

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Brixton

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

3–7 November 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	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	31
Section 3. Purposeful activity	45
Section 4. Resettlement	53
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	61
Section 6. Appendices	69
Appendix I: Inspection team	69
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	71
Appendix III: Prison population profile	79
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	83

Introduction

HMP Brixton is one of London's oldest functioning prisons and has, for the last two years, been transitioning from its traditional function as a local prison to its new role as a category C/D resettlement prison for south London. At this inspection we found that the process of change was continuing and just a few months before our arrival, the prison's vulnerable prisoner population (mainly sex offenders) were removed at short notice to be replaced by more mainstream prisoners. We last inspected Brixton during the summer of 2013 when the prison was just beginning the transition process. We committed then to return quickly for an announced inspection and to ensure a fuller and more comprehensive assessment of the potential we saw last year. Overall we have been encouraged by what we have seen. Brixton is a difficult prison to run and requires constant attention, not least because of its age, location and the limitations of its environment. However, overall it continues to improve.

Arrangements to admit new prisoners had improved and the wellbeing of prisoners on their first night had received attention. However, induction arrangements were less effective and took too long. Prisoner perceptions about their safety had not improved and there was evidence of more violence which had coincided with the recent population changes. Levels of violence were however, consistent with similar prisons. Work to address and reduce violence was improving but more needed to be done. We were particularly concerned about the lack of confidence prisoners had in reporting victimisation and intimidation.

Incidents of self-harm had increased over the last year but remained lower than comparable prisons. Tragically the prison had experienced two self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection. Action had been taken to address the recommendations of investigating authorities, but more needed to be done to ensure responses and improvements were sustained. A safer custody strategy was still being worked on but prisoners at risk we spoke to felt well supported. The case management of these prisoners, however, needed to improve.

Security was generally applied proportionately but there were still vestiges of the old Brixton and the prison needed to review unlock arrangements for the now significant low risk category D population. Use of force was low, as was use of segregation. The segregation unit itself was a poor environment but prisoners were normally reintegrated fairly quickly.

A structural weakness of the prison remained the aged, cramped environment. The prison was reasonably clean but we describe many cells in this report as grim. Too many were overcrowded and this undermined the ethos of a prison that was meant to be guiding prisoners toward resettlement. Relationships between staff and prisoners were benign and most prisoners felt respected but some staff needed to be more helpful. Consultation arrangements were reasonably good. Work to promote equality was improving and outcomes for some groups were getting better but our survey indicated more negative perceptions among some minorities, particularly prisoners from a black and minority ethnic background, Muslim prisoners and those with disabilities. Improved consultation and more rigour in responding to adverse monitoring data was required.

Faith provision was strong, as was pastoral care, but prisoners lacked confidence in the complaints process. Our own observations suggested that this perception was quite harsh and complaints responses were generally fair and respectful. Health services were effective and prisoners were positive about the service they received.

Prisoners who worked could be out of their cells for an impressive 10 hours a day but we still found a quarter of prisoners locked up during the working day. Routines were being delivered but the prison closed down very early in the evening. Both these issues were again at odds with the function of prison that was preparing prisoners nearing the end of their sentences. The provision of learning and skills and activity was improving and there were now sufficient activity places for the whole population. However, attendance was not good enough and about 80 prisoners were unacceptably

refusing to work. There was a good focus on employability and some very impressive and developing vocational training, as well as resettlement placements available on daily temporary release. Education opportunities broadly met need but teaching, learning and achievements could all be improved, as could progression opportunities provided for higher level learning. There was also too much underemployment with most of the work available, such as wing cleaning, being low skill and undemanding.

The prison's resettlement strategy was reasonable but the analysis of need had yet to keep pace with recent population changes. The use of release on temporary licence (ROTL), was well managed and now integral to the work of the prison, although we were concerned that too many prisoners were sent to Brixton with too little time left of their sentence to benefit from ROTL. Offender management was also struggling to keep pace with recent population changes and many prisoners had neither an up-to-date assessment nor a sentence plan. The quality of the sentence plans we saw also required improvement. Work to support resettlement was generally very good despite no initial assessment on reception. Support for children and families was particularly good, but the prison needed to rethink and realign its offending behaviour interventions to better meet need.

At recent inspections and largely as a response to the poor conditions we have seen at Brixton, this inspectorate called for a rethink of this establishment's role and purpose. That rethink is taking place and Brixton is developing a new sense of purpose. Brixton provides a unique opportunity for London prisoners to resettle into their local community. The resettlement function makes sense and it is clear that a huge amount of work has been done to deliver this new vision, but Brixton needs help to ensure it receives prisoners who are able to take advantage of the opportunities it offers. The prison is not yet transformed and there are features and aspects of the operation that jar with this new direction. However, Brixton is a better place; it is reasonably safe and settled and there have been demonstrable improvements in the way it is equipping and preparing prisoners for release.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Brixton is a category C and D resettlement prison.

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

Public

Region/Department

London

Number held

741

Certified normal accommodation

530

Operational capacity

810

Date of last full inspection

1–12 July 2013

Brief history

HMP Brixton opened in 1819 as the Surrey House of Correction, subsequently becoming a prison for women and then a military prison. In 1898 it became an adult male local prison, serving the whole of the London area and particularly focusing on South London. In July 2012, it was re-roled again, becoming a category C and D resettlement prison for the local area.

Short description of residential units

A wing holds 240 category C prisoners

B wing holds 150 category C prisoners

C wing holds 133 category D prisoners

D wing is the drug recovery wing, with a capacity of 47

G wing which houses the first night accommodation holds a total of 240 category C prisoners.

Name of governor/director

Edmond Tullett

Escort contractor

Serco

Health service providers

Physical health service provider: Care UK

Mental health service provider: Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Trust

Learning and skills providers

A4e Justice

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Amanda Williams

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 reception environment and processes had improved. Good new first night arrangements had been introduced, with increased support and attention to vulnerability and risk issues. Induction processes took too long. More prisoners than at similar prisons felt unsafe. Reported levels of violence had increased with the change in population. Levels of self-harm were relatively low, but there had been two recent deaths in custody. Care for those in crisis was reasonable but we were not assured that case management was effective. Security was mostly good. Drug availability was similar to that at other prisons but the availability of new psychoactive substances, particularly spice, was a growing concern. Use of segregation and force was low. Substance misuse arrangements were good and enhanced by the new drug recovery wing. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in July 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners at HMP Brixton were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3** Most journeys to the prison were short and all of the vans we saw were clean and in good order. On arrival at the prison, prisoners no longer experienced delays waiting in vans before disembarking.
- S4** The reception environment had improved following refurbishment. Most prisoners reported being in reception for relatively short periods before moving on to first night accommodation. The reception processes we observed were polite, thorough and expedient, although in our survey fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that they had been treated respectfully in reception.
- S5** An initial safety assessment which focused on vulnerability was conducted in private in reception and then shared with staff on the first night landings.
- S6** New first night arrangements had recently been introduced. Most of the dedicated first night cells were well prepared but not all were sufficiently clean. Initial support for newly arrived prisoners was provided by peer supporters.
- S7** The induction process took too long and new arrivals experienced long periods of inactivity. There was no tracking system and we were unable to ascertain which prisoners had completed all elements.
- S8** Prisoners' perceptions about safety had not improved and in our survey more prisoners than at comparator prisons reported feeling unsafe. The number of violent incidents had increased (but was similar to that at comparator prisons), particularly over the previous three months, which coincided with the removal of the longer-term, more settled sex offender population. In our survey, prisoners reported similar levels of victimisation as at comparable prisons but did not feel confident in reporting it. We were not assured that all reported incidents were investigated. A new and promising tool to manage bullies and support victims was not yet effective in practice and we were not convinced that the behaviour of all perpetrators was actively challenged. The safer custody strategy was in an early stage of development and the continuous improvement plan was regularly reviewed.

The safer custody meeting considered an improved range of data but did not yet analyse individual characteristics and trends.

- S9 Levels of self-harm were lower than at similar prisons but double the number reported at the time of the previous inspection. There had been two self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection but Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations were not routinely reviewed. Prisoners at risk of harm told us that they felt well supported but the quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had deteriorated, with some significant weaknesses in care mapping and reviews. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) were positive about their role, but the scheme was not well promoted or visible, particularly in reception and during the early days in custody.
- S10 Security processes were generally proportionate but conditions for most category D prisoners were unnecessarily restrictive. Good levels of intelligence were received from across the prison and analysis had improved, but there was a large backlog of work. Excellent partnership working with local and regional police forces had led to some successful operations to reduce the inflow of drugs. In our survey, the number of prisoners who said that drugs were easily available at the prison was similar to the comparator. There was evidence to indicate that new psychoactive substances such as spice were available in the prison. Over the previous six months, the mandatory drug testing positive rate had reduced considerably and was now similar to that at other prisons but it was not a reliable indicator of drug use as spice was not detectable. The drug and alcohol strategy and action plan were weak, with a lack of detailed objectives and no focus on the increasing challenge posed by the new psychoactive substances.
- S11 Prisoners were negative about the incentives and earned privileges scheme, and in our survey fewer prisoners than elsewhere said that processes were fair and promoted behaviour improvement. We found that processes were mostly adhered to and well managed, with sufficient opportunities for progression.
- S12 The number of adjudications was similar to that at comparator prisons. The processes we observed were sound, and monitoring and managerial oversight were effective.
- S13 The level of use of force was very low, despite an increase coinciding with the change in population. Completion of use of force documentation was mostly of a reasonable standard but the recording of the use of special accommodation was poor. The recently reintroduced use of force committee reviewed all usage but there was as yet no trend analysis, and video-recordings were not reviewed.
- S14 Use of segregation was low, at around half that at comparator prisons, and monitoring processes were very good. The regime was minimal, although stays on the segregation unit were mostly short. Despite a lack of formal reintegration planning, most of those located on the unit returned to normal location at the establishment.
- S15 Clinical substance use arrangements were effective, with appropriate and flexible prescribing and good engagement with prisoners. Psychosocial support was good. Prisoners knew their individual drug workers and there was a wide range of programmes, incorporating both abstinence and harm reduction. The new drug recovery wing was a positive development and prisoners there told us that they felt well supported.

