appropriate times. There was access to X-rays in the prison for non-urgent issues, which was helpful. Waiting lists for the optician were reasonable, but waits for an external podiatry appointment were unacceptably long.
- 2.57** The Albatross inpatient unit was a positive therapeutic environment with an excellent programme of activities, and a very strong approach from all staff towards some very challenging behaviour. However, its positive work was disturbed consistently by the presence of a very challenging young person, which compromised the regime for other inpatients (including excessive noise at night). Young men were effectively included in their treatment decisions and care through a weekly ward round meeting, and a weekly community meeting on the unit focused on their experience.
- 2.58** External hospital appointments were well managed and rarely cancelled due to lack of escort staff.

Recommendations

- 2.59** The needs of all inpatients on Albatross should be considered when decisions are made to place or keep severely disturbed and disruptive prisoners there.
- 2.60** Prisoners should have their blood-testing equipment and insulin pens in possession, except where the risk to them or others outweighs the benefits, and have facilities to store in-possession medicines securely. Where this is not possible they should be able to test their blood and inject frequently enough to maintain good blood sugar control.

Pharmacy

- 2.61** Medicines were supplied from two community pharmacies. The majority of prisoners received their medication in possession, but not all could store it securely. Suitable risk assessments were recorded on SystmOne, the clinical IT system. Prisoners ordered their own in-possession medication and were supported by the pharmacy staff, who visited them on request, whenever they were issued with a new in-possession medicine, and to follow up compliance issues.
- 2.62** Medicines were administered by nurses up to four times a day in a private, secure environment with effective supervision by officers. Prisoners self-administered insulin under the supervision of a nurse.
- 2.63** Nurses gave and recorded over-the-counter medicines, including simple painkillers, to prisoners who needed them, but they had no covering policy or patient group direction (PGD) authorisation to supply and administer prescription-only medicine. A limited number of PGDs authorised the administration of a few medicines with a suitable audit process. Simple remedies were available to prisoners through the prison shop. Patients had appropriate access to medication out of hours. Discharge arrangements for those on prescribed medication were satisfactory but prisoners attending court did not get their medicines in possession, except for insulin.
- 2.64** All controlled drugs were administered from the Albatross treatment room, and prisoners were escorted there. Controlled drugs management was generally good, although only one person (a nurse or the pharmacy technician) accompanied the controlled drugs when they were transported around the prison in a locked box, which was not a robust arrangement.
- 2.65** There was an up-to-date, tailored prescribing formulary, and levels of prescribing were low and age-appropriate. All prescribing and administration was recorded on paper charts. Medicines management and clinical governance procedures were good, although stock and named-patient medicines were often stored together.

Recommendations

- 2.66** A wider range of medication should be available without a prescription through appropriate policies and patient group directions, which are ratified by the medicines management committee.
- 2.67** All consultations and interventions, including prescribing and administration of medicines and dental care, should be recorded on SystmOne to support safe care and enable more effective audit and analysis.

Housekeeping points

- 2.68** Patients should be supplied with an appropriate quantity of their medication for any court appearances. (Recommendation 2.86 repeated as housekeeping point)
- 2.69** Two staff members should be involved in the transport of controlled drugs around the prison, and at least one should have a radio.

Dentistry

- 2.70** Dental care was provided by an independent contractor. Access was reasonable and prisoners waited on average up to three weeks for a new appointment and up to five weeks for follow-up appointments. There were 37 prisoners (including young adults) on the initial appointment list and 38 waiting for follow-up or treatment appointments.
- 2.71** The dentist operated a clinical triage system through visiting prisoners who had submitted applications on the units. Prisoners were given individual oral and dental health education during appointments, supported by helpful leaflets explaining different treatments.
- 2.72** The dental suite had no access to SystmOne and the dentist recorded on dental record cards (see recommendation 2.67). The suite was generally clean but the floor remained cracked and was stained from a previous oil leakage. There was reasonable separation between clean and dirty areas and the suite now complied with basic infection control standards, but did not meet national best practice standards.

Recommendation

- 2.73** **The floor in the dental suite should be replaced to meet infection control requirements.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.74** The mental health service was good. Specialist practitioners included forensic psychiatry, occupational therapy, psychology, and speech and language therapy. The 'stepped' integrated mental health model served both populations and was based on child and adolescent mental health services in the community; it included staff training and awareness.
- 2.75** An effective mental health referral pathway enabled prisoners to be seen within 24 hours for an urgent referral and usually within 48 hours for a non-urgent referral. Weekly multidisciplinary meetings ensured regular review and appropriate case management.
- 2.76** There was helpful focus and group work on anger management, skills for life, relaxation and wider social skills, and a specialist project, Star, focused on supporting young men in gang membership (see paragraph 1.18). Identification and care for young men with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and on the autistic spectrum was good, with advanced plans to recruit a specialist nurse for learning disability.
- 2.77** A significant number of young men had had their transfer to secure hospital delayed for considerably longer than the two-week target, due to delays in external assessments and/or funding decisions.

- 2.78** There was excellent provision for mental health awareness training of prison staff, although staffing pressures had meant this was not always taken up by the prison. However, the prison had supported the mental health awareness training of selected discipline staff, including attendance on external specialist training programmes (Star and Hearing Voices).

Good practice

- 2.79** *The prison was committed to training prison staff in understanding mental health issues, including sponsorship to attend external courses supporting prisoners with mental health problems.*

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.80** *Catering arrangements were generally managed well, and meals were now served more respectfully. Although the food was unpopular with some prisoners, it was of sufficient quality and quantity. Muslim prisoners were dissatisfied with some of the arrangements for Ramadan. Consultation arrangements were responsive.*

- 2.81** A published pictorial menu cycle catered for different dietary needs and preferences. At least one substantial hot meal was provided every day, and fresh fruit and vegetables were available at all meals. Improvements to the service of breakfast and lunch since the last inspection allowed prisoners to leave their cells to collect their meals, which was more respectful than previously (when meals were left at cell doors). Meals were also now served at appropriate times, with breakfast packs issued on the morning they were to be eaten.
- 2.82** Despite negative survey results about the quality of the food, we received no complaints at the point of service, formal complaints about the food were infrequent, and we saw adequate portions of food that was of a reasonable quality. Ramadan had ended just before the start of the inspection and Muslim prisoners were dissatisfied with some of the arrangements, particularly the provision of dried/reconstituted food at weekends. Prisoners were consulted about the food in a twice-yearly survey and through the regular prisoner forum, and there was evidence that menus changed as a result.
- 2.83** Although there were facilities for communal dining, they were not used. The kitchen was generally clean and well equipped with proper attention to arrangements for halal food. Prisoners who worked there could achieve qualifications. Serveries were generally clean but worn, and were not always managed properly.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.84 *Prisoners were generally dissatisfied with the range of goods sold through the prison shop but we found the list was sufficiently diverse. Some new arrivals waited too long to use the prison shop. Prisoners could not shop from catalogues.*

2.85 In our survey, prisoners were more negative than the comparator about the range of goods offered through the prison shop, and responses from black and minority ethnic prisoners were even worse. We found no evidence to support these views, as the range of items available was sufficiently broad and catered for the needs of minority groups.

2.86 It was unacceptable and could lead to debt that some new arrivals could wait up to 10 days before they received their first order from the prison shop, and this was compounded by the lack of reception packs for them (see paragraph 1.11). Shop consultation arrangements were reasonable, and had resulted in changes to the shop list. It remained unacceptable that prisoners could not buy items from catalogues.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

3.1 *Time out of cell was reasonable for most prisoners and had improved since the last inspection. However, a small but significant number of unemployed prisoners spent too much time locked in their cells.*

3.2 Prisoners who were employed full time (about 41% of the population) could have about eight hours a day out of their cell on weekdays and about six hours at weekends. The majority group of prisoners (49%), who worked or attended education part time, had about four to five hours a day. Time unlocked for the small but significant number of prisoners who were unemployed (about 10%), or not required for activities due to temporary work restrictions, was very poor and limited to about two hours per weekday (see main recommendation S40).

3.3 At roll checks during the morning and afternoons of the core day, we found about 20% the population locked in their cells. However, this was better than at the previous inspection, when similar checks showed between 40% and 45% of prisoners locked in their cell.

3.4 Although periods of exercise and association were rarely cancelled, there was some slippage in the regime due to late unlocking. Exercise yards were clean and had outdoor gym equipment.

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.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.5 *The management of learning and skills and work was good, and effective partnership working between the prison and A4e had resulted in a clear strategic direction and significant improvements. Quality assurance was good and had improved the quality of teaching and learning, although lesson observation was not yet sufficiently rigorous. The number of activity places had increased recently but remained insufficient, although the opportunities for prisoners to benefit from learning, skills and work had been maximised. The range of provision had been widened, although vocational training options were limited. A few teachers did not use individual learning plans effectively enough, and prisoners' development of English and mathematics was weak. New support staff were helping prisoners and teachers, although not all the many prisoners with support needs received the help they needed. Vocational training was good, as were achievements of qualifications. The library was well resourced and met prisoner needs, but lacked computer facilities for them.*

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

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

Management of learning and skills and work

3.7 Leadership and management of learning and skills and work were good. The head of learning and skills and A4e managers jointly provided clear strategic direction, strongly supported by the governor. They understood the provision well and contributed very effectively to resolving many of the weaknesses identified at the last inspection. Staff at all levels understood and used data to improve the provision. Data were analysed to identify and address trends, performance, attendance and differences in achievement between groups of prisoners.

3.8 Quality assurance and improvement arrangements were good. The standard of learning sessions had improved significantly since the last inspection. Managers had implemented a range of improvements, such as using feedback from prisoners to help improve the provision. Self-assessment was inclusive and the judgements were accurate and well supported by data. There was good use of course reviews to identify and deal with underperforming courses.

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>.