Respect

- S16** *The cleanliness of internal areas had greatly improved and they were better maintained but many cells were poor and prisoners lived in unacceptably overcrowded conditions. Most prisoners said that staff generally treated them respectfully but were sometimes unhelpful. Attention to diversity and equality had improved, as had some outcomes for minority groups, but black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners, and those with disabilities in our survey reported more negatively about their treatment across many areas. Faith provision was good. The number of complaints submitted was not high and they were generally well managed. Health services had improved and were of high quality. The food provided had improved and was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S17** *At the last inspection in July 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners at HMP Brixton were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S18** External areas were clean and tidy, with minimal litter. The cleanliness of internal areas had greatly improved and there was an ongoing painting programme. The condition of many cells was poor, with damaged furniture and insufficiently screened toilets. Far too many prisoners were living in extremely cramped conditions in overcrowded cells designed for one, which was particularly unacceptable for a training and resettlement prison. Access to showers was good and screening had improved and was now reasonable on most wings, but many shower areas continued to be dirty and poorly maintained. The application system lacked any form of tracking and prisoners had little confidence in the process.
- S19** Most prisoners said that staff treated them respectfully but had little interaction with them, and that some were unhelpful and reluctant to assist them in getting things done. We saw a wide range of interactions between staff and prisoners, some of which were very good and supportive, but we were not assured that enough staff had made the shift to dealing with longer-term prisoners. Electronic case note entries were mostly good and were appropriately overseen by managers. Prisoner consultation arrangements were effective in promoting improvements.
- S20** The strategic management of equality and diversity had improved, although there remained areas of significant weakness. The equality action team met regularly but long-term planning was inadequate. There was insufficient consultation with protected groups and the equality action team had been slow to act on monitoring data on the treatment of such groups. This left the prison ill-equipped to explain the negative results in our prisoner survey for black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners, and those with disabilities. Discrimination incident report form investigations took too long and lacked detail and many were not quality checked.
- S21** Some foreign national prisoners facing deportation had no effective access to independent legal representation. Although the prison was taking steps to reduce the problem, some were only informed that they were going to be detained shortly before their release. There was some good support for Gypsy/Romany/Travellers.
- S22** There was evidence of some good outcomes for some prisoners with disabilities and most told us that they felt reasonably well cared for. However, procedures were not consistently implemented so not all needs were being met, and emergency evacuation and care planning were inadequate. Work with older prisoners had improved with the introduction of older prisoner groups.

- S23 Faith provision was good, pastoral care was strong and there was particularly good resettlement support through mentoring.
- S24 The number of complaints submitted was not high. Prisoners expressed a lack of confidence in the fairness of the process but we were assured that the system was effective, and many complaints were upheld. The complaint responses we looked at were generally fair and respectful. Monitoring and quality management for complaints against staff were very good, but less so for others.
- S25 Health care provision had improved and was good, and prisoners were generally satisfied with it. Access to health service professionals was usually good, although did-not-attend rates were too high overall. Waiting times were generally reasonable. Improved health care emergency responses had been implemented. Pharmacy services were very good and access to on-wing pharmacy clinics represented exemplary practice. Medicines management was very good but safe administration of medicines was sometimes compromised by a lack of supervision on the wings. Mental health services had been improved by being fully integrated with a wider staff skills mix and an impressive array of therapeutic options.
- S26 Prisoners' satisfaction with the food provided had improved considerably, although breakfast packs were still too small. Prison shop arrangements were satisfactory.

Purposeful activity

S27 *The amount of time out of cell had improved and was mostly good. The management of learning and skills and work had improved but was still a work in progress. There were sufficient activity places available but attendance was poor and a third of the population was not actively engaged at any one time. There was a good focus on employability and a wide range of vocational training and release on temporary licence placements. Education provision was broadly appropriate but provided too few opportunities to progress and too many prisoners were under-employed in low-skilled wing work. The quality of teaching and learning and achievements required further improvement. Library provision was adequate but access was limited. PE facilities had improved but staff shortages limited the range of provision. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S28 *At the last inspection in July 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners at HMP Brixton 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 two of the recommendations had been achieved, 11 had been partially achieved, three had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S29 The amount of time out of cell had improved and was now good, at over 10 hours a day for those in employment; however, it remained poor, at less than four hours, for those not in activities. We found too many prisoners, over a quarter of the population, locked up during the working day. The published regime was adhered to, and association and exercise were rarely cancelled, but the 6.15pm lock-up for most prisoners during the week was too early and hindered contact with family and friends.
- S30 The management of learning and skills and work had improved. The self-assessment and quality improvement planning processes were thorough and managers were clear about what needed to be improved further. The new activities building had helped to increase the number of activity places available and there were now sufficient for the population. However, processes for allocating work and monitoring attendance were weak. The number of prisoners engaged in education was still too low, at only 63%.

- S31 There was a good focus on employability, and strong partnerships provided an improved and wide range of vocational training and release on temporary licence (ROTL) placements.
- S32 Education provision broadly met the needs of many prisoners but provided insufficient opportunities to progress above level 1. There were particularly high levels of engagement in distance learning programmes and Open University courses. The range of work was limited and too many prisoners were under-employed in low-skilled wing-based work which did not develop their skills or promote a work ethic.
- S33 The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in education and vocational training had improved but required further improvement. There were insufficient additional learning support tutors and the use of peer mentors was underdeveloped. The use of individual learning plans to support prisoners' learning needs was too variable.
- S34 Achievements in education and vocational training required improvement, particularly in English and mathematics. Prisoners' skills development and standard of work were good, particularly in The Clink Restaurant, Bad Boys' Bakery and prison radio work. Prisoners' punctuality and behaviour were very good and prisoners were motivated to learn, but attendance was variable and frequently poor.
- S35 Prisoners' access to the library had improved, with opening times extending to two evenings a week, but not enough was done to prioritise and monitor use. The range of materials and resources was generally adequate and reading material was available on the wings, in the health care department and in the segregation unit.
- S36 A new, well-equipped indoor activities centre had enhanced PE provision. Most prisoners could attend at least twice weekly but staff vacancies limited the range of activities and accredited programmes available.

Resettlement

- S37** *The strategic management of resettlement was reasonably good. The use of temporary release had developed well and there were good opportunities for category D prisoners. The offender management unit was struggling to meet the needs of prisoners as a result of recent changes in the population but had processes in place to resolve the temporary issues. Too many prisoners did not have an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, and home detention curfew and recategorisation decisions were often late, which seriously affected prisoners' ability to progress. Public protection arrangements were good. Prisoners knew where to go for help with resettlement, and this provision was mostly good. Children and families work, and education, training and employment had improved. The interventions available needed to be reviewed in light of the new population. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S38 *At the last inspection in July 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners at HMP Brixton were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

- S39 The reducing reoffending strategy addressed all resettlement pathways but the needs analysis required updating to reflect the change in the population. A wide range of community-based organisations provided services and they were included in the strategic management group. The use of ROTL had developed well and it was an integral part of the strategy. Category D prisoners were held in more restrictive conditions than they would experience in an open establishment but this was counterbalanced by a wide range of opportunities for employment in the local community and for rebuilding family ties. However, too many category D prisoners were received who could not take advantage of ROTL opportunities as they had too little time left to serve.
- S40 The offender management unit was not meeting the needs of prisoners. It had undergone reorganisation and had been adversely affected by a huge increase in workload as a result of the rapid and recent change in population and staff shortages. Too many prisoners did not have a sentence plan and there were almost 400 without an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment. Many of these were the responsibility of external offender managers. The quality of OASys risk assessments and sentence plans was inconsistent. In some, objectives were missing because they had been restricted to interventions available at the establishment. Processes to assess prisoners for recategorisation and home detention curfew were fair and transparent but in both cases too many were late, which adversely affected the progress of many prisoners.
- S41 There were processes in place to reduce the temporary backlog of work and provide future resilience. Further measures to improve services to prisoners, including wing surgeries and a peer adviser scheme, were promising Initiatives.
- S42 Public protection arrangements were good. Prisoners raising a public protection concern were identified on arrival. Interdepartmental risk management meetings were effective in assessing the risk of prisoners due for release. Links with multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were good and MAPPA levels were set before discharge or temporary release. Assessments for ROTL were comprehensive. Temporary release was suitably staggered and structured, and plans were detailed and included appropriate restrictions when required.
- S43 There was no overall assessment of resettlement needs on arrival but prisoners were informed of the services available and could make applications. A wide range of peer supporters helped prisoners to access services.
- S44 A reasonable range of accommodation services was provided but such needs were not assessed until three months before release, potentially missing some urgent issues that prisoners might have had on arrival. The number of prisoners being released without accommodation was low.
- S45 Education, training and employment (ETE) provision was reasonably good. Prisoners' ETE needs were assessed on arrival, with good support at induction and 'through the gate'. ROTL placements were of high quality and relevant to the needs of the local labour market and finding jobs. The number of prisoners entering ETE on release was relatively high.
- S46 Health discharge preparation had improved but there were still problems in ensuring that everyone being released had a GP. There was no palliative care policy but working arrangements with the local hospice were good. For prisoners with substance misuse issues there were effective links with community teams, and there was good continuity of prescribing.
- S47 Support was available for prisoners with debt problems and prisoners could open bank accounts.

- S48 Work with children and families had improved. An impressive range of group and individual support for parenting and maintaining family ties had been introduced. Visits facilities included refreshments, and the children's play area was supervised. Staff treated visitors respectfully.
- S49 With the change in population, the range of accredited interventions had reduced to only the thinking skills programme, and did not meet the full range of prisoners' offending-related needs. Victim awareness programmes and individual psychotherapy were valuable additional interventions.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S50 Concern: Around half of the cells designed for one prisoner were occupied by two. These prisoners lived in extremely cramped, poorly furnished and uncomfortable conditions, with little privacy. Some of the cells did not have adequate screening around the toilet and due to insufficient space most prisoners had to eat their meals in their cells. This was particularly unacceptable for longer-term prisoners in a resettlement training prison.
- Recommendation: Cells designed for single occupancy should not be used to hold two prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 2.9)
- S51 Concern: Prisoners reported mostly negatively about relationships with and treatment by staff. Most said that staff treated them respectfully but were unhelpful and felt that staff had not adjusted towards managing them as longer-stay category C prisoners.
- Recommendation: Staff training and supervision processes should support staff in developing relationships with prisoners appropriate to a category C/D resettlement regime.** (Repeated recommendation S55)
- S52 Concern: Despite sufficient activity places, too many prisoners, over a third, were not engaged in learning and skills and work activities.
- Recommendation: Processes for allocating work and monitoring attendance should be improved to ensure that all prisoners are purposefully engaged in learning and skills and work.**
- S53 Concern: The establishment provided a unique resettlement opportunity for category C and D prisoners resettling in London, with high-quality local ROTL placements and good outcomes for prisoners entering into employment on release. However, too many prisoners, particularly category D prisoners, were received with too little time left to serve to take advantage of the opportunities available.
- Recommendation: Prisoners should not be transferred to Brixton with insufficient time left to serve to benefit from the regime.**
- S54 Concern: Too many prisoners did not have an up-to-date OASys assessment and sentence plan and there were significant delays in the recategorisation processes and decisions to grant home detention curfew. This adversely affected prisoners' ability to progress.
- Recommendation: All prisoners should have an up-to-date OASys assessment and sentence plan. Recategorisation and home detention curfew decisions should be made on time.**

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1** *Most prisoners travelled short distances to the prison. Escort vans were in good order and prisoners were disembarked reasonably quickly.*
- I.2** Around 30 new prisoners arrived each week. Most new arrivals had travelled relatively short distances from other London prisons but a small proportion (usually category D prisoners) had had longer journeys.
- I.3** Although our survey results about the cleanliness of vehicles and treatment by escort staff were negative, all the vehicles we inspected were clean and in good order, and prisoners who arrived during the inspection told us that they had been treated well by escort staff. Prisoners no longer experienced delays waiting in vans before being disembarked. All of those we saw arriving were disembarked without handcuffs and the interactions we witnessed between prisoners and escort staff were friendly and respectful.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.4** *Early days arrangements had improved and provided a generally positive experience for new arrivals. The reception area had been refurbished and processes were good. Initial safety screening considered vulnerability issues, and first night arrangements were reasonable. Induction took too long to complete and was not adequately recorded.*
- I.5** Our survey results about the early days at the establishment were very poor but new first night and induction procedures had only recently been implemented and addressed most of the weaknesses.
- I.6** The reception area had recently been refurbished and was much improved. The previously poor toilet facilities had been replaced and were now clean and in good order. Holding rooms were very clean, although there was little information on noticeboards.
- I.7** Newly arrived prisoners were offered a drink and were processed quickly, which reduced the amount of time spent in reception before moving to the first night landings. All prisoners had a private initial safety screening; this was suitably focused on vulnerability and was shared

with first night and induction staff. Searching arrangements were appropriate and strip-searching of prisoners transferred in only took place when there was supporting intelligence.

- I.8** Despite our survey results suggesting that prisoners were not treated respectfully in reception, we saw reasonable interactions, but there were no peer supporters or Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) to help to put prisoners at ease.
- I.9** Private consultation rooms were used by health services staff and the interviews we observed were thorough and supportive, including one conducted with the aid of professional telephone interpreting services.
- I.10** A revised first night system had recently been introduced for category C (G4 landing) and category D (C2 landing) prisoners. This ensured that key information was handed over to first night staff and night staff. Prisoners we spoke to confirmed that night staff had reassured them about how to contact them during the night if they needed assistance.
- I.11** First night cells were well prepared. All had lockers, clean mattresses, pillows and a television. However, not all were sufficiently clean. Access to showers on the first night was good. Although telephone calls were available on request, they were not routinely offered.
- I.12** Peer supporters met all new prisoners and started the first stage of induction before lock-up on the first day. Induction continued the next morning, with a formal presentation given by induction orderlies and also an individual interview with the early days staff. Prisoners told us that this had been useful and assisted them to familiarise themselves with wing routines.
- I.13** Regardless of the day of arrival, the main 'second' stage of the induction did not start until the Tuesday of the following week. There was then a full day of presentations on Wednesday, and a further two sessions were run later in the week. The remaining periods were unplanned and, despite a policy of inductees being allowed to associate during these times, we found many to be locked in their cell with nothing to do. There was no tracking system and it was impossible to ascertain who had completed all sessions of the induction.

Recommendations

- I.14 All first night cells should be clean and fully prepared for occupation.**
- I.15 All newly arrived prisoners should be offered a free telephone call to inform family or friends of their arrival at the establishment (subject to public protection measures).**
- I.16 The time taken to complete induction should be reduced, to avoid unnecessary periods of inactivity.**

Housekeeping points

- I.17** Information about the establishment should be provided in holding rooms.
- I.18** Attendance at induction should be monitored, to ensure that all prisoners complete it.

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.19** *Prisoners' perceptions about safety were poorer than at similar prisons and appeared to reflect the significant change in the population. A safer custody strategy was developing but needed further improvements to make it relevant to the issues at the establishment. The new violence reduction tool was a promising idea but had not been well implemented to date. Too few prisoners felt confident in reporting victimisation and there were too few interventions to challenge behaviour and protect victims.*
- I.20** Prisoners' perceptions about safety had not improved. In our survey, more prisoners than at other category C prisons (37% versus 33%) said that they had felt unsafe at some point during their stay at the establishment and more (18% versus 14%) said that they currently felt unsafe. The population at the establishment had changed considerably over the previous few months. The large population of sex offenders, who had been more settled and serving longer sentences, had been moved out to make way for a large number of mainstream prisoners; this had coincided in an increase in the number of violent incidents (which was now similar to that at other prisons). In the previous six months, there had been 37 assaults on prisoners, compared with 19 in the six months before the previous inspection, and 14 fights, compared with six in that earlier period.
- I.21** A new safer custody strategy had begun to take shape but was not sufficiently tailored to the issues specific to the establishment. The strategy had not been informed by a survey of prisoner perceptions about safety, and there was little inclusion of local data, or identification of characteristics or specific action needed.
- I.22** The monthly safer custody meeting was well attended and reviewed the continuous improvement plan. Data analysis at the meeting had improved and included location, type of incident and the number of management and support plans opened each month. However, this needed further development to examine the characteristics of those involved, such as age and disability. Trend analysis had only just restarted so it was too early to see how this informed the action plan.
- I.23** In our survey, prisoners reported a similar level of victimisation from other prisoners and staff as at comparable prisons. However, fewer prisoners said that they had reported it (29% versus 40%). This finding was echoed by prisoners we spoke to, who said that they did not report victimisation for fear of reprisal from other prisoners and a perception that staff would not do enough to protect them (see section on staff–prisoner relationships). We were not assured that all incidents that were reported were investigated.
- I.24** An electronic investigation and management tool had been developed in P-Nomis (electronic case management system) to support victims and identify bullies. It was a promising step forward and meant that all staff had access to the investigation and management plan. However, it had only just been introduced and its use in practice was poor. Some investigations lacked detail, and targets were often missing or were formulaic rather than identifying specific actions which could improve safety, challenge perpetrators and support victims. We found too many daily observations missing or lacking specific detail about behaviours linked to bullying. Other staff (for example, education and gym staff) did not

make regular entries, which limited the evidence gathered. Two prisoners had been trained in mediation techniques but they had not yet taken up post as violence reduction representatives, which was a wasted opportunity.

Recommendations

- I.25 The prison should investigate and take action on prisoners' negative perceptions of their safety.** (Repeated recommendation I.20)
- I.26 The safer custody and violence reduction strategy and action plan should be specific to Brixton and be clearly based on an analysis of data on violent incidents which includes the characteristics of those involved.**
- I.27 Prisoners should feel confident in reporting incidents of bullying and victimisation. All incidents should be investigated thoroughly.**
- I.28 An effective tool for managing perpetrators and supporting victims should be fully implemented, and trained bullying and violence reduction representatives should be in post.**

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.29 *Levels of self-harm had increased but were lower than at comparator prisons. There was no strategy specific to the establishment but the monthly safer custody meeting provided oversight of individuals at risk. Prisoners we spoke to felt well supported through the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) process but case management recording had some significant weaknesses. An adequate number of Listeners were in post but our survey showed that prisoners could not always access them when needed. The location of the constant supervision cell in the segregation unit was not appropriate for prisoners at risk of self-harm.*

- I.30** The number of self-harm incidents was lower than at similar prisons but double that reported at the time of the previous inspection (35 incidents compared with 16). The number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents opened in the previous six months (74) was also lower than that at similar prisons.
- I.31** There had been five deaths in custody since the previous inspection, two of which had been self-inflicted. Sufficient action had been taken against the recommendations in the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman reports but these recommendations were not routinely reviewed at the safer custody meeting or included in the continuous improvement plan, so we were not assured that progress was always maintained.
- I.32** The prison did not have a local self-harm and suicide prevention policy tailored to the circumstances of the establishment or lessons learnt. A safer custody strategy was in the early stages of development but it was not yet detailed enough in relation to issues specific to the establishment (see also section on bullying and violence reduction). The safer custody

meeting provided oversight of those at risk of self-harm, although analysis of data and trends was not yet thorough enough (see also section on bullying and violence reduction).

- I.33** Prisoners at risk of harm told us that they felt well supported by staff and were appreciative of the extra level of observation and interaction they were afforded. The ACCT review we observed was handled well. The quality of ACCT case management documents had deteriorated. Some failed to identify triggers well enough; others had weak care maps, sometimes with objectives that did not address the actual reasons for being in crisis. Few were updated and attendance at reviews was often not sufficiently multidisciplinary.
- I.34** There was an adequate number of Listeners, and they were clear and positive about their role. However, in our survey, similarly to the situation at the time of the previous inspection, fewer prisoners than at similar prisons said that they could access a Listener at any time. The reasons for this negative perception remained unclear and had not been explored but difficulties in moving around the prison were suggested as one obstacle to timely access. The Listener scheme was not well promoted or visible, particularly in reception and during the early days in custody.
- I.35** Constant supervision was provided through the use of a gated cell in the segregation unit, which was an inappropriate environment in which to hold a prisoner in crisis. Constant supervision had been used five times in the previous six months, for relatively short and appropriate lengths of time.

Recommendations

- I.36** **Trend analysis should be used to inform a localised suicide and self-harm prevention strategy.** (Repeated recommendation I.30)
- I.37** **The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management recording should be improved and reviews should be sufficiently multidisciplinary.**
- I.38** **Prisoners' poor perception of access to Listeners when they need it should be explored and addressed.**
- I.39** **The constant supervision cell for those at risk of self-harm should not be located in the segregation unit.**

Housekeeping point

- I.40** The implementation of Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations should be included in the continuous improvement plan and reviewed regularly.