- 3.9** The observation of teaching and learning gave teachers useful feedback on their performance, but action plans to improve their performance further were not detailed or challenging enough. The prison's assessment of the overall quality of learning sessions was generally accurate, although a minority of lessons were over graded.
- 3.10** Partnership working between A4e and the prison was particularly effective and productive, offering prisoners an improved range of vocational and classroom provision. Managers planned well to determine the curriculum, and worked effectively to develop partnership working, including with a range of employers.
- 3.11** The quality of education and vocational training provided by A4e had improved significantly from a very low base but required improvement. Staff were well qualified and experienced, especially those delivering training in the workshops. Teachers had appropriate qualifications or were working towards them. Vocational teachers had relevant industry expertise, which they used well during classes.

Recommendation

- 3.12** **The session observation scheme across all learning and skills should be strengthened to ensure that teaching grades are accurate, and action plans for teachers are more detailed and challenging.**

Provision of activities

- 3.13** The range of courses had been improved but there were limited opportunities for prisoners to work in a wider range of trades related to jobs on release, such as in construction, or to learn more about self-employment. Open University courses or distance learning were not offered. However, following a recent detailed needs analysis, the range of vocational courses had been widened to include horticulture, barbering, industrial cleaning and radio production.
- 3.14** There were not enough activity places. About 50% of all prisoners were engaged in purposeful activities part time, and 10% were unemployed. The remainder were mostly full-time wing workers. A few were on full-time courses, mostly in brickwork. Education staff had worked very effectively to reduce the number of unemployed prisoners and allocate the limited number of activity places equitably, despite the constraints of the prison's long-term staffing difficulties (see main recommendation S40).
- 3.15** The number of places in vocational training had increased and included industrial cleaning, horticulture, painting and decorating, bricklaying, catering and barbering. Courses ranged from entry level to level 2. The allocation of prisoners to work and vocational training courses was effective, and most ran to full capacity.

Recommendations

- 3.16** **The learning and skills provision should be extended to include a wider range of relevant trades, as well as a business start-up qualification.**
- 3.17** **Prisoners should have opportunities to study on Open University and distance learning courses.**

Quality of provision

- 3.18** Teaching, learning and assessment required improvement, although the overall quality of learning sessions had improved significantly since the previous inspection. The best lessons were well planned and teachers used a wide range of teaching methods that actively involved all prisoners in learning and making good progress. The use of individual learning plans to set measurable targets for achievement required improvement. Target setting was generally too generic and only a very few teachers set individual and time-bound targets.
- 3.19** Although achievements in externally accredited English and mathematics tests had improved in the last year, prisoners' skills in these subjects were not well developed. The promotion, delivery and improvement of English and mathematics in all lessons required greater emphasis to develop and improve the skills of prisoners.
- 3.20** A new special education needs coordinator gave prisoners and teachers highly effective support and guidance, and a learning support assistant was used well by teachers to assist a minority of prisoners in the classroom. However, these staff were unable to support all of the many prisoners who required extra help.
- 3.21** Teachers generally managed classes well and dealt appropriately with some challenging behaviour. However, not all disruptive behaviour was challenged well enough, which affected the progress and achievement of prisoners. Staff promoted health and safety well in the classes, and all prisoners wore appropriate personal protective equipment. They also promoted equality and diversity, with some innovative strategies to include non-English speaking prisoners.
- 3.22** Teaching and learning in vocational training and the prison workshops were good. Staff planned the sessions well and prisoners clearly enjoyed the activities. Assessment was also well planned, as was verbal feedback to prisoners, but written feedback was limited. Resources were generally good, and particularly so in the music making workshop, and were to a commercial standard in the barbering salon and the radio studio. Staff related theory well to the practical activities, and prisoners were engaged and enthusiastic about their work.
- 3.23** All prisoners had a clear idea of what qualification they were working towards and what they needed to do to achieve. The education department provided good support for English and mathematics in the vocational training, and integrated occupationally relevant materials well into workshop activity.

Recommendations

- 3.24 Individual learning plans should include personalised and challenging targets to help prisoners make better progress.**
- 3.25 The promotion and development of prisoners' English and mathematics skills should be evident in all classroom lessons.**
- 3.26 Prisoners who require additional learning support should receive appropriate help.**
- 3.27 Written feedback on prisoners' work in vocational training should be more detailed so that prisoners know what they have to do to improve.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.28** Classroom-based educational and vocational achievement required improvement. Outcomes in English and mathematics had improved dramatically from a very low base the previous year, although they required further improvement. Outcomes in art and business studies had been particularly low, although recent data for art showed they were improving (business studies was not currently offered).
- 3.29** Outcomes in wider vocational areas were good. In painting and decorating, music and bricklaying, prisoners achieved well and developed skills that improved their employability on release. Outcomes for prisoners following qualifications delivered by prison gym staff were particularly good. Prisoners developed appropriate skills that reflected the level of qualification, and particularly good industry-standard skills on barbering and radio courses. Prisoners on construction courses were able to produce decorating and brickwork to a professional standard. Overall, the number of prisoners gaining qualifications had significantly improved, although further improvements were still required.
- 3.30** Attendance on education and vocational courses was good, and prisoner punctuality in vocational training sessions was much better than at the previous inspection.

Recommendation

- 3.31 Achievement of qualifications, particularly in English and mathematics, should be improved further.**

Library

- 3.32** The library was well stocked with an age-appropriate and accessible range of reading and reference materials, and was valued and appreciated by prisoners who regularly used it. The opening hours were satisfactory. Library services were not available to prisoners in the evening, because of staffing problems, but they could access them on alternate Saturdays. However, officers too often failed to ensure that prisoners were escorted to the library at their allocated time slot.
- 3.33** The library had an adequate range of material in appropriate East European and South Asian languages, and a popular range of colourful and accessible graphic novels that promoted an appreciation of literature, politics and history. Legal reference materials and resources were available. Despite our previous recommendation, the library still had no computers for prisoners to practise their computing skills.

Recommendations

- 3.34 Prison officers should ensure that prisoners receive their entitlement to library services.**
- 3.35 The library should install computers for use by prisoners in developing their IT and job search skills.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

3.36 *The PE department was well managed. Senior staff had developed very good links with external organisations, including employers, and some professional football and rugby clubs supported the development of prisoners' sporting skills. There was a very good range of activities, and prisoner focus groups were used to plan the provision. Prisoners had good success rates on gym courses, although these were not accredited.*

3.37 The PE department was very well managed. The senior officer and gym manager had introduced good initiatives and new programmes that had improved the provision. Staff were well qualified, and some had additional specialist qualifications. The good PE resources included a spacious sports hall and a wide range of cardiovascular equipment. The range of activities was very good and included health and fitness courses, circuit training, football, rugby and cricket. Showers were adequate, and prisoners received a gym kit, trainers and a towel if needed.

3.38 The PE induction programme was comprehensive and inclusive. All prisoners took an emergency first aid and manual handling qualification as part of the programme, and received a well-produced summary leaflet and guidance on health and safety. Staff held focus groups with prisoners to obtain information about activities to include in the recreational programme. Prisoners had satisfactory access to the gym, and gym staff used data well to monitor gym use and identify the reasons why a small minority of prisoners did not use the facilities.

3.39 Success rates for courses delivered by gym staff were very good. Functional skills were well embedded into all PE courses and prisoners improved their English and mathematics skills well. However, these skills were not externally accredited.

3.40 Gym managers had developed exceptionally good links with external organisations. As a result, several professional football and rugby clubs supported the training and development of prisoners' sporting skills, achievement of qualifications, and progression into work or further training.

Recommendation

3.41 **Prisoners should be able to achieve literacy and numeracy qualifications while undertaking physical education and gym qualifications.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *The prison's resettlement function had shifted since the last inspection and there was now a greater emphasis on work by the offender management unit to assess and address prisoners' risk of harm and reoffending. However, this work was underdeveloped and the prison was too exclusively focused on prisoners' immediate resettlement needs. There had been no overarching needs analysis of the population.*

4.2 The resettlement function of the prison had gone through some changes since the previous inspection but was still in transition. The introduction of new offender management unit (OMU) staff and the change in the prisoner population meant that major aspects of this work still required development. In 2013, around 30% of the population were unsentenced and much of the work focused on resettlement pathways, whereas now virtually all prisoners (97.4%) were serving a sentence. Similarly, the proportion serving a sentence of over 12 months had risen from 38% in 2013 to over 90%, and there was now far greater emphasis on the OMU's work on the assessment and management of risk of harm and risk of reoffending. However, the high number of prisoners without an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment (see section on offender management and planning) and the paucity of interventions addressing offending behaviour were significant omissions (see main recommendation S42). Although there were plans to address both aspects, the needs of many prisoners at the time of the inspection were being missed. There had been a prisoner needs analysis earlier in 2014, although data on some of the resettlement pathways had not yet been collated.

4.3 As part of the new resettlement model, offender management now incorporated public protection, whose lead manager was also on the senior management team. Policies on public protection and offender management were up to date, covered the key work involved, and included developmental and strategic objectives. The reducing reoffending committee continued to meet monthly and was generally attended by staff from across the prison, including offender management and resettlement pathway providers. The OMU also met monthly and reviewed its development objectives. Although resettlement and offender management staff met strategically once a month, the two functions needed better day-to-day integration. Pre-release meetings for prisoners were no longer routine, and while resettlement needs were met for most prisoners, they were not linked well with the work of offender supervisors.

4.4 Feltham generally had good strategic links with other prisons in the area, and the pan-London coordination of offender management provision, but some of this was ineffectual as a number of issues remained outstanding. Prisoners were still transferred to Feltham without an up-to-date OASys, as was the case in many other similar prisons, delays in receiving completed assessments by the National Probation Service for home detention curfew (HDC) reviews often resulted in prisoners being released later than their potential release date and,

of greater concern, there were regularly delays in obtaining information on the agreed multi agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels for prisoners about to be released.