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.41 *Progress had been made in developing a protocol with the local safeguarding adults board but we were not assured that the referral process was effective.*

I.42 Contact with a local safeguarding adults board had been made in preparation for the new Care Bill being introduced in 2015. This had involved discussion about suitability criteria, and a protocol was in development, but the referral process had not yet been tested out in practice and we were not assured that all wing staff were sufficiently familiar with the issues.

Recommendation

I.43 **An effective referral process should be in place to safeguard vulnerable adults.**

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.44 *With the exception of conditions for category D prisoners, security measures were mostly proportionate to the risks posed by the population. Intelligence systems were reasonable and in most cases responded well to emerging threats. Drug testing procedures were reasonable but there was insufficient activity in relation to the increasing use of new psychoactive substances.*

I.45 Despite the prison being designed as a category B remand prison with little free movement across the site, most of the security arrangements were proportionate and reflected those of other category C prisons. However, conditions for most of the category D prisoners on C wing were inappropriately restrictive, with limited access to outside areas and an unnecessary policy of being locked up overnight from 7.30pm. Closed visits were sometimes imposed for non-visits-related activity.

I.46 A drive to improve the flow of intelligence into the security department had been successful, with almost double the number of incident reports (IRs) than at the time of the previous inspection being received each month. This posed a problem for the collators, who were unable to keep up with the flow of information and had to prioritise IRs in order to be able to respond to the more serious issues; this had led to some IRs being almost a month out of

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).

date. Additionally, although the analysis of IRs had improved, there were significant difficulties in accessing training for security analysts; this hampered the prison's ability to analyse data fully.

- I.47** There were excellent partnership arrangements with local and regional police teams, and combined operations had yielded some excellent results which had contributed to drug supply reduction and also disrupted some serious organised crime in the community.
- I.48** The monthly security meetings were well attended by an appropriate range of staff. A wide range of data was considered in order to assess current and emerging risks to the stability and security of the establishment. One of the emerging issues was the availability of spice and other new psychoactive substances. There had been notable and increasingly common finds of spice in the previous three months, with the prison's drug dog playing a key role in its discovery. However, little action had been taken to reduce the threat posed. The supply reduction meeting had not run for almost three months and it was due to become an integral part of the monthly security meeting. The drug and alcohol strategy lacked focus on the challenge posed by the new psychoactive substances, and the action plan was not sufficiently detailed and lacked monitored objectives, and there was no current needs analysis.
- I.49** In our survey, similar numbers of prisoners to those at comparator prisons said that it was easy to obtain drugs or alcohol at the establishment. Mandatory drug testing processes were well managed and met testing targets. The random positive rate for the previous six months was 8.3%, with a year-to-date rate of 8.9%; this represented a major reduction since the time of the previous inspection and from a high of 24% earlier in 2014, and was now similar to that at comparator prisons. However, this was not a reliable indicator of drug use as spice was not detectable.

Recommendations

- I.50** **The physical security and regime arrangements should be revised to reflect conditions which are appropriate to category D prisoners.**
- I.51** **Visits restrictions should only be imposed in response to visits-related activities.**
- I.52** **Intelligence reports should be processed within 48 hours of receipt by the security department.**
- I.53** **The drug and alcohol strategy should be informed by an up-to-date needs assessment and reflect the current challenges of drug availability, including new psychoactive substances such as spice. The supply reduction meeting should be held regularly, to ensure an appropriate focus on the current substance misuse challenges.**
- I.54** **The prison should ensure that all measures identified in the supply reduction strategy are in place. (Repeated recommendation I.45)**

Incentives and earned privileges³

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.55 *The incentives and earned privileges scheme was used effectively to manage behaviour. Prisoners in our survey were negative about the fairness of the system. Those on the basic level were well managed and were able to attend off-wing activities. Managerial oversight was effective.*

I.56 The prison ran the ‘London male IEP scheme’, in line with the rest of the region. In our survey, fewer prisoners than elsewhere said that the scheme was fair and that it encouraged behavioural improvement. However, we found that there was sufficient opportunity for those on the basic regime (34) to progress back to standard, and recent changes to procedures meant that they could continue in employment or education while on the basic level, giving them the opportunity to demonstrate an improvement in behaviour.

I.57 Overall, we considered the scheme to be applied reasonably, although we were not convinced that the process to notify prisoners when they received a ‘red’ warning for poor behaviour was sufficiently robust

I.58 The scheme was well publicised and made clear to prisoners during the induction process. Management oversight was effective and electronic case notes showed a good level of scrutiny of the process.

Housekeeping point

I.59 Prisoners should be notified in writing about the receipt of a ‘red’ warning.

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.60 *Monitoring and managerial oversight of adjudications, segregation and the use of force had improved. The number of adjudications was in line with that at other category C prisons, and processes were sound. Levels of use of force were very low, and fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons were segregated – and usually only for short periods.*

³ In the previous report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

Disciplinary procedures

- I.61** The number of adjudications was similar to that at comparator prisons, at around 100 per month, with the independent adjudicator hearing around 20 of the more serious charges each month.
- I.62** Procedures were sound and there was a good level of managerial oversight, with a regular adjudication standardisation meeting and a system of quality control whereby the deputy governor reviewed a random sample of 10% of adjudications and provided individual and group feedback as appropriate.

The use of force

- I.63** The level of use of force was very low, at around a third of that at comparator prisons. There had been a slight increase with the change of population (see section on bullying and violence reduction). Documentation was mostly completed to a reasonable standard, although there were a few incomplete dossiers dating back to the beginning of 2014.
- I.64** There were three recorded uses of special accommodation during 2014. None of the records had been fully completed and records showed that two of the prisoners had shown a reasonable level of compliance, and had asked to be removed from this accommodation considerably before they had actually been removed, in one case over 21 hours later.
- I.65** The use of force committee had recently been reinstated and reviewed all incidents but there was no trend analysis and no reviewing of video recordings of incidents. We found the video-recording of planned incidents to be inconsistent and not all incidents were available to be viewed.
- I.66** There had been one recorded incident of a baton being drawn (but not used); it had been drawn appropriately, to protect staff, and had been withdrawn at an early opportunity during the de-escalation of a particularly difficult incident.

Recommendations

- I.67** **Recording and management oversight of the use of force, including special accommodation, should be effective.** (Repeated recommendation I.57)
- I.68** **The use of force committee should regularly review video recordings of all planned use of force incidents and should analyse data to establish emerging trends and areas of particular concern.**

Segregation

- I.69** Use of the small, six-cell, segregation unit was low, and around half that at comparator prisons. There were, on average, fewer than four prisoners housed there at any one time and most prisoners were located there for relatively short periods.
- I.70** The fabric of the unit was poor, and we were told that an underground stream caused significant problems with damp. There was an ongoing painting programme but wall surfaces continued to 'blister' and crumble, and one of the cells was out of action.

- I.71** Monitoring processes were very good and there was a comprehensive system that covered a range of data, such as ethnicity, length of stay, original location and religion. The segregation monitoring and review group met regularly to review these data and to investigate any anomalies.
- I.72** There was no formal reintegration policy but an impressive 85% of all prisoners located there during 2014 had returned to normal location at the establishment. Most of the remainder had been transferred for security reasons.
- I.73** The regime on the unit was minimal, although there was some limited 'association', with prisoners exercising together on the large, but bare, yard.

Recommendations

- I.74** **Sufficient investment should be made to resolve the structural and decorative issues in the segregation unit accommodation.**
- I.75** **The regime for prisoners in the segregation unit should be improved.** (Repeated recommendation I.64)

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.76 *Clinical substance use services were good, with appropriate identification of risk and flexible prescribing for individual need. Psychosocial support was very good and all prisoners could access both individual support and programmes. The new drug recovery wing provided a positive environment for prisoners abstaining or reducing their dependency.*

- I.77** There were approximately 64 prisoners on opiate substitution, with most based on the newly located drug recovery wing (D wing) and A wing. Treatment regimes were flexible and prisoners were appropriately involved in their own treatment plans. There were regular reviews, with multidisciplinary involvement, and prisoners could request reviews. Prisoners we spoke to said that they had been actively involved in treatment decisions. Dual diagnosis (the co-existence of mental health and substance misuse problems) needs were managed through the substance use prescriber, who was a psychiatrist, and also good working links with the mental health team.
- I.78** Supervision of administration by nurses was good but supervision by officers was confined to A wing and was not sufficiently vigilant.
- I.79** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons (77% versus 62%) said that they had received support for their drug problem, and more than at the time of the previous inspection (70% versus 50%) that they had received help for alcohol problems.
- I.80** The new drug recovery wing was a positive development and prisoners there told us that they felt well supported. The range of phased interventions offered on the wing, coupled with selected and supportive staff, provided a thoughtful therapeutic approach and provided a positive environment for men to prepare for release. There were eight peer supporters,

who were present on all wings and were well used. Prisoners on the drug recovery wing signed compacts to undergo drug testing to help them in reducing and managing their dependency; however, staff shortages had led to few tests actually being completed.

- I.81** Psychosocial support was provided to 284 prisoners by Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt). Staff provided both individual support and a balanced range of programmes, accessible to all prisoners. These incorporated a blend of intensive and brief interventions and pathways to abstinence and harm reduction, and included alcohol support. There were regular Narcotics Anonymous and Cocaine Anonymous meetings. Service user feedback mechanisms were included within each programme and prisoners could feed back individual concerns or complaints to RAPt.
- I.82** There were good working relationships between the RAPt team, the prison and the health care department, with appropriate contributions to multidisciplinary meetings, including ACCT review, pre-release continuity of care, and supply and reduction meetings.

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** *External areas were clean and tidy. Internal areas were much improved but too many prisoners still shared cramped, poorly equipped cells designed for one. Access to clothing and cleaning materials was good. Prisoners had little confidence in the application process.*
- 2.2** External areas of the prison were clean and tidy, with minimal litter. Inside the prison, although the cleanliness of communal areas had greatly improved, it varied markedly between these areas, even though there were many wing cleaners (see section on learning and skills and work activities). There was an ongoing painting programme, using prisoners from the painting and decorating course.
- 2.3** The condition of many cells was grim. The prison's capacity had increased since the previous inspection, which meant that even more of the small and cramped single cells (around 50%) were used to hold two prisoners; this was unusual and unacceptable for a training and resettlement prison (see main recommendation S50). There was often insufficient furniture for two, and it was often in a poor condition, and many in-cell toilets were poorly screened. Very few prisoners had access to a lockable cabinet in which to keep valuables secure. Access to cleaning materials was good and the offensive displays policy was adhered to well.
- 2.4** Access to showers was very good and some screening had improved but remained inadequate on the larger wings. Many shower areas were dirty, damp and poorly maintained. Prisoners (except those on the basic regime) could wear their own clothes and each wing had its own laundry. Prison-issue clothes and bedding were in reasonable condition and kit change procedures were regular. Most kit stores on the wings were well stocked; there was a shortage of towels but this was rectified during the inspection.
- 2.5** Prisoners had little confidence in the application system and considered the process to be poor, with a lack of response or help. Only 26% (versus 44 % in comparator prisons) said that applications were dealt with quickly (within seven days). There was no tracking system and many prisoners told us that they often had to resubmit applications in order to get a response.
- 2.6** Emergency cell call bells were generally answered quickly during the inspection but there was no managerial oversight, and in our survey only 30% of prisoners said that call bells were responded to within five minutes.
- 2.7** Access to telephones was reasonable but the early lock-up meant that, for many, contacting families who were out during the day was problematic (see section on time out of cell) and prisoners complained that this also impacted on the cost of calls.
- 2.8** Mail processes were efficient and personal letters, including those from the 'email a prisoner' scheme, were usually distributed on the day of arrival. Outgoing mail was usually dispatched on the day after posting, following the necessary security and public protection checks.

Procedures for managing Rule 39 (privileged mail) were appropriate and the small number of errors (usually due to poor marking of R39 on the envelope) were recorded and explained to prisoners.

Recommendations

- 2.9 Toilets in cells on A, B and G wings should be appropriately screened.** (Repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 2.10 All showers should be clean, well maintained and screened to provide full privacy.**
- 2.11 Prisoner applications should be tracked to ensure completion and to raise prisoner confidence in the system.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.12** Response times to cell call bells should be monitored to ensure that they are answered within five minutes.

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.

2.13 *Most prisoners said that staff generally treated them respectfully but we were not assured that enough staff had made the shift to dealing with longer-term prisoners. Some prisoners told us that staff were unhelpful. Electronic case note entries were mostly good and were appropriately overseen by managers. Prisoner consultation arrangements were good.*

- 2.14** Most prisoners said that staff treated them respectfully but that some were unhelpful and rarely spoke to them on association, and that it was difficult to get things done, even through formal applications (see section on residential units). The environment was still not sufficiently supportive (see main recommendation S51).
- 2.15** We saw some good, supportive interactions between staff and prisoners, both face to face and reported within P-Nomis (electronic case notes), but this was not universal and we were not convinced that all staff understood the different approach required for longer-term supportive relationships with a static population (see main recommendation S51).
- 2.16** We sampled 20 randomly selected electronic case notes and found regular qualitative entries in most and a good level of managerial oversight, with entries reflecting achievements and also behavioural issues. As at the previous inspection, there was little evidence of personal officers contributing to sentence plans or offender assessment system (OASys) reviews.
- 2.17** Consultation arrangements were good. There were many prisoner representatives, some of whom attended meetings at both wing and establishment level, the minutes of which reflected responses to requests and issues raised.

Recommendation

- 2.18** Personal officers should contribute to sentence planning boards and offender assessment system (OASys) reviews where appropriate. (Repeated recommendation 2.20)

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.19** *The strategic management of equality and diversity had improved but there remained areas of significant weakness. Insufficient consultation and delays in responding to adverse monitoring data left the establishment ill-equipped to explain the negative results in our survey for black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners, and those with disabilities. While there was evidence of some improved outcomes for some prisoners in minority groups, we were not satisfied that the needs of all were being met.*

Strategic management

- 2.20** There was a brief overarching equality and diversity policy, and separate documents for foreign national, older and transgender prisoners, and those with disabilities. Policy was underdeveloped for those areas not covered by separate documents.
- 2.21** The equality action team meeting, chaired by the deputy governor, met regularly and was reasonably well attended. The meeting showed some purposeful engagement with matters raised but there was insufficient attention to longer-term planning, and the equality action plan required substantial revision to establish future priorities for action, with deadlines. There had been no programme of equality impact assessments until shortly before the inspection.
- 2.22** As with other prisons, the establishment had found the new national equality monitoring tool less intuitive to use than the old monitoring system, and it had been slow to respond to data indicating possible discrimination. The new tool was not comprehensive as it did not collate data about the treatment of foreign nationals.
- 2.23** An equality officer had been appointed at the beginning of 2014 but, until about two months before the inspection, had been redeployed too often for the demands placed on the role.
- 2.24** There was insufficient consultation with protected groups. When held, forums showed some useful engagement with prisoners which resulted in improved outcomes.

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

- 2.25** Only 19 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted in the previous six months, little more than the low number recorded at the time of the previous inspection. The Zahid Mubarek Trust had been asked to investigate the reasons for this. Many DIRF investigations took too long to complete. Records of investigations we looked at often lacked detail and it was therefore unclear if they were all fully investigated. Not all DIRFs were quality checked by the deputy governor, or by any senior manager.

Recommendations

- 2.26** **Equality monitoring data should include foreign nationals and be assessed promptly to help ensure equality of outcomes for different minority groups.**
- 2.27** **The prison should hold regular forums and consultation with prisoners across each of the main diversity strands.**
- 2.28** **All discrimination incident report forms should be monitored effectively and checked by a senior manager to ensure a full and prompt investigation.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.29** Equality and diversity action plans should be kept under review and set out future priorities for action, with deadlines.

Protected characteristics

- 2.30** At the time of the inspection, 61% of prisoners were from a black and minority ethnic background and 28% were Muslim. In our survey, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners reported more negatively than white and non-Muslim prisoners, respectively, across a broad range of important indicators, including respectful treatment by staff. There had been no forums with black and minority ethnic prisoners since June 2014 and none with Muslim prisoners. Not enough was being done to understand their concerns, and investigations of adverse data for these groups, obtained from the equality monitoring tool, were not investigated promptly.
- 2.31** In our survey, 4% of respondents identified themselves as being from Gypsy/Romany/Traveller communities; this suggested a prison population of about 28, but the prison had only identified nine. An external charity, the Irish Chaplaincy, provided good one-to-one support to these prisoners but there was insufficient information sharing between the support worker and the equality officer to enable the prison to understand the needs of prisoners in this group better.
- 2.32** There were 81 foreign national prisoners, many of whom were facing complex deportation proceedings. There had been only one dedicated forum for foreign national prisoners in the previous year, which had taken place a week before the inspection. Home Office immigration staff visited the prison twice a week and the equality officer provided good support to this group, but no free independent legal advice was available and not all prisoners could afford to pay for it.
- 2.33** Although the prison was diligent in informing the Home Office of prisoners whose sentences were nearing completion, some such prisoners were told only shortly before their release that they were going to be detained, which could have caused unnecessary distress. Eleven men were being held solely on immigration powers at the time of the inspection.

- 2.34** The establishment was not confident that its identification of prisoners with disabilities was accurate as records contained historical data on temporary disabilities which were out of date. It was taking steps to review its information on such prisoners. There was evidence of some good outcomes for many prisoners with disabilities, including older prisoners, and most told us that they felt reasonably well cared for. However, procedures were not consistently implemented and so not all needs were being met.
- 2.35** Evacuation and care planning for these prisoners was inadequate. Only four prisoners had a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP), which was low, considering that 16% of prisoners in our survey considered themselves to have a disability and we met several prisoners who required a PEEP but did not have one. Some staff were unclear of the evacuation needs of prisoners with PEEPs. Parts of the prison, including the chapel and education classes, were difficult to access for prisoners with disabilities. It was unclear why two prisoners with mobility difficulties were located on a wing with showers on the second floor. Only two prisoners with disabilities had care plans, but these were not available on wing files and staff we spoke to were unaware of them. A paid carer scheme had recently been introduced but no prisoners were yet receiving such support.
- 2.36** In our survey, 32% of prisoners with disabilities said that they currently felt unsafe, compared with 16% without a disability. Some with restricted mobility expressed fears for their safety, although this concerned being jostled in crowded areas rather than a fear of violence.
- 2.37** Work with older prisoners had improved. Retirement pay was sufficient and retired prisoners were unlocked during the core day. The prison had just started an older prisoners' club (the 'Old Boys Club'). It had begun to develop a programme of activities for the club, including dedicated gym and library sessions, and there were plans to build on this, developing links with outside support agencies.
- 2.38** In our survey, around 3% of prisoners identified themselves as gay or bisexual. There had been little provision for this group in the previous year, but the prison had just begun to promote the Bent Bars pen-pal service.
- 2.39** There had been no transgender prisoners since 2012, but the transgender policy described appropriate support for such prisoners.

Recommendations

- 2.40** **Foreign national prisoners liable to deportation should have effective access to independent legal representation. Those who cannot afford to pay for it should be offered free advice.**
- 2.41** **The Home Office should serve all decisions to detain a person under immigration powers at least one month before the end of a prisoner's custodial sentence expiry date.**
- 2.42** **Prisoners with disabilities should have an up-to-date personal emergency evacuation and care plans where necessary, and all wing staff should be aware of them.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.43** The prison should implement its paid carer scheme.

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.

2.44 *Faith provision was good and pastoral care provision strong. There was particularly good resettlement support through mentoring.*

- 2.45** In our survey, 54% of prisoners said that their religious beliefs were respected, which was similar to the comparator, and more Muslim than non-Muslim prisoners responded positively to this survey question (64% versus 51%). The chaplaincy team comprising of employed sessional and volunteer chaplains, covered the diverse religious affiliations of the prison population.
- 2.46** The chaplaincy was generally well run. However, only 37% of prisoners said that they had had access to a chaplain/religious leader when they first arrived, compared with 51% at similar prisoners. Chaplaincy data confirmed that some prisoners were not seen by a member of the team when they first arrived.
- 2.47** The chapel was large and well lit, but had not been decorated in some years and was shabby. It could be converted for use for other services, including Muslim worship, and the Muslim chaplain was satisfied with the arrangements for this.
- 2.48** There was strong pastoral care provision, which included regular engagement with prisoners on family issues and bereavement support. Chaplains were visible on the wings during the inspection and older prisoners and those with disabilities told us that they regularly saw a chaplain. Prisoners in segregation and those on an assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) were visited daily.
- 2.49** There was a wide range of faith-related classes and courses. The Faith in the Future course made a positive contribution to the prison's resettlement work. There was some particularly good provision for mentoring and support of prisoners on release.