Recommendation

- 4.5 There should be a London wide strategy to ensure prisoners are not transferred from London prisons to Feltham or elsewhere without an up to date OASys.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.6 *Although most prisoners were subject to OASys and sentence planning, more than half had no assessment or one that was out of date. The quality of completed OASys also varied considerably. Offender supervisor contact with prisoners was inconsistent and often unfocused. Quality assurance had improved but required further development. The management of release on temporary licence was very good. Public protection arrangements were broadly appropriate but there were concerns about the timely identification of prisoners' risk levels before their release.*

4.7 Around 90% of all prisoners were subject to OASys assessment and sentence planning, and were allocated to an offender supervisor. In our survey, more than twice as many prisoners than at the last inspection (71% against 31%) said that they knew who their offender supervisor was. All offender supervisors were officers and worked in the department full time. Most were enthusiastic about the work and keen to develop their knowledge and skill. There were plans to expand the department with additional dual-role offender supervisor/wing officers as well as probation officers.

4.8 Despite these points, there was a substantial backlog of OASys assessments and therefore sentence plans. More than 57% of the population did not have an up-to-date OASys, rising to 63% of those assessed as low or medium risk of harm and the responsibility of the prison. Only 46% of prisoners in our survey, against the comparator of 58%, said they had a sentence plan, although this was better than the 27% at the last inspection. Although not specifically monitored, many prisoners arrived at Feltham without an up-to-date OASys, which was adding to the pressure. Some staff had only recently had OASys training and the prison was due to use staff overtime to clear the backlog. As an alternative to the lack of OASys, the prison had introduced 'interim sentence plans' some months previously, but these were of little benefit and not based on OASys. None that we saw addressed the specific needs of the prisoners concerned, there was little to address risk factors, and nearly all targets replicated points in wing compacts. Furthermore, most were not being used as an interim but as an alternative to OASys assessment (see main recommendation S42).

4.9 During the inspection we were joined by colleagues from HM Inspectorate of Probation who analysed 12 cases in detail (half in scope for offender management and managed by community offender managers, and half out of scope and managed by offender supervisors), and a further 13 cases – primarily prisoners due to be released – in less detail.

- 4.10** Of those OASys that we assessed that were up to date, the quality varied considerably, although, unusually, those completed by offender supervisors were marginally better than those completed by community offender managers. However, even in such cases, while sentence plans were appropriately focused on educational and behavioural targets, there was too little focus on specifically addressing identified risk factors and on offending behaviour programmes. Risk of serious harm assessments and risk management plans were not done consistently or were of insufficient quality.
- 4.11** Offender supervisor contact with prisoners also varied considerably. In many cases, it was infrequent and even where it was regular (as it was expected to be at least monthly), the focus was unclear and too often focused on practical questions, such as home detention curfew (HDC) dates or housing issues. Such contact was rarely oriented to managing identified risk factors or offending behaviour.
- 4.12** There were some indications of an increase in the frequency and focus of quality assurance of offender supervisors' work, but more was required. There had been one group supervision meeting since our last inspection, and the head of offender management reviewed some cases. While this was positive, there needed to be a more specific focus on addressing risk factors. We were encouraged by the advanced plans for support in this area from a senior probation officer from another London prison.
- 4.13** In the previous six months, 55 prisoners had been considered for HDC, with 39 (71%) successful – an increase from only 41% at the last inspection. Although procedures to manage HDC were generally appropriate, there were delays in getting prisoners out at the earliest possible date, primarily because of delays in obtaining reports from offender managers.
- 4.14** There were very good arrangements to assess and manage prisoners for release on temporary licence (ROTL). In the previous six months, there had been 522 separate ROTL events covering 183 periods (some events included multiple prisoners, such as the Duke of Edinburgh's award) and 32 prisoners. ROTL boards were challenging and rigorous without being unnecessarily risk averse, ROTL plans were detailed and sufficiently individualised, and there was excellent individual support by the two officers managing placements.

Recommendations

- 4.15** **Quality assurance in the offender management unit should be extended to ensure the quality and frequency of offender supervisor-prisoner contact and engagement are effective and meaningful.**
- 4.16** **The prison should develop a protocol to challenge assessments by offender managers that are of insufficient quality.**
- 4.17** **All offender supervisors should have regular casework supervision and personal development to build the necessary skills to engage effectively with prisoners to reduce their risk of harm and reoffending.**

Public protection

- 4.18** Procedures to screen new arrivals for public protection concerns were generally appropriate, as were arrangements for reviews at the monthly interdepartmental risk management team (IDRMT) meeting. The IDRMT was well attended from across the prison. However, there were problems in identifying prisoners' MAPPA risk levels at the earliest

opportunity. There were 68 prisoners due to be released within the next six months whose MAPPA management level was still not known, including seven due to be released in the next month and a further seven the following month. In two cases in the previous month, the MAPPA level had not been identified until the day before the prisoner was released. These delays had clear implications for the effective management of high risk prisoners due to be released into the community. There was evidence that the OMU had made considerable efforts to identify risk levels in sufficient time, but had been hampered by inadequate or no responses from offender managers.

Recommendation

- 4.19 The prison should work with the national probation service to agree a protocol to ensure that prisoners' multi agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) risk levels are identified at the earliest opportunity, and within the last six months of their sentence.**

Categorisation

- 4.20** At the time of the inspection, 90% of the population were under 21 and subject to closed conditions. Transfers to open conditions were rare but two prisoners had done so in the previous six months. On reaching the age of 21, prisoners were appropriately reviewed for adult establishments in line with their six-monthly reviews. At the time of the inspection, eight of the 44 prisoners over 21 were eligible for open conditions and awaiting transfer.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.21** Feltham held no indeterminate sentence prisoners at the time of the inspection, which was neither unusual nor inappropriate given the limited facilities. Three such prisoners had been held in the previous six months but had stayed only a short time, transferring once multi agency (lifer) risk management panels had been undertaken. A leaflet was available for indeterminate sentence prisoners outlining processes to manage their sentence.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.22** *More sentenced prisoners were being released with the prison's changed role. Provision across most resettlement pathways was reasonable but there was inconsistent integration with offender management work, and no routine pre-release review meetings with prisoners, although they had some individual support. Accommodation provision and the National Careers Service offered good support. Health care and substance misuse pre-release work was appropriate. Visits were reasonable but there was not enough support for prisoners to maintain links with their families. Although accredited offending behaviour programmes were planned, we were not confident that all the offending behaviour needs of the population were met.*

4.23 The prison released an average of around 40 sentenced prisoners a month, compared with only 25 at the previous inspection. In our survey, prisoners were more positive than the comparators about most areas of resettlement pathway work, and 20%, against 14%, said that a member of staff had helped them prepare for their release. However, the integration of resettlement work between pathway providers and with the prison generally, especially with offender supervisors, was less good. Although offender supervisors should have scheduled meetings to collate pre-release plans with pathway providers, this was more likely in complex cases (sometimes including the community offender manager). In many cases that we looked at, prisoners had little or no contact with their offender supervisor in the weeks leading up to their release. Lapwing had taken over Teal's resettlement role since the last inspection but, due to staffing and other logistic issues, was no longer specifically a resettlement unit.

Recommendation

4.24 **The prison should ensure that the assessment of need, provision of required interventions and review of support before release are in place for all prisoners.**
(Repeated main recommendation HP49)

Accommodation

4.25 Accommodation support was provided by St Mungo's (a specialist housing support charity for ex-prisoners and offenders) and was generally good. In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator (55% against 38%) said they knew who to speak to in the prison about help with accommodation. The service received regular referrals from across the prison and saw around 20-25 new prisoners each month, most within four days of referral. Initial support usually included helping prisoners sustain accommodation held before sentence or to deal with tenancies no longer required.

4.26 St Mungo's staff saw all prisoners before release, with much of the work centring on links with family and friends and finding alternative placements where necessary. Although around 5% of the population were released with no accommodation (a similar figure to the last inspection), all prisoners leaving Feltham were offered information and support, and emergency accommodation was often found for those with no fixed accommodation once they were released.

Education, training and employment

4.27 The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Prospects Careers Services was good. Advisers actively contributed at induction, and assessed each prisoner and interviewed them to establish education and employment options within the prison and on release. They met with prisoners at least three times, especially near to release, when they worked with other agencies to meet prisoner needs.

4.28 Although there was no formal pre-release course, prisoners were offered individual support and various courses to assist with accommodation and adjustment to release, as well as gaining employment, training and employment. All prisoners had access to the virtual campus (providing access to community education, training and employment opportunities via the internet), through the computers in each classroom, but this was not used to good effect. The process for clearing prisoners for ROTL was excellent, and the monthly targets for those going into education, training or employment on release were generally exceeded. The resettlement staff also offered training in CV writing and job interview skills. The prison had

excellent links with a wide variety of outside education providers and employers, some of which offered progression through apprenticeships to employment.

Recommendation

- 4.29 Education staff should ensure that prisoners make better and informed use of the virtual campus.**

Health care

- 4.30** Prisoners were offered an appointment with a nurse at least one day before their release and given two weeks supply of medication, where appropriate. They were all given a 'health passport' discharge summary, and those without a registered GP were given information about how to register with one. Staff made effective and timely links with community mental health teams before release where needed – teams were invited to attend pre-release planning meetings, and families were also invited and sometimes attended.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.31** Resettlement opportunities for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems were good, with special harm reduction sessions before release and access to the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) national network of community support.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.32** Support under this pathway remained underdeveloped. Although new arrivals were asked during induction if they had problems with money and debt, there was little done to collate, verify or establish comprehensive support to address this information. Some debt support was available through organisations attending the prison, including St Mungo's and New Horizons (a central London youth service), but there was no structured service. A 'principles of finance' programme was delivered through the education department, and prisoners could apply to open a bank account before their release. Jobcentre Plus saw all prisoners, and information on benefits was good. In our survey, 36% of prisoners, compared with only 23% at the last inspection, said they knew who to speak to at the prison for information about benefits.