Housekeeping point

- 2.50** All prisoners should be seen by a chaplain within 24 hours of arriving in the prison.

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.

2.51 *Prisoners expressed a lack of confidence in the complaints process but we were assured that the responses were generally fair and respectful. Monitoring and quality assurance arrangements for complaints against staff were very good but less so for others.*

2.52 There had been 1,122 complaints in the previous six months, which was similar to the number at comparable prisons. In our survey, only 37% of prisoners said that complaints were dealt with fairly, which was similar to the comparator. However, the complaints log showed that 44% of complaints had been upheld and most complaint responses we looked at were fair, although not all responses addressed all the issues raised.

2.53 Just 27% of prisoners in our survey said that complaints were dealt with quickly. According to the complaints log, very few responses had been late. The logging and management of some complaints for which a holding response had been sent were ineffective and we were not assured that they had been responded to promptly, or at all.

2.54 Monitoring and quality assurance arrangements for complaints against staff were very good, but we were not as satisfied with arrangements for other complaints. Although some good analysis of such complaints was sent to the senior management team, the minutes of their meetings recorded no comments or actions in relation to them.

Recommendation

2.55 **The prison should explore prisoner's limited confidence in the discrimination incident and general complaints processes and take action to address it. This should include informing prisoners of the results of regular analysis of the patterns and trends of complaints and the response to them.** (Repeated recommendation 2.42).

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.

2.56 *There was little support for prisoners with their legal problems. Arrangements for legal visits were adequate.*

2.57 There were no trained legal services officers to help prisoners with their legal problems, although we were told that offender supervisors could help to signpost prisoners to a legal representative.

- 2.58** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that it was easy to communicate with a legal representative, attend legal visits and get legal books from the library. Effective access to the library was limited (see also section on learning and skills and work activities) but we found that arrangements for legal visits were adequate and assured confidentiality.

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.

- 2.59** *Health services were effective and prisoners generally expressed satisfaction with them. Access to health care professionals was usually good, although did-not-attend rates were too high for some clinics. Patients waited too long in the health centre waiting room before and after their appointments. New and clear approaches to health emergency responses by prison, health and ambulance services had been agreed and introduced since the previous inspection. Pharmacy services were very good and access to on-wing pharmacy clinics represented exemplary practice. Medicines management was very good but safe administration of medicines was sometimes compromised by a lack of supervision on the wings. Mental health services had been improved by being fully integrated with a wider staff skills mix and an impressive array of therapeutic options.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.60** Health services were commissioned by NHS England London and provided by Care UK; some activities were sub-contracted to other providers. The health needs assessment was out of date but was due to be repeated following the change to the prison's population. Oversight of performance and clinical governance was good, with collaborative working relationships. In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons (51% versus 42%) said that the overall quality of health care was good.
- 2.61** Approximately eight health care complaints per month had been submitted since April 2014. Responses had been appropriate and offered apologies where necessary. The general complaints system had been amended to introduce a confidential component for health care complaints but only one in 10 prisoners were aware of this.
- 2.62** Health promotion was evident, with campaigning on the wings and occasional health promotion days, but there was no prison-wide strategy to promote health and well-being.
- 2.63** There was a well-organised system of health representatives and a regular forum for discussion. Additionally, regular Care UK surveys of service users yielded useful data.
- 2.64** Long-term disease management met individual needs, with a GP providing most of the care. Nurses had begun to run several clinics following some training. A more sophisticated approach to clinical training was planned for 2015, which would enhance the service. Mandatory training for health services staff was up to date, including basic life support, and clinicians received regular clinical supervision.

- 2.65** There were relevant policies on communicable diseases, infection control, blood-borne viruses, immunisation and information sharing. Health services staff had received some guidance on the management of Ebola (a serious communicable disease) outbreaks. Condoms were available in the prison but this was not advertised.
- 2.66** Around 36% of prisoners were aged 29 years or younger and one in 10 were aged 50 years or above. There were appropriate testing and immunisation programmes available to these groups. A nurse led on the care of older prisoners and health issues had been discussed at the 'Old Boys Club'. (See section on Equality and Diversity).
- 2.67** The health centre was dated, but functional. It was generally clean, although wing treatment rooms were poor in places and, despite limited refurbishment, several had grubby floors. The treatment rooms in reception had no hand-washing facilities, and some fixtures and fittings did not meet infection control compliance standards. Infection control was audited and there was an action plan to address some of the issues.
- 2.68** New and clear approaches to health emergency responses by prison, health and ambulance services had been agreed and introduced since the previous inspection. These, in part, responded to concerns from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman following deaths in custody. Staff expressed confidence that there would be a rapid and appropriate response to emergency events. Resuscitation equipment, including automated defibrillators, was held in the main health centre and the wing offices, and was accessible to prison staff. Eleven prison staff had been trained to use a defibrillator, and a further 25 in first aid; these individuals were deployed when health services staff were not on site.

Recommendation

- 2.69 Prisoners should be able to report health care complaints confidentially.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.57)

Housekeeping points

- 2.70** There should be a prison-wide strategy to promote health and well-being.
- 2.71** Nurses should receive clinically certificated training, or equivalent, in the management of long-term conditions.
- 2.72** The availability of condoms should be made known to prisoners.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.73** In our survey, the percentage of respondents who rated as good or very good the service provided by the GP was 57% (against the 47% comparator) and by the nurse was 60% (which was in line with the comparator but better than at the time of the previous inspection), and we observed a good-humoured but professional rapport between nurses and prisoners.
- 2.74** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at similar prisons (32% versus 55%) said that they had received information on health services after arrival at the establishment and we did not see written information being issued at reception. The reception screening we observed was thorough and identified key risks on arrival, and it combined elements of a secondary health assessment.

- 2.75** Prisoners could see a nurse daily on the wings and were able to seek advice and treatments at minor ailments clinics run by the pharmacist. Access to health services overall was good. Most prisoners waited no more than three days for a routine appointment. The consultations we saw were good, with appropriate follow-through of long-term conditions.
- 2.76** There were regular GP clinics, and waiting times were reasonable. However, 15% of patients did not attend for appointments, which was too high. Out-of-hours services were provided by Care UK, with a doctor on call; this was a telephone advice line only, with no option for a GP visit to the prison.
- 2.77** There were regular visits by a podiatrist, optician and physiotherapist. However, prisoners waited too long (14 weeks) to see the podiatrist. The did-not-attend rate for the optometrist was 28%, which was unacceptable. There was good use of specialist nursing skills for tuberculosis screening and care; nursing and pharmacy staff were trained to perform plain chest X-rays. During the inspection, the X-ray facility was not in use, for contractual reasons, which represented a lapse in service efficiency. Patients waited too long in the health centre atrium waiting room before and after their appointments.
- 2.78** The SystmOne electronic clinical records we reviewed were appropriately completed and subject to clinical audit.
- 2.79** External hospital appointments were well managed, with rare cancellations due to a lack of escorting staff.

Recommendations

- 2.80** **Did-not-attend rates and waiting times should be subject to sustained management action to drive them down.**
- 2.81** **The out-of-hours medical cover should emulate the service provided in the community.**
- 2.82** **The X-ray facility should be available to patients as required by clinicians.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.83** Prisoners should receive information on how to access health services, in a format they can read, when they enter the prison.

Pharmacy

- 2.84** Pharmacy services were provided by Care UK, and medicines were supplied in a timely and appropriate manner. The two pharmacists ran on-wing medicine reviews and asthma, smoking cessation, minor ailment and addiction clinics, some of which we observed.
- 2.85** Clear records for supply and administration were maintained on SystmOne. In our survey, 74% of patients said that they had their medicines in-possession. For most of them, completed risk assessments were attached to their records, but we found one patient for whom the prescriber had stated that the medicines were in possession but had not completed a risk assessment.

- 2.86** Medicines were administered by nursing staff from treatment rooms on the wings via hatches into the main corridors. We saw staff preparing for methadone administrations; there was a large, rowdy queue outside and no officer present. Nursing staff said that they would not start the administration until an officer arrived but we observed other general medicine queues that were not closely supervised.
- 2.87** Storage of medicines was good. The health care block had a large waiting room in the atrium, and controlled drug deliveries were taken past patients when they arrived at the gate. Only one member of staff took the delivery and they did not have a walkie-talkie radio, although officers were usually present.
- 2.88** The medicines and therapeutics committee met every five weeks and there was good attendance from stakeholders, but detailed prescribing data was not discussed. Written policies were up to date and had been reviewed in 2013. Prescribing levels of medicines liable to diversion were generally low, although 52 patients were currently being prescribed mirtazapine (an antidepressant often used to aid sleep), which was relatively high; the pharmacist was reviewing this.

Recommendation

- 2.89 Medication administration should be adequately supervised, to ensure privacy and compliance, and reduce the risk of bullying and diversion** (Repeated recommendation 2.80)

Housekeeping point

- 2.90** Two staff members should transport controlled drugs around the prison when cells are unlocked, with one of these having a walkie-talkie radio.

Good practice

- 2.91** *On-wing pharmacy-led clinics were delivered regularly.*

Dentistry

- 2.92** Prisoners' access to dental checks, oral health promotion and appropriate treatments was very good. There was no waiting list for urgent appointments and the wait for non-urgent treatment was a reasonable five weeks, although the did-not-attend rate, at 13.7% in September 2014, was too high (see recommendation 2.80). The dental facilities were functional and the required safety certifications were up to date. The migration of decontamination facilities into another room to satisfy best practice compliance was under way.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.93** Mental health services were very good. In our survey, more prisoners with emotional well-being or mental health problems than at comparator establishments said that they had received support (58% versus 50%). No uniformed officers had received training in mental health awareness since their induction, which potentially meant that they would fail to recognise when to refer prisoners to mental health practitioners.

- 2.94** Barnet, Enfield and Haringey NHS Trust (BET) provided an integrated mental health service. There were six mental health practitioners, from nursing, occupational therapy, psychiatry and psychology backgrounds, offering an impressive array of short- and long-term one-to-one and group therapies. On average, therapists had 10 people on their case loads, which enabled in-depth therapeutic work.
- 2.95** There was an open referral system and a weekly single point referral meeting, which allocated prisoners to appointments; the target of initial assessment within 72 hours of referral was usually met.
- 2.96** There was a separate counselling service and bereavement support available from the chaplaincy. BET was working to support Certitude (a charity) to introduce a peer mentoring scheme designed to support people with mental health problems in and beyond the prison, which looked promising.
- 2.97** There had been two patients transferred under the Mental Health Act in 2014. One had transferred to another prison to effect access to an NHS bed and the second had taken a week longer than the expected transfer time to enter the NHS.