Recommendation

- 4.33 The finance needs of prisoners, especially in relation to debt, should be evaluated, and appropriate and necessary support provided.** (Repeated recommendation 4.44)

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.34** The visits centre was open all day and was run by Spurgeons (a children's charity). It was a reasonable size and offered appropriate provision, including advice and information about the prison, community agencies and how to get financial help to visit. Where possible, first-time visitors were seen before entering the prison.

- 4.35** Visits were available on alternate days during the week, as well as at weekends. Around 78% of all prisoners lived within 50 miles of the prison, and in our survey 42% of respondents said that it was easy for friends and family to get to the prison, higher than the comparator and at the last inspection. To accommodate the demand, each session included two slots, allowing visits to last an hour. Staff logged the time visitors arrived to ensure they had at least an hour, although where possible a little longer was given. However, it was inappropriate that prisoners on the basic IEP level were restricted to only a half-hour visit, penalising their family and diminishing the support available to them.
- 4.36** The visits hall was a reasonable size and it was rare that there were insufficient spaces for the level of demand. However, the children's play area was not staffed for every session, and the only available refreshments were from a vending machine selling drinks and chocolate and crisps. Staff generally managed prisoners who had to be kept apart due to previous conflict well.
- 4.37** There was limited further support to encourage family engagement. The prison ran the 'building bridges' programme, designed to improve relationships between young adults and their families, and the number of family visits had increased from two to four a year since our last inspection. However, the 'family man' programme had only been delivered once since the last inspection and was not currently available, although three courses were planned over the next 12 months. The Storybook Dads initiative (enabling prisoners to record a story for their children) was no longer available. Prisoners who did not receive visits were not monitored or able to receive telephone calls in place of visits (unless they were foreign nationals).

Recommendations

- 4.38** **The length of visits should not be reduced for prisoners on the basic level of the IEP.**
- 4.39** **The range and level of support for prisoners to maintain contact with their families should be improved.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.40** There was minimal offending behaviour work available for prisoners at the time of the inspection. The 'Thinking Skills Programme' was due to commence in autumn 2014, and the 'Resolve' programme, designed to address violent offending, was due to begin in early 2015. Although these programmes appeared appropriate, they were based on offending behaviour needs information from HMP/YOI Isis in the absence of up-to-date OASys data at Feltham (see paragraph 4.8). The lack of OASys data meant that the prison did not know the wider need for work to address offending (see main recommendation S42). While in principle prisoners with identified offending behaviour needs could transfer to another prison to complete a course or programme not available at Feltham, in practice such transfers were rare.
- 4.41** The Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme was delivered four times a year through the chaplaincy. Work on restorative justice was developing well with five conferences between prisoners and their victims in 2014 to date. However, there was no direct work by offender supervisors addressing individual prisoners' offending behaviour or identified risk factor (see paragraph 4.10 and main recommendation S42).

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 NOMS

- 5.1** The prison should identify and meet the resettlement and offender management needs of all prisoners. (S42)

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.2** There should be more opportunities for prisoners to participate in full-time purposeful activity. (S40)
- 5.3** There should be a new resettlement and offender management needs assessment, which is repeated at regular intervals and should inform a revised resettlement and offender management strategy, allocation of resources and, co-ordination with other establishments and services. (S41)

Recommendations

To NOMS/PECS

- 5.4** Prisoners arriving at the prison should travel with all their property. (1.5)
- 5.5** NOMS should work with the Home Office to ensure that foreign national detainees are held at Feltham only when it is appropriate to do so and for the minimum time possible. (2.31, repeated recommendation 2.42).
- 5.6** There should be a London wide strategy to ensure prisoners are not transferred from London prisons to Feltham or elsewhere without an up to date OASys. (4.5)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.7** The induction should enable prisoners to fully understand all aspects of the prison, and all prisoners should be kept fully occupied while they are on the induction unit. (1.13)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.8** Case management and review arrangements for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved. (1.28)

Security

- 5.9** Closed visits should only be applied where there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits. (1.36, repeated recommendation 1.55)
- 5.10** Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.37, repeated recommendation 1.56)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.11** The regime for prisoners on basic level should be improved, and include daily association, purposeful activity and access to showers and telephones. (1.41)

Discipline

- 5.12** Use of force reports should be complete and fully justify the need for force. (1.48)
- 5.13** Any occasion in which special accommodation is used should be kept under continuous review and be for the shortest possible time. (1.49)
- 5.14** Segregation review documentation should be completed thoroughly and include meaningful targets. (1.55)

Substance misuse

- 5.15** Clinical substance misuse and Journey to Recovery services should improve joint work and provide fully integrated care. (1.62, repeated recommendation 1.90)
- 5.16** The use of the Albatross inpatient unit for opiate or alcohol detoxification should be assessed for each patient, and the appropriateness of treatment on normal location for non-complex cases should be considered, especially once clinical stabilisation is achieved. (1.63)

Residential units

- 5.17** All cells should be clean, well ventilated and properly furnished. (2.7)
- 5.18** All single cells should have adequate toilet privacy screens. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.12)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.19** The prison should continue to give a high priority to developing positive staff-prisoner relationships and ensure they are appropriate to the age and maturity of the population. (2.14)

Equality and diversity

- 5.20** The prison should identify and address the needs of all groups with protected characteristics, provide regular forums for each group, and promote all aspects of equality and diversity. (2.22)
- 5.21** Investigations into discrimination complaints should be thorough. (2.23)

5.22 The prison should work with relevant external agencies to understand black and minority ethnic prisoners' concerns and any differences in their treatment, they should also implement plans to address these differences. (2.30)

5.23 Care and support for all prisoners with disabilities should be improved. (2.32)

Faith and religious activity

5.24 The faith provision for Muslim young adult prisoners should be improved, including facilitating corporate worship in the mosque. (2.36)

5.25 Prisoners on the 'keep apart' list should only be excluded from corporate worship following a robust risk assessment. (2.37)

Complaints

5.26 The prison should do more to address prisoners' limited confidence in the complaints process especially complaints about staff, which should be properly investigated and responded to. (2.40)

Health services

5.27 The health needs analysis should be updated to reflect the changed population. There should be a separate confidential health complaints system (2.49)

5.28 All clinical areas and equipment should comply with infection control requirements. (2.50, repeated recommendation 2.63)

5.29 All health and discipline staff should receive practical resuscitation skills training, and defibrillators should be available for all staff to use. (2.51)

5.30 The needs of all inpatients on Albatross should be considered when decisions are made to place or keep severely disturbed and disruptive prisoners there. (2.59)

5.31 Prisoners should have their blood-testing equipment and insulin pens in possession, except where the risk to them or others outweighs the benefits, and have facilities to store in-possession medicines securely. Where this is not possible they should be able to test their blood and inject frequently enough to maintain good blood sugar control. (2.60)

5.32 A wider range of medication should be available without a prescription through appropriate policies and patient group directions, which are ratified by the medicines management committee. (2.66)

5.33 All consultations and interventions, including prescribing and administration of medicines and dental care, should be recorded on SystemOne to support safe care and enable more effective audit and analysis. (2.67)

5.34 The floor in the dental suite should be replaced to meet infection control requirements. (2.73)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.35** The session observation scheme across all learning and skills should be strengthened to ensure that teaching grades are accurate, and action plans for teachers are more detailed and challenging. (3.12)
- 5.36** The learning and skills provision should be extended to include a wider range of relevant trades, as well as a business start-up qualification. (3.16)
- 5.37** Prisoners should have opportunities to study on Open University and distance learning courses. (3.17)
- 5.38** Individual learning plans should include personalised and challenging targets to help prisoners make better progress. (3.24)
- 5.39** The promotion and development of prisoners' English and mathematics skills should be evident in all classroom lessons. (3.25)
- 5.40** Prisoners who require additional learning support should receive appropriate help. (3.26)
- 5.41** Written feedback on prisoners' work in vocational training should be more detailed so that prisoners know what they have to do to improve. (3.27)
- 5.42** Achievement of qualifications, particularly in English and mathematics, should be improved further. (3.31)
- 5.43** Prison officers should ensure that prisoners receive their entitlement to library services. (3.34)
- 5.44** The library should install computers for use by prisoners in developing their IT and job search skills. (3.35)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.45** Prisoners should be able to achieve literacy and numeracy qualifications while undertaking physical education and gym qualifications. (3.41)

Offender management and planning

- 5.46** Quality assurance in the offender management unit should be extended to ensure the quality and frequency of offender supervisor-prisoner contact and engagement are effective and meaningful. (4.15)
- 5.47** The prison should develop a protocol to challenge assessments by offender managers that are of insufficient quality. (4.16)
- 5.48** All offender supervisors should have regular casework supervision and personal development to build the necessary skills to engage effectively with prisoners to reduce their risk of harm and reoffending. (4.17)
- 5.49** The prison should work with the national probation service to agree a protocol to ensure that prisoners' multi agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) risk levels are identified at the earliest opportunity, and within the last six months of their sentence. (4.19)

Reintegration planning

- 5.50** The prison should ensure that the assessment of need, provision of required interventions and review of support before release are in place for all prisoners. (4.24, repeated from main recommendation HP49)
- 5.51** Education staff should ensure that prisoners make better and informed use of the virtual campus. (4.29)
- 5.52** The finance needs of prisoners, especially in relation to debt, should be evaluated, and appropriate and necessary support provided. (4.33, repeated recommendation 4.44)
- 5.53** The length of visits should not be reduced for prisoners on the basic level of the IEP. (4.38)
- 5.54** The range and level of support for prisoners to maintain contact with their families should be improved. (4.39)