Recommendation

- 2.98** **Prison officers should be trained to recognise when a prisoner requires assistance from mental health practitioners.**

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

2.99 *Prisoners' satisfaction with food had improved, although breakfast packs were still too small and served on the evening before consumption. Prisoners were involved in cooking food and could gain National Vocational Qualifications.*

- 2.100** In our survey, 43% of prisoners said that the food provided was good or very good, which was considerably better than the comparator (25%) and than at the time of the previous inspection (29%). Black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners expressed similar levels of satisfaction to other prisoners.
- 2.101** Pre-select menus provided a wide range of meals, including at least one hot meal a day. Prisoners told us that menu items could sometimes run out so they could not get the meal they had selected, although we were assured that the catering manager was actively managing the problem. Breakfast packs were distributed on the evening before consumption and were too small.
- 2.102** There were good arrangements to ensure that food was served hot from the wing serveries, although it was sometimes cold on the segregation unit. Arrangements were being made to address this problem. The service of food we observed was well supervised. Due to a lack of space, it was not possible for most prisoners to dine in association and many had to take them in cramped cells with unscreened toilets.

- 2.103** The main kitchen was new and well equipped. Kitchen areas were clean and food was appropriately stored. However, during our night visit we found that some serveries had not been cleaned properly.
- 2.104** Prisoners working in the kitchen were well supervised. They were involved in the preparation and cooking of food and, in addition to acquiring useful skills, could obtain National Vocational Qualifications at levels 1 and 2.

Recommendations

- 2.105 Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are meant to be eaten.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.109)
- 2.106 Prisoners on the main wings should be able to eat out of their cells.** (Repeated recommendation 2.110)

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.107 *Orderlies were involved in the distribution of goods, potentially leaving prisoners open to victimisation. The range of goods was adequate and arrangements were generally satisfactory*

- 2.108** In our survey, only 14% of prisoners said that they had had access to the prison shop on arrival, against the 21% comparator. On arrival, prisoners were offered a reception pack (which contained basic grocery items) but could then wait up to 11 days for their first full shop order. Prisoners told us that shop prices were too high.
- 2.109** Shop goods were distributed to prisoners each Saturday. Orderlies were involved in the process and we were concerned that this potentially left prisoners open to victimisation as orderlies would be aware of prisoners receiving large quantities of highly valued goods – tobacco, for example.
- 2.110** In addition to the shop list, goods could be ordered from four catalogues, and no administration fee was charged.

Recommendations

- 2.111 The cost of items in the prison shop list, including telephone credit, should be in line with that in the community** (Repeated recommendation 2.117).
- 2.112 The prison should ensure that arrangements for the distribution of shop goods do not increase the risk of victimisation.**

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.⁵

3.1 *The amount of time out of cell had improved for those in activities but was still too limited for others, and too many prisoners were locked in their cell during the core day. Some prisoners had evening association but others were locked up from early evening until the following lunchtime. Exercise times were too short. Some core day timetables displayed on the wings were out of date.*

3.2 The amount of time out of cell had improved and was now good, at over 10 hours a day for those in employment. However, it remained poor for those not in activities, at less than four hours each weekday. In addition, we found too many prisoners (28%) locked up during the working day (see section on learning and skills and work activities).

3.3 Some prisoners were granted more time out of cell than others because of their status. Most prisoners did not have access to evening association and were locked up too early, at 6.15pm, during the week, which hindered contact with family and friends. Category D prisoners had evening association but only those going out to work on release on temporary licence (ROTL) had privacy keys to their cells and could stay out until after 10pm; they were then locked in their cells for the night. The lock-up of category D prisoners was unnecessary (see section on security) and not in line with procedures for such prisoners nationally. Those on the drug recovery wing, enhanced prisoners and some workers also had additional time out of their cell during weekday evenings.

3.4 Outdoor exercise periods were too short, at only 30 minutes on weekdays. However, those on C wing had access to the yard all day. Most exercise areas were bare, with little seating or other features.

3.5 We found a number of different core day timetables publicised, which was confusing. However, actual core day timings were adhered to and association/domestic periods were rarely cancelled.

Recommendations

3.6 Evening association should be available to all, to promote family contact.

3.7 All category D prisoners should have privacy keys to their cells and they should not be locked in their cells during the evening and night.

3.8 All prisoners should have at least one hour of outdoor exercise each day, in yards which are adequately equipped.

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

Housekeeping point

3.9 All wings should publicise their most up-to-date core day timetable.

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.

3.10 *The prison had made good progress in improving the learning and skills provision but more was required. There were sufficient purposeful activity places for all prisoners. However, too many remained on the residential wings during the working day without an allocated activity and many others were under-employed in low-skilled wing work, which did not sufficiently occupy them. Prison staff had made rapid progress in improving the learning and skills provision. There was a good focus on the development of employability-related skills and a wide range of vocational training. The prison worked well with local voluntary agencies and employers that provided high-quality placements for prisoners on release on temporary licence in the community. Partnership working between the prison and A4e Justice was good and the range of education courses broadly met the needs of prisoners, although too few programmes were provided at levels 2 and 3. The achievements of prisoners had improved but were not yet good enough, particularly in English and mathematics. The library was adequate but access was limited.*

3.11 *Ofsted⁶ 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>requires improvement</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

3.12 Prison senior managers had made rapid improvements in learning and skills and work, including opening a new activities centre. This provided additional work areas for vocational training and significantly enhanced PE facilities. A comprehensive and accurate needs analysis had been completed and, as a result, the development of vocational training clearly reflected the needs of the local labour market. There were plans to provide more construction industry-focused vocational training – for example, dry lining and plastering.

3.13 Joint working between the prison and A4e Justice (the Learning and Skills provider) had improved. However, a planned curriculum review was overdue and more work was needed

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

to increase the range of provision at levels 2 and 3, fully to meet the identified needs of prisoners in a training and resettlement prison (see section on provision of activities and recommendation 3.27). The education and vocational training provided by A4e Justice required improvement.

- 3.14** Self-assessment and quality improvement planning processes were well established and provided the prison with an accurate evaluation of what was working well and what needed to be improved. Judgements in the content of the self-assessment report included all relevant areas of the prison. However, most targets were insufficiently specific.
- 3.15** A4e Justice collected accurate overall data on prisoners' participation and achievements but this was not used sufficiently well to identify variations in performance between groups of prisoners and set targets for improvement.
- 3.16** Improvements in the quality of teaching, learning and assessment were ongoing. Managers had successfully eradicated inadequate classroom teaching and learning. However, there was frequently insufficient evaluation of the progress that prisoners made in acquiring new skills in learning sessions, and managers did not always follow up adequately on tutors' action plans and areas for improvement (see section on quality of provision and recommendations 3.36 and 3.37).

Recommendations

- 3.17** **Prison managers should develop further the self-assessment and quality assurance process to ensure that actions to improve the provision are prioritised, specific and measurable, and aimed at improving further prisoners' outcomes.**
- 3.18** **Managers should analyse participation and achievement data to identify variations in performance and set targets for improvement.**

Provision of activities

- 3.19** The new activities building had helped to increase the number of activity places available and there were now sufficient for the population. However, places were significantly underutilised. The processes for allocating prisoners to purposeful activities and monitoring their attendance were not delivered effectively. At the time of the inspection, about a third of prisoners remained on the wings during the core day. Of these, approximately 40 prisoners were waiting to be allocated to an activity (see main recommendation S52). A further 80 refused to engage in activities; wing staff had not made sufficient effort to identify and ensure they did so. Prison managers had recently implemented new processes to identify and reduce the number of prisoners refusing to work but it was too early to measure their impact.
- 3.20** Prisoners' induction to purposeful activity was generally well managed and timely, so that most received guidance within a week of arriving at the prison. Staff had improved the arrangements for the initial assessment of prisoners' skill levels before they started in education or work. They mostly used this well to place prisoners on appropriate courses, although they did not direct enough prisoners with low-level skills in English and mathematics to courses in these subjects.

- 3.21** A4e Justice provided approximately 100 full-time and 240 part-time education places. The education curriculum had expanded well. The range included English; mathematics; information and communications technology; English for speakers of other languages; peer mentoring; information, advice and guidance; web design; graphics art; business administration and 'work ready' programmes. Most were accredited but provided too few opportunities at levels 2 and 3.
- 3.22** There was insufficient provision of English and mathematics to meet fully the needs of the population. Managers had started to implement a good strategy to prioritise improving prisoners' skills in English and mathematics. However, participation rates were still too low.
- 3.23** Approximately 80 prisoners were enrolled onto distance learning and Open University courses, which was impressive, but there was insufficient provision at level 3. The percentage of prisoners participating in education classes, at only 63%, was similar to that at the time of the previous inspection, and was too low.
- 3.24** Since the previous inspection, managers had worked effectively to broaden the range of vocational courses available. Approximately 200 full-time places were currently available. However, there were insufficient progression opportunities to level 2 and above.
- 3.25** Vocational training took place in well-equipped facilities which closely replicated industry standards, such as the barbering salon, the painting and decorating bays and the construction workshop. These complemented the already excellent facilities in The Clink Restaurant and Bad Boys' Bakery, which provided good training in catering, baking and customer service skills in realistic commercial settings. Effective partnerships with Bounce Back (a charity focused on the training and employment of ex-offenders) provided good post-release employment opportunities for prisoners.
- 3.26** The range of work opportunities was limited and included orderlies, wing cleaners and painters; kitchen and servery workers; peer mentors and a variety of prisoner representatives. Much of this work was low-level work on the wings, which did not provide sufficient opportunities for skills development and failed to establish the disciplines required by employers. The non-accredited work skills developed in the prison and in ROTL placements were not recognised or recorded.

Recommendations

- 3.27** **Managers should ensure that there are enough relevant progression opportunities in education and vocational training to level 2 and above. Sufficient English and mathematics provision should be available to meet all prisoners' assessed needs.**
- 3.28** **Prisoners' acquisition of work and employment skills should be systematically recognised and recorded to ensure that they are aware of their progress in the development of their employability skills.**

Quality of provision

- 3.29** Since the previous inspection, A4e Justice managers and tutors had taken on the challenge of improving teaching, learning and assessment. Within a short space of time, standards had risen and prisoners' experiences and achievements had improved, but the quality was not yet good enough and areas for further development remained.