Housekeeping points

To the governor

Discipline

- 5.55** Video recordings of planned incidents should be reviewed and learning points shared. (1.50)

Health services

- 5.56** Health literature should be targeted at the age and literacy level of young adults. (2.52)
- 5.57** Patients should be supplied with an appropriate quantity of their medication for any court appearances. (Recommendation 2.68 repeated as housekeeping point 2.66)
- 5.58** Two staff members should be involved in the transport of controlled drugs around the prison, and at least one should have a radio. (2.69)

Example of good practice

- 5.59** The prison was committed to training prison staff in understanding mental health issues, including sponsorship to attend external courses supporting prisoners with mental health problems. (2.79)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Kieron Taylor	Team leader
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Catherine Shaw	Head of research, development and thematic
Rachel Prime	Researcher
Jane Parsons	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Crissi Cousins	Care Quality Commission
Helen Boniface	Pharmacist
Nicola Carlisle	Pharmacist
Charles Clarke	Ofsted inspector
Denise Olander	Ofsted inspector
Jai Sharda	Ofsted inspector
Paddy Doyle	Offender management inspector
Ian Menary	Offender management inspector
Amanda Paterson	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2013, the environment in reception and the first night unit offered a poor experience on arrival, but the support by staff was good. Induction did not ensure that prisoners were clear about what to expect. Levels of violence were high but some good work was developing to address this. Self-harm was also high but reducing. Care for the most vulnerable was inconsistent. Security was appropriately focused. Many prisoners did not feel the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme effectively rewarded good behaviour. The number of adjudications and use of segregation were high. The segregation regime was limited but relationships were good, and the special cell was rarely used. Use of force was high, and we were very concerned about the unprecedented frequency that batons were drawn and used. Substance misuse treatment was good but psychosocial services needed to be developed. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

NOMS should carry out an urgent review of the viability of Feltham, as it is currently constituted, as a suitable location for large numbers of young adult prisoners. Alternatives for their location, and safer and more constructive management should be considered. (HP44)

Achieved

Batons should only be drawn and/or used as a last resort, and incidents involving batons should be scrutinised to ensure proportionality. (HP45)

Achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods. (1.6)

No longer relevant

Escort vans should be clean and free from graffiti. (1.7)

Not achieved

The reception should be refurbished, be more welcoming and contain relevant information for new arrivals. (1.19)

Achieved

All new arrivals should be offered a shower on their first night whatever time they arrive. (1.20, repeated recommendation 1.49)

Not achieved

The first night wing should be a welcoming environment in a good state of repair. First night cells should be clean and well prepared. (1.21)

Achieved

The induction should enable prisoners to fully understand all aspects of the prison. All prisoners should complete it, and prisoners who have fully completed induction should be moved into the main prison as soon as possible. (1.22)

Partially achieved

The prison should explore and address prisoner perceptions about their safety, particularly concerning their treatment by staff. (1.33)

Achieved

Managers should ensure a consistently high standard of documentation for assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews. (1.42, Repeated recommendation 3.49)

Partially achieved

Plans for prisoners in crisis should include purposeful activity and time out of cell, and managers should ensure that officers are fully engaged in supporting such prisoners. (1.43)

Partially achieved

The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.48)

Achieved

Closed visits should only be applied where there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits. (1.55)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 1.36)

Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.56)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 1.37)

There should be greater differences between the incentive levels in the rewards and sanction scheme to encourage responsible behaviour. (1.64)

Achieved

There should be formal links between IEP processes and sentence planning. (1.65, repeated recommendation 7.44)

Achieved

Prisoners should only be subject to properly authorised punishments (1.69)

Not achieved

The regime and environment for young adults in segregation should be improved to include greater opportunity for purposeful activity and structured input to address problematic behaviour. (1.79)

Achieved

The drug and alcohol strategy should be updated and action plans should be informed by the most recent needs analysis. (1.89)

Partially achieved

Clinical substance misuse and Journey to Recovery services should improve joint work and provide fully integrated care. (1.90, repeated recommendation 3.97)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 1.62)

The Journey to Recovery service should assess young adults without delay and prioritise work according to individual need. Service users should be actively involved in future service development. (1.91)

Partially achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2013 conditions in residential areas were poor. Relationships between prisoners and many staff were distant and sometimes disrespectful, although we saw some that were good. Many staff had too low expectations of prisoners. The prison needed to do more to understand and meet the concerns of diverse groups. Prisoners lacked confidence in the complaints process, and legal services were underdeveloped. Health care provision was in transition but outcomes were reasonable. Prisoners disliked the food, which at lunchtime was served at cell doors. There was no catalogue ordering service. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison.

Main recommendations

All staff should interact positively with prisoners, build good relationships with them, refer to them by their preferred name, and treat them with respect. The prison should develop a strategy that will deliver these positive outcomes. (HP46)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Communal areas on wings should be maintained to an acceptable standard. Showers should be kept clean and in a good state of repair. Accommodation must be free from rodents, and association equipment should be in a good condition. (2.10)

Partially achieved

Cell cleaning materials should be offered regularly and cells should be free of graffiti, clean and contain furniture maintained to an acceptable standard, including lockable cupboards in all double cells. (2.11)

Partially achieved

All single cells should have adequate toilet privacy screens. (2.12)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.8)

Staff should answer cell call bells within five minutes. (2.13, repeated recommendation 2.22)

Achieved

Prisoners should receive a timely and fair response to general applications. (2.14)

Partially achieved

Managers should ensure that personal officers work with all departments involved with the young adults allocated to them, and that targets set by personal officers are specific to the needs of young adults, as well as their behaviour. (2.22, repeated recommendations 2.48 and 2.46)

Not achieved

There should be regular monthly consultation meetings involving prisoners and staff. (2.23)

Achieved

An equality and diversity policy should be developed to ensure that the needs of all groups within the establishment are identified and addressed, and the prison should promote all aspects of equality and diversity. (2.29)

Not achieved

Equality data should be gathered on all protected characteristics and where problems are consistently identified these should be fully explored to understand the reasons and take action to address them. (2.30)

Not achieved

Prisoner equality representatives should be appointed and there should be regular consultation meetings with them. The prison should investigate the negative perceptions of foreign national and disabled prisoners and address these concerns. (2.31)

Partially achieved

The establishment should develop and implement a programme to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour at Feltham. (2.32, repeated recommendation 4.33)

Not achieved

The prison should improve systems to identify prisoners from minority groups, and meet their needs. (2.41)

Partially achieved

NOMS should work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that foreign national detainees are held at Feltham only when it is appropriate to do so and for the minimum time possible. (2.42)

Not achieved (repeated as main recommendation S40)

Prisoners with a disability who have additional needs should have a care plan and, if appropriate, a personal emergency evacuation plan. Those who require day-to-day support should be offered a paid carer or buddy. (2.42)

Partially achieved

The prison should investigate and address negative perceptions about the formal complaints system. (2.51)

Partially achieved

There should be a robust quality assurance scheme for complaints, which ensures promised action is taken and patterns or trends identified for remedial action. (2.52, repeated recommendation HP53)

Achieved

The legal services provision for young adults should be improved. (2.55)

Achieved

All clinical areas and equipment should comply with infection control guidance. (2.63)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.46)

There should be mechanisms to monitor the delivery of health services once new providers are in place. (2.64)

Achieved

There should be sufficient officers trained to respond to emergencies, sufficient emergency equipment around the site, and all staff should know how to access equipment. (2.65)

Not achieved

Health promotion information should be available in a variety of media. (2.66)

Achieved

There should be an ongoing audit to enhance the quality of record keeping. (2.73)

No longer relevant

The views of prisoners on health care should be further investigated and the high number of 'did not attends' should be reduced. (2.74)

Achieved

There should be a training needs analysis to identify the skills and training required for nursing staff. (2.75)

Achieved

SystemOne should be used to record prescribing and administration of medicines and enable more effective audit and analysis of medicines used. (2.85)

Not achieved

Patients should be supplied with an appropriate quantity of their medication for any court appearances. (2.86)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point 2.66)

A wider range of patient group directions should be introduced to enable more potent medication to be supplied by the pharmacist or nurse, and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.87)

Not achieved

An anger management training programme should be introduced for prisoners. (2.96)

Achieved

Mental health awareness training, including learning disabilities and personality disorders, should be available to all staff. (2.97)

Achieved

The food provided should be of an adequate quality and quantity, and offer a balanced diet, and prisoners should be regularly consulted about these issues. (2.103)

Achieved

Lunch should not be served before noon and dinner not before 5pm. (2.104, repeated recommendation 8.10)

Achieved

All meals should be issued at the servery. (2.105)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to order from catalogues. (2.110)

Not achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2013 time out of cell and access to outside exercise were poor. Management of learning and skills provision was inadequate, and the education curriculum did not meet the needs of the population. There were insufficient activity places, and those available were poorly used. The quality of teaching varied and too much was inadequate. Provision English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) was insufficient and outcomes in the key areas of basic skills were inadequate. The quality of vocational training and achievements for those on a programme were generally good. The library was good but not well used. The gym provided good opportunities for most prisoners. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Prisoners' time out of their cells should be improved and include association every evening and at least an hour exercise outside per day. (HP47)

Partially achieved

There should be sufficient purposeful activities for the population, places should be appropriately focused on addressing individual needs, and all places should be fully used. (HP48)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Exercise yards in the young adult units should be large enough for the number of people using them and be furnished with adequate seating. (3.5, repeated recommendation 6.85)

Not achieved

All young adults requiring learning and skills support should attend education and training classes, and attendance and participation in education and training sessions should be improved. (3.14, repeated recommendation 6.30)

Achieved

Arrangements to maximise the use of vocational training places shared with the young people's side should be improved. (3.15)

No longer relevant

The establishment should make better use of initial screening information to ensure learners are allocated to programmes meeting their needs. (3.16, repeated recommendation 6.32)

Achieved

There should be a prison-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work that includes and evaluates all activities, and fully informs action planning for improvement. (3.17)

Achieved

The session observation scheme across all learning and skills activities should be developed to improve the quality of teaching and learning and assessment. (3.18)

Partially achieved

The analysis and use of data to assess participation and achievement of different groups of young adults should be improved to ensure all learners' needs are identified and met. (3.19)

Partially achieved

The establishment should continue to develop social and life skills programmes, especially those that help to improve young adults' personal effectiveness by addressing negative attitudes and self-control. (3.25, repeated recommendation 6.36)

Achieved

All work and training opportunities should be formally accredited to national standards, and skills not formally accredited should be recognised and recorded to support prisoners' employment needs. (3.26)

Partially achieved

The quality of teaching and learning should be improved, and the behaviour of young adults in learning sessions should be managed better. (3.30, repeated recommendation 6.31)

Partially achieved

There should be systematic provision in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) for young adults needing support, and appropriate ESOL qualifications should be offered. (3.31)

Achieved

Achievement of learners' learning and skills outcomes, particularly in English and mathematics, should be improved. (3.35)

Partially achieved

Access to the library should be improved, and it should be available in the evenings and at weekends. (3.39)

Partially achieved

The library should keep its computers, which should be upgraded. (3.40)

Not achieved

The prison should implement a budgeted plan for the replacement of cardiovascular and modular weight training equipment. (3.47)

Achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2013 there was a reducing reoffending strategy based on a needs analysis of the population but resettlement services were in transition, which affected outcomes for prisoners. The quality of offender management work was mixed and there was only minimal contact with offender supervisors. The needs of many prisoners were not systematically identified on arrival or reviewed before their release. There was limited coordination and delivery of some reintegration work, although good support was offered in some but not all of the resettlement pathways. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The prison should ensure that the assessment of need, provision of required interventions and review of support before release are in place for all prisoners. (HP49)

Not achieved (repeated as recommendation 4.26)

Recommendations

Sentence planning meetings and OASys (offender assessment system) assessments should include contributions from all departments involved with the prisoner. (4.15)

Not achieved

The prison should introduce a quality assurance model that extends beyond OASys work and which ensures that offender supervisors are sufficiently skilled and trained to meet prisoner needs. (4.16)

Partially achieved

The prison should clarify the role of the Teal unit and ensure that it meets the resettlement needs of its prisoners. (4.17)

No longer relevant

Release on temporary licence should be extended to meet the needs of prisoners preparing for release. (4.18)

Achieved

There should be greater efforts to secure probation input into multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel (MALRAP) meetings. (4.23, repeated recommendation 9.59)

Partially achieved

The prison should work with statutory and community groups to ensure that all prisoners needing housing on release are offered stable and suitable accommodation. (4.30)

Partially achieved

The prison should monitor the accommodation needs of foreign national prisoners released with no access to public funds, and work with other community agencies to ensure their needs are met. (4.31)

Partially achieved

Links between partner agencies working in the resettlement pathways, prison managers and the education department should be more structured and information better shared to maximise the effectiveness of work to resettle prisoners. (4.36)

Partially achieved

The prison should offer a pre-release and business start-up course for prisoners due for release. (4.37)

Not achieved

The J2R service should develop and implement a harm reduction checklist for clients before their release. (4.41)

Achieved

The finance needs of prisoners, especially in relation to debt, should be evaluated, and appropriate and necessary support provided. (4.44)

Not achieved (repeated recommendation 4.35)

The number of family visits should be extended and available to all prisoners. (4.49)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	326	42	89.3
Recall	21	1	5.0
Convicted unsentenced	3	2	1.2
Remand	4	2	1.4
Detainees	9	0	3.1
Total	363	47	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	14	4	4.3
Less than six months	5	0	1.3
six months to less than 12 months	16	1	4.2
12 months to less than 2 years	54	5	14.5
2 years to less than 4 years	167	22	46.0
4 years to less than 10 years	104	12	28.3
10 years and over (not life)	1	5	1.4
Total	361	49	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	330	89.3
21 years to 29 years	43	10.7
Total	410	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	279	38	79.2
Foreign nationals	86	7	20.8
Total	365	45	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	15	1	1.1
Uncategorised sentenced	343	44	97.1
Category C	1	-	0.3
Category D	1	-	0.3
Other	5	-	1.2
Total	365	45	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	90	16	25.8
Irish	5	0	1.2
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	1	0.2
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	25	3	6.9
White and black African	6	1	1.7
White and Asian	5	1	1.5
Other mixed	9	2	2.8
Asian or Asian British			

Indian	10	1	2.8
Pakistani	6	1	1.7
Bangladeshi	4	0	1.0
Other Asian	13	2	3.7
Black or black British			
Caribbean	60	4	15.7
African	62	5	16.4
Other black	21	3	5.9
Other ethnic group			
Arab	2	0	0.5
Other ethnic group	5	1	1.5
Not stated	44	0	10.7
Total	367	43	

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	1	0.3
Church of England	30	6	8.5
Roman Catholic	65	11	17.9
Other Christian denominations	76	14	23.1
Muslim	127	8	34.3
Sikh	5	2	1.9
Hindu	2	0	0.5
Buddhist	1	0	0.3
No religion	50	4	13.5
Total	364	46	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	64	15.9	1	0.2
1 month to 3 months	125	31.0	7	1.7
3 months to six months	85	21.1	13	3.2
six months to 1 year	59	16.2	15	3.7
1 year to 2 years	12	3.0	7	1.7
2 years to 4 years	1	0.2	0	0.0
Total	347	86.1	43	10.7

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	9	0	2.9
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	199	29	58.0
Total	208	29	59.5

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	2	0.3	0	0.0
1 month to 3 months	1	0	0	0.0
3 months to six months	2	0.5	0	0.0
Six months to 1 year	3	0.8	1	0.3
1 year to 2 years	1	0.3	1	0.3
Total	9	2.2	2	0.6

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	58	9	16.71
Sexual offences	8	1	2.24
Burglary	35	8	10.72
Robbery	111	11	30.42
Theft and handling	8	1	2.24
Drugs offences	92	8	24.94
Other offences	50	1	12.72
Total	362	39	99.99

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

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

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 21 July 2014 the young adult population at HMYOI Feltham was 409. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 183 young adults.

We received a total of 160 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 87%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Five respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 15 questionnaires were not returned and three were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
Kingfisher	13
Lapwing	14
Mallard	19
Osprey	24
Partridge	21
Quail	21
Raven	22

Swallow	25
Ibis (segregation unit)	1

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP/YOI Feltham young adults.

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

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

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Feltham in 2014 compared with responses from young adults surveyed in selected young adult trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from young adults surveyed in HMYOIs Deerbolt, Littlehey, Aylesbury and Isis since April 2011.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Feltham in 2014 compared with the responses of young adults surveyed at HMYOI Feltham in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Muslim and non-Muslim young adults.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of young adults who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	136 (85%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	24 (15%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	144 (91%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	63 (40%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	32 (20%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Life</i>	2 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)	
	<i>Yes</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>No</i>	127 (80%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	158 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	159 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	31 (20%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	12 (8%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 14 (9%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	33 (21%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 7 (4%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	29 (19%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 4 (3%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Arab</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 4 (3%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	3 (2%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	<i>Yes</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>No</i>		153 (97%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	<i>None</i>	24 (15%)	<i>Hindu</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	36 (23%)	<i>Jewish</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	30 (19%)	<i>Muslim</i> 53 (34%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Other</i> 4 (3%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>		159 (99%)
	<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)		
	<i>Yes</i>		16 (10%)
	<i>No</i>		144 (90%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>No</i>		158 (99%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	<i>Yes</i>		81 (51%)
	<i>No</i>		79 (49%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	<i>Yes</i>		29 (18%)
	<i>No</i>		131 (82%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	87 (54%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	65 (41%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (5%)

Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	87 (54%)
	Yes	47 (29%)
	No	24 (15%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	87 (54%)
	Yes	7 (4%)
	No	63 (39%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	74 (47%)
	No	71 (45%)
	Don't remember	14 (9%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	120 (75%)
	No	33 (21%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	38 (24%)
	Well	63 (39%)
	Neither	46 (29%)
	Badly	9 (6%)
	Very badly	3 (2%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
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	86 (54%)
	Yes, I received written information	34 (21%)
	No, I was not told anything	39 (25%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	126 (79%)
	No	27 (17%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	120 (76%)
	2 hours or longer	27 (17%)
	Don't remember	11 (7%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	133 (85%)
	No	21 (13%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well		18 (11%)	
	Well		80 (51%)	
	Neither		42 (27%)	
	Badly		10 (6%)	
	Very badly		6 (4%)	
	Don't remember		2 (1%)	
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	40 (26%)	Physical health	6 (4%)
	Housing problems	28 (19%)	Mental health	6 (4%)
	Contacting employers	6 (4%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	6 (4%)
	Contacting family	29 (19%)	Getting phone numbers	38 (25%)
	Childcare	5 (3%)	Other	4 (3%)
	Money worries	21 (14%)	Did not have any problems	54 (36%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	12 (8%)		
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?			
	Yes		27 (18%)	
	No		67 (45%)	
	Did not have any problems		54 (36%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	Tobacco		112 (70%)	
	A shower		37 (23%)	
	A free telephone call		124 (78%)	
	Something to eat		94 (59%)	
	PIN phone credit		41 (26%)	
	Toiletries/ basic items		68 (43%)	
	Did not receive anything		11 (7%)	
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		89 (58%)	
	Someone from health services		91 (59%)	
	A Listener/Samaritans		40 (26%)	
	Prison shop/ canteen		26 (17%)	
	Did not have access to any of these		37 (24%)	
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		64 (41%)	
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal		48 (31%)	
	How to make routine requests (applications)		35 (22%)	
	Your entitlement to visits		45 (29%)	
	Health services		66 (42%)	
	Chaplaincy		76 (49%)	
	Not offered any information		44 (28%)	
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?			
	Yes		131 (82%)	
	No		21 (13%)	
	Don't remember		7 (4%)	

Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	68 (43%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	39 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	20 (13%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>	56 (36%)
	<i>No</i>	49 (32%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	19 (12%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	29 (19%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	40 (26%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	58 (37%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	29 (19%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	12 (8%)	41 (27%)	31 (20%)	33 (21%)	14 (9%) 23 (15%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	20 (13%)	53 (36%)	32 (21%)	9 (6%)	3(2%) 32 (21%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	6 (4%)	18 (12%)	30 (21%)	28 (19%)	18 (12%) 46 (32%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					31 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>					51 (33%)
	<i>No</i>					74 (47%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	<i>Yes</i>					44 (28%)
	<i>No</i>					16 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					96 (62%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	80 (51%)	72 (46%)	5 (3%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	130 (84%)	23 (15%)	1 (1%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	78 (52%)	68 (45%)	4 (3%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	48 (31%)	105 (68%)	2 (1%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	51 (33%)	101 (65%)	3 (2%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	94 (61%)	59 (38%)	1 (1%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	51 (33%)	63 (41%)	41 (26%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	<i>Very good</i>					2 (1%)
	<i>Good</i>					31 (20%)
	<i>Neither</i>					43 (27%)
	<i>Bad</i>					40 (25%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					42 (27%)

Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>	4 (3%)
	Yes	28 (18%)
	No	126 (80%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes	62 (39%)
	No	23 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	73 (46%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	98 (63%)
	No	29 (19%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	29 (19%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	108 (69%)
	No	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	43 (28%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	12 (8%)
	Very easy	50 (32%)
	Easy	51 (32%)
	Neither	18 (11%)
	Difficult	9 (6%)
	Very difficult	7 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (7%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	98 (64%)
	No	40 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	16 (10%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (<i>If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	28 (21%) 61 (45%) 47 (35%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	28 (21%) 29 (22%) 76 (57%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	71 (53%)
	No	23 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	40 (30%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (<i>If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	60 (44%) 27 (20%) 49 (36%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	60 (45%) 25 (19%) 47 (36%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	25 (20%)
	No	102 (80%)

Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	31 (23%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>Easy</i>	29 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	37 (27%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	17 (13%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	7 (5%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Yes</i>	52 (38%)
	<i>No</i>	72 (52%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (9%)
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>	2 (1%)
	<i>Yes</i>	79 (59%)
	<i>No</i>	42 (31%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	12 (9%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	26 (19%)
	<i>No</i>	111 (81%)
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>	110 (72%)
	<i>Very well</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Well</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Neither</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Badly</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	10 (7%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	99 (65%)
	<i>No</i>	54 (35%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	111 (72%)
	<i>No</i>	44 (28%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	47 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	108 (70%)

Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Never</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	46 (29%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	43 (28%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	27 (17%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	13 (8%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	60 (39%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	37 (24%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	34 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	21 (14%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	60 (40%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	25 (17%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Neither</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	14 (9%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?			
	<i>Yes</i>	37 (24%)		
	<i>No</i>	117 (76%)		
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?			
	<i>Yes</i>	18 (12%)		
	<i>No</i>	134 (88%)		
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	117 (77%)	<i>At meal times</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	13 (9%)	<i>At health services</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Visits area</i>	15 (10%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	10 (7%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	8 (5%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	8 (5%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	8 (5%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>At work</i>	7 (5%)	<i>In your cell</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>During movement</i>	11 (7%)	<i>At religious services</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>At education</i>	15 (10%)		
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?			
	<i>Yes</i>	27 (18%)		
	<i>No</i>	127 (82%)		

Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Debt</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	9 (6%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	50 (33%)
	No	102 (67%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>Medication</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	5 (3%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	91 (61%)
	Yes	15 (10%)
	No	43 (29%)

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	17 (11%)	10 (6%)	32 (21%)	28 (18%)	39 (25%)	28 (18%)
	The nurse	13 (9%)	15 (10%)	46 (31%)	23 (15%)	36 (24%)	16 (11%)
	The dentist	24 (16%)	6 (4%)	13 (9%)	19 (13%)	42 (28%)	45 (30%)
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	25 (17%)	15 (10%)	47 (31%)	36 (24%)	16 (11%)	12 (8%)
	The nurse	14 (10%)	13 (9%)	33 (23%)	42 (29%)	23 (16%)	21 (14%)
	The dentist	41 (28%)	14 (10%)	21 (15%)	30 (21%)	17 (12%)	21 (15%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						13 (9%)
	<i>Very good</i>						8 (5%)
	<i>Good</i>						41 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i>						41 (27%)
	<i>Bad</i>						29 (19%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						19 (13%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes						36 (24%)
	No						116 (76%)
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>						116 (77%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						13 (9%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						5 (3%)
	<i>No</i>						17 (11%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes						25 (16%)
	No						129 (84%)
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>						129 (85%)
	Yes						12 (8%)
	No						10 (7%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	35 (23%)
	No	118 (77%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	18 (12%)
	No	134 (88%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	11 (7%)
	Easy	8 (5%)
	Neither	11 (7%)
	Difficult	5 (3%)
	Very difficult	18 (12%)
	Don't know	96 (64%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	4 (3%)
	Easy	3 (2%)
	Neither	6 (4%)
	Difficult	4 (3%)
	Very difficult	26 (18%)
	Don't know	105 (71%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	4 (3%)
	No	149 (97%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	4 (3%)
	No	147 (97%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	115 (78%)
	Yes	24 (16%)
	No	9 (6%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	134 (90%)
	Yes	10 (7%)
	No	5 (3%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	119 (83%)
	Yes	19 (13%)
	No	6 (4%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	12 (8%)	12 (8%)	22 (14%)	26 (17%)	42 (27%)	40 (26%)
	Vocational or skills training	36 (24%)	8 (5%)	35 (23%)	32 (21%)	22 (15%)	18 (12%)
	Education (including basic skills)	14 (9%)	20 (13%)	64 (43%)	24 (16%)	17 (11%)	10 (7%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	50 (34%)	10 (7%)	17 (11%)	32 (21%)	21 (14%)	19 (13%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						52 (35%)
	Prison job						49 (33%)
	Vocational or skills training						11 (7%)
	Education (including basic skills)						42 (29%)
	Offending behaviour programmes						4 (3%)

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	45 (32%)	42 (30%)	34 (24%)	19 (14%)
	Vocational or skills training	50 (40%)	32 (26%)	20 (16%)	22 (18%)
	Education (including basic skills)	28 (20%)	59 (43%)	31 (23%)	19 (14%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	55 (47%)	24 (20%)	23 (19%)	16 (14%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				9 (6%)
	<i>Never</i>				36 (24%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>				63 (42%)
	<i>About once a week</i>				33 (22%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>				9 (6%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				30 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>				69 (47%)
	<i>No</i>				48 (33%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				6 (4%)
	<i>0</i>				16 (11%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				112 (74%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				16 (11%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				1 (1%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				6 (4%)
	<i>0</i>				14 (9%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				27 (18%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				37 (25%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				66 (44%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				1 (1%)
	<i>0</i>				4 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				10 (7%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				19 (13%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				117 (77%)
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>				54 (36%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>				27 (18%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>				33 (22%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>				18 (12%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>				10 (7%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>				3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				7 (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	45 (30%)
	No	106 (70%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	60 (40%)
	No	91 (60%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	46 (31%)
	No	103 (69%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>Easy</i>	45 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	27 (18%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (4%)

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>	4 (3%)
	Yes	101 (68%)
	No	43 (29%)
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>	47 (32%)
	<i>No contact</i>	38 (26%)
	<i>Letter</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Phone</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Visit</i>	45 (30%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	106 (71%)
	No	44 (29%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	4 (3%)
	Yes	68 (45%)
	No	80 (53%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	84 (56%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>Involved</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	10 (7%)

Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			84 (57%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			38 (26%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>			17 (11%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>			11 (7%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>			9 (6%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			4 (3%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			84 (56%)
	<i>Yes</i>			40 (27%)
	<i>No</i>			10 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			16 (11%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			84 (57%)
	<i>Yes</i>			16 (11%)
	<i>No</i>			33 (22%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			15 (10%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			84 (56%)
	<i>Yes</i>			20 (13%)
	<i>No</i>			19 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			27 (18%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	<i>Yes</i>			7 (5%)
	<i>No</i>			53 (37%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			84 (58%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	<i>Yes</i>			29 (20%)
	<i>No</i>			117 (80%)
Q13.12	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that apply to you.)			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	27 (19%)	55 (39%)	60 (42%)
	Accommodation	28 (20%)	60 (44%)	49 (36%)
	Benefits	31 (23%)	37 (27%)	67 (50%)
	Finances	33 (26%)	20 (16%)	76 (59%)
	Education	27 (19%)	56 (40%)	56 (40%)
	Drugs and alcohol	40 (30%)	45 (34%)	48 (36%)
Q13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>			4 (3%)
	<i>Yes</i>			74 (50%)
	<i>No</i>			71 (48%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMYOI Feltham YA 2014

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerboit, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013
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		160	677	160	165
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	85%	66%	85%	93%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	100%	98%	53%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	8%	7%	7%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	19%	27%	19%	19%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	3%	0%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	20%	13%	20%	22%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	99%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	69%	46%	69%	70%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	4%	3%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	34%	26%	34%	38%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	2%	1%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	13%	10%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1%	2%	1%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	51%	43%	51%	48%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	18%	27%	18%	19%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	41%	42%	41%	37%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	64%	53%	64%	21%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	10%	8%	10%	6%
2.4	Was the van clean?	46%	42%	46%	38%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	75%	78%	75%	70%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	63%	57%	63%	48%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	54%	42%	54%	68%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerbolt, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013
	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				
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	21%	28%	21%	4%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	79%	88%	79%	74%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	76%	53%	76%	83%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	76%	85%	71%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	57%	62%	56%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	64%	67%	64%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	26%	20%	26%	21%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	19%	17%	19%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	3%	4%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	19%	27%	19%	26%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	3%	2%	3%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	14%	16%	14%	28%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	8%	11%	8%	12%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%	7%	4%	7%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	4%	10%	4%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	12%	4%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	25%	24%	25%	38%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	29%	29%	29%	24%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	70%	83%	70%	79%
3.6	A shower?	23%	38%	23%	14%
3.6	A free telephone call?	78%	54%	78%	76%
3.6	Something to eat?	59%	61%	59%	61%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	26%	47%	26%	32%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	42%	55%	42%	47%
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?	58%	60%	58%	47%
3.7	Someone from health services?	59%	63%	59%	58%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	26%	27%	26%	26%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	17%	18%	17%	21%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerbolt, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013
	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				
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	41%	44%	41%	30%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	31%	41%	31%	31%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	23%	40%	23%	20%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	29%	39%	29%	29%
3.8	Health services?	42%	56%	42%	42%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	49%	52%	49%	37%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	73%	82%	68%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	80%	92%	80%	76%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	45%	48%	45%	40%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	82%	85%	82%	64%
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?	34%	35%	34%	33%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	49%	40%	49%	58%
4.1	Get bail information?	16%	13%	16%	12%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	40%	33%	33%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	28%	31%	28%	35%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	51%	49%	51%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	85%	43%	85%	87%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	52%	52%	52%	67%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	31%	47%	31%	56%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	36%	33%	34%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	61%	59%	61%	52%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	33%	24%	33%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	21%	36%	21%	11%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	18%	46%	18%	28%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	39%	39%	39%	39%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	63%	53%	63%	64%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	69%	54%	69%	61%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	64%	55%	64%	62%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerbolt, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013
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 5: Applications and complaints				
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	64%	73%	64%	59%
For those who have made an application:				
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	57%	56%	57%	49%
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	28%	48%	28%	29%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	53%	60%	53%	47%
For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	36%	27%	36%	25%
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	35%	31%	35%	19%
5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	25%	20%	20%
5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	32%	25%	32%	12%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme				
6.1 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	38%	42%	38%	40%
6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	59%	45%	59%	46%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	19%	18%	19%	22%
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?	22%	35%	22%	30%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff				
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	65%	63%	65%	63%
7.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72%	64%	72%	65%
7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	30%	19%	30%	25%
7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	26%	17%	26%	22%
7.5 Do you have a personal officer?	61%	60%	61%	46%
For those with a personal officer:				
7.6 Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	49%	48%	49%	51%
SECTION 8: Safety				
8.1 Have you ever felt unsafe here?	24%	40%	24%	42%
8.2 Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	20%	12%	13%
8.4 Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	18%	25%	18%	25%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	12%	9%	11%
8.5 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	11%	7%	6%
8.5 Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	3%
8.5 Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	20%	8%	12%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerbolt, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	8%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	1%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	4%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	3%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	4%	3%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	5%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	0%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	2%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	7%	5%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	8%	6%	10%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	33%	31%	33%	37%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	13%	13%	22%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%	5%	9%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	3%	2%	3%	3%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	13%	12%	14%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	6%	9%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	4%	8%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	2%	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	3%	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerbolt, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013
	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?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	7%	7%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	5%	1%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	5%	3%	7%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	26%	30%	26%	43%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	27%	41%	27%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	41%	61%	41%	35%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	13%	16%	13%	9%
	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?	49%	54%	49%	42%
9.2	The nurse?	35%	62%	35%	35%
9.2	The dentist?	34%	42%	34%	33%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	35%	52%	35%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	24%	25%	24%	20%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	51%	47%	51%	55%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	16%	22%	16%	24%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	54%	59%	54%	36%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	23%	27%	23%	24%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	19%	12%	17%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	13%	22%	13%	12%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	5%	10%	5%	8%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	3%	5%	3%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	2%	3%	5%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	73%	64%	73%	85%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	67%	79%	67%	81%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	77%	80%	77%	69%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerbolt, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013
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?	22%	16%	22%	18%
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	29%	30%	29%	20%
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	56%	51%	56%	37%
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	18%	19%	18%	12%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	33%	32%	33%	27%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	7%	15%	7%	10%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	29%	42%	29%	25%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	3%	9%	3%	3%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	68%	71%	68%	63%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	44%	47%	44%	43%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	60%	71%	60%	50%
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?	43%	55%	43%	42%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	80%	84%	80%	66%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	54%	62%	54%	43%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	53%	67%	53%	47%
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?	38%	48%	38%	32%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	28%	50%	28%	26%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	47%	37%	47%	43%
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	11%	12%	11%	10%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	69%	53%	69%	23%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	78%	15%	78%	52%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	2%	4%	2%	2%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	30%	31%	30%	25%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	40%	55%	40%	43%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	31%	42%	31%	31%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	42%	30%	42%	29%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham 2014	Deerbold, Littlehey, Aylesbury & Isis	HMYOI Feltham 2014	HMYOI Feltham 2013	
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?	70%	76%	70%	67%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	38%	44%	38%	49%
13.2	Contact by letter?	21%	22%	21%	20%
13.2	Contact by phone?	8%	13%	8%	8%
13.2	Contact by visit?	45%	33%	45%	31%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	71%	73%	71%	31%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	46%	58%	46%	27%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	58%	50%	58%	54%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	59%	57%	59%	57%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	27%	29%	27%	14%
13.6	Offender manager?	17%	15%	17%	20%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	14%	5%	14%	20%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	6%	16%	6%	14%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	60%	65%	60%	53%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	25%	25%	25%	18%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	30%	28%	30%	33%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	7%	5%	13%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	20%	14%	20%	17%
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?	48%	39%	48%	35%
13.12	Accommodation?	55%	38%	55%	48%
13.12	Benefits?	36%	29%	36%	23%
13.12	Finances?	21%	23%	21%	14%
13.12	Education?	50%	37%	50%	30%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	48%	38%	48%	43%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	51%	50%	51%	51%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMYOI Feltham YA 2014

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
Number of completed questionnaires returned		108	48	31	127	53	105
1.3	Are you sentenced?	97%	98%	94%	98%	96%	98%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	22%	15%			29%	15%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			77%	68%	90%	59%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	4%	6%	3%	2%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	44%	11%	48%	30%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	15%	13%	9%	10%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	48%	56%	55%	50%	38%	58%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	66%	63%	75%	61%	57%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	52%	59%	71%	50%	48%	57%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	79%	77%	86%	79%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	64%	61%	62%	55%	65%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	67%	56%	59%	66%	76%	59%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	59%	59%	76%	55%	52%	62%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	92%	71%	86%	81%	83%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	73%	90%	78%	87%	78%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	34%	39%	33%	33%	36%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	51%	56%	52%	51%	38%	57%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	83%	89%	94%	82%	78%	87%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	37%	43%	31%	25%	37%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	36%	13%	23%	10%	27%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	12%	31%	19%	17%	10%	22%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	38%	44%	39%	40%	29%	44%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	69%	52%	70%	62%	74%	58%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	74%	63%	74%	69%	61%	74%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	60%	77%	50%	66%	55%	67%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	51%	39%	55%	58%	50%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	31%	57%	36%	39%	19%	45%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	71%	59%	60%	44%	66%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	16%	22%	13%	21%	25%	17%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	68%	60%	66%	48%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	70%	79%	76%	70%	61%	77%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	23%	33%	13%	29%	10%	33%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	58%	68%	57%	61%	47%	67%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	26%	19%	34%	21%	26%	22%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	7%	20%	9%	10%	13%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	14%	23%	17%	17%	16%	18%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	5%	13%	4%	8%	4%	10%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	3%	7%	3%	4%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	3%	0%	4%	6%	3%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	4%	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	35%	26%	36%	32%	47%	27%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	4%	10%	12%	16%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11%	3%	4%	10%	21%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	4%	0%	9%	16%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	3%	4%	4%	6%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	36%	23%	28%	10%	36%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	39%	47%	47%	39%	37%	43%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	24%	21%	34%	22%	18%	26%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	15%	19%	10%	17%	14%	18%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	13%	15%	12%	15%	12%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	29%	45%	38%	33%	22%	40%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	5%	11%	7%	8%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	34%	17%	38%	26%	29%	28%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	2%	5%	4%	3%	4%	2%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	29%	28%	32%	27%	22%	32%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	12%	11%	11%	12%	10%	12%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	70%	70%	59%	71%	71%	67%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	79%	76%	76%	78%	78%	77%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	1%	4%	0%	3%	2%	2%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	43%	28%	41%	40%	50%	34%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	32%	22%	43%	28%	39%	27%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMYOI Feltham YA 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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	144
1.3	Are you sentenced?	88%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	26%	19%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	56%	71%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	32%	34%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	56%	50%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	88%	60%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	50%	55%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	62%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	74%	63%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	47%	60%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	83%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	56%	83%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	20%	36%

Key to tables

Diversity analysis

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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?	63%	50%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	83%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	24%	20%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	12%	18%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	37%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	87%	60%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	81%	68%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	74%	63%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	78%	50%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	53%	36%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	59%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	21%	19%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	74%	64%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	93%	69%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	24%	26%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	53%	61%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	32%	23%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	12%	12%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	26%	17%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	26%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	8%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	8%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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)	8%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	33%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	13%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	12%	29%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	21%	43%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	32%	23%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	56%	12%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	13%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	26%	34%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	8%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	26%	29%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	3%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	21%	29%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	8%	12%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	81%	67%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	79%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	0%	2%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	32%	41%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	37%	30%