- 3.30** Most tutors planned lessons well and provided prisoners with a good learning experience. However, they did not always use individual learning plans well enough to ensure that prisoners fully understood the skills they needed to develop. Consequently, not all prisoners made progress quickly enough. In providing written feedback, not enough tutors gave clear guidance to prisoners on how to improve their skills, although verbal feedback given during learning sessions was mostly positive and encouraging.
- 3.31** Tutors made good use of technology in learning sessions, which helped to stimulate interest in the subject. In a minority of subjects, tutors relied too heavily on worksheets which were not adapted to meet the employment or skills needs of individual prisoners and insufficiently stimulated learning sessions.
- 3.32** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in vocational training was good in most sessions. Tutors provided good one-to-one coaching that enabled prisoners to develop their skills. Tutors used a wide range of strategies to engage prisoners. In the few less-good training sessions, tutors were over-reliant on worksheets and multiple-choice questionnaires. In some training sessions, peer mentors, with strong vocational backgrounds, provided good support to tutors and prisoners and helped the latter to progress more quickly through their learning.
- 3.33** At the previous inspection, there had been no arrangements to provide assistance for prisoners who needed extra help, particularly with English and mathematics, in education classes. A newly appointed additional learning support tutor had started to improve the situation and the few prisoners receiving support were making good progress with improving their skills. Peer mentors were not used for English and mathematics qualifications.
- 3.34** The accommodation for education classes and vocational training had improved substantially over the previous year and was very good. Classrooms contained lively and informative displays and tutors used these well to reinforce learning. In the best cases, such as in fashion, displays highlighted the employment prospects available within the relevant industries. Posters also displayed positive messages about attitudes to social equality and the celebration of cultural diversity.

Recommendations

- 3.35** **The standard of teaching and learning in education and vocational training should be raised further through effective and more extensive use of the observation of teaching and learning arrangements and through planned professional development for staff.**
- 3.36** **Tutors should ensure that, in setting targets in individual learning plans and in the assessment of prisoners' work, they refer to the specific skills and knowledge that prisoners need to develop.**
- 3.37** **The prison should increase the amount of support for prisoners with additional learning needs, particularly in English and mathematics. The number of peer mentors should be increased and they should be used throughout the learning, skills and work provision, to support teaching and learning.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.38** Prisoners' education and vocational achievements overall required improvement. Not enough prisoners achieved the English and mathematics qualifications they worked for. Rates of achievement on a minority of employability courses were too low but, in general, prisoners made reasonable progress towards completing their qualifications successfully.
- 3.39** Achievements by prisoners on most vocational courses were good, particularly in cleaning services, horticulture, painting and decorating, and in the bakery. However, those working in The Clink Restaurant and on fashion courses did less well. There was good skills development across the vocational provision, with prisoners in the painting and decorating and hard landscaping workshops mastering techniques very quickly. Standards of work were good; for example, products from the bakery were sold through commercial outlets. The work of prisoners involved in the radio station was particularly impressive.
- 3.40** Punctuality at all activities was good and prisoners were motivated to learn, but attendance was variable and frequently poor, particularly in education classes and vocational training, where attendance was often as low as 50%. Prisoners behaved very well in learning sessions and there was a high degree of mutual respect between staff and prisoners.

Recommendations

- 3.41 Prisoners achievements in vocational training and educational qualifications should be improved particularly in English and mathematics.**
- 3.42 Attendance in education and vocational training should be better managed to ensure that prisoners allocated to these activities attend regularly and that the use of places is maximised.**

Library

- 3.43** The library was run by Lambeth Borough Council's Library Service. Library staff were supported by a prison orderly, who had been well trained. The library had relocated since the previous inspection but remained small and cramped.
- 3.44** The range of stock was adequate. Up-to-date legal texts and Prison Service Instructions were readily available to prisoners. There was a good selection of quick-read books, designed for those with limited reading skills, and books in large print, as well as books in a range of foreign languages. Stock included texts to support Open University studies. There were a few computers and new assistive technology devices available for partially sighted readers. The library worked well with staff from the Shannon Trust Toe by Toe reading scheme. Tutors from the education department regularly brought classes in to use the library resources. Family centre staff liaised closely with the library when working with prisoners to record stories for their children (see section on children, families and contact with the outside world).
- 3.45** The number of prisoners using the library had increased, but access was still inadequate, despite a number of initiatives which had been put in place to increase usage, including extending opening to two evenings a week and developing a team of library representatives on each wing. However, too many prisoners in our survey reported poor access to the library. Negotiations between the prison and Lambeth Council to extend opening times to the weekend were incomplete.

- 3.46** The library's management information system had been upgraded and was more efficient in tracking loans and producing reports on usage. However, no analysis had been carried out to find out why some prisoners who were enrolled as members at induction did not go on to use the library.

Recommendation

- 3.47** **Managers should analyse data on non-library users and implement strategies to increase usage, including making the library available at weekends.**

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.

- 3.48** *The quality of recreational PE was reasonably good. The facilities had improved considerably with additional good-quality resources in the new activities centre. The lack of PE staff due to recruitment delays meant that a full schedule of recreational PE was often not provided and very little accredited training was delivered.*

- 3.49** The PE provision was well managed and effectively promoted. The department provided as much recreational PE as possible within the constraints of staffing shortages. Delays in the recruitment of suitable additional staff meant that access for prisoners and the provision of accredited courses were much reduced. Recreational PE was available during the core day, on two evenings a week and at the weekend. Many prisoners could attend two gym sessions a week but access was more limited for those in full-time activity or working outside of the prison. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at similar establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection (20% versus 34% and 36%, respectively) said that they went to the gym three or more times a week.
- 3.50** The new indoor facilities comprised spinning machines, cardiovascular equipment and free-weights areas. These facilities were well used when staff were available to supervise. The outdoor yards and all-weather surface were also well used. However, the all-weather surface was in a poor condition. A small recreational PE room was used often by prisoners with enhanced status. However, the exercise room on A wing was in a poor condition, and the equipment and its use were not sufficiently supervised.
- 3.51** PE provision was advertised on wing noticeboards effectively. There was good use of orderlies to inform prisoners of what was offered. Specific times and programmes were run for prisoners aged over 50 and over 60, and PE staff worked well with health services staff to provide remedial PE.
- 3.52** PE staff offered just one accredited course, occasionally, and an opportunity for prisoners to engage in the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme.

Recommendations

- 3.53** Additional PE staff should be recruited as a matter of urgency, to ensure that all prisoners are able to access PE.
- 3.54** The outside all-weather surface should be resurfaced to the latest standards, to ensure that continued use is made of the facility.
- 3.55** An appropriate range of accredited vocational PE training courses should be provided, with opportunities for progression (Repeated recommendation 3.42)

Housekeeping point

- 3.56** Prison managers should ensure that the condition and use of the PE facilities on A wing are monitored and supervised more effectively.

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 reducing reoffending strategy described a wide range of resettlement services but the needs analysis was out of date and development objectives had not been identified in it. External providers were well integrated into the management of the strategy. Release on temporary licence was a key part of the strategy and was developing well.*

4.2 A revised version of the reducing reoffending strategy had been published in September 2014. It gave a full account of the wide range of resettlement services provided across all the pathways, but the action plans were basic and did not identify development objectives.

4.3 A survey of prisoners' views of their resettlement needs had been undertaken in 2013/14 and this informed provision; however, there had subsequently been a significant change in the prison's population so it needed to be reviewed. The needs analysis did not include offender assessment system (OASys) data, although prisoners' views on the causes of their offending were recorded.

4.4 Resettlement provision was reliant on a wide range of external organisations, and the resettlement partnership meeting, which was held every three months, included providers in overseeing services. This level of inclusion and partnership was effective in ensuring the commitment of service providers and provided a good forum for communication and sharing views on the development of services.

4.5 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was a key part of the strategy and was developing well but it had the potential to develop further once the prison was receiving suitable prisoners. A growing range of both paid and voluntary employment opportunities was available but too many category D prisoners arriving at the establishment did not have long enough left to serve to complete the three-month assessment period and undertake outside employment before they were released (see main recommendation S53).

4.6 Although many category D prisoners were held in more restrictive conditions than those at an open prison, this was counterbalanced by the access it provided to an exceptionally good range of meaningful work experience, and training and employment opportunities within the local area where prisoners would resettle.

Recommendation

4.7 **The reducing reoffending strategy should be informed by a needs analysis that reflects the current population and uses offender assessment system (OASys) data to provide more evidence of offending-related need. It should be used to inform development objectives in the strategy.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.8** *Pressures on the offender management unit caused by population changes and reorganisation had affected its functioning and it was currently not meeting the needs of many prisoners. Too many offender assessment system (OASys) and home detention curfew assessments and recategorisation reviews were late. The quality of assessments and sentence planning was inconsistent. Arrangements for public protection were good and for release on temporary licence were thorough.*
- 4.9** In the previous nine months, significant changes in the prison population and internal changes had had a detrimental effect on the effectiveness of the offender management unit (OMU). There had been a huge turnover of prisoners, following the transfer of all sex offenders and their replacement with category C prisoners, who needed OASys reviews, recategorisation and home detention curfew assessments. In the previous six months, 836 prisoners had been received, 61% of whom did not have a start-of-custody OASys assessment (see main recommendation S54). During this period, the department had been required to reorganise administration structures, which compromised their ability to meet the increasing demands, and this was further exacerbated by unusually high levels of staff sickness. Staff and managers told us that uniformed offender supervisors were increasingly being reallocated to wing duties with little notice, taking them away from OMU work. They said that in the previous month this had amounted to 300 hours, equating to nearly two full-time roles.
- 4.10** The outcome for many prisoners was that progression in their sentence and their entitlement to be considered for release had been delayed or denied. In our survey, only 37% said that they had a sentence plan, compared with 69% at other category C training prisons and 49% at the time of the previous inspection. In addition, 47% said that they had no contact with their offender manager in the community, which was worse than the 35% comparator. We were told that this reflected the strains on probation services in London, which was where most prisoners came from. The most recent figures available showed that 173 prisoners had no OASys assessment and that 204 were out of date and required a review. Of those out of date, 183 (90%) were the responsibility of offender managers in the community, which was consistent with our negative survey results about relationships with community probation services (see main recommendation S54).
- 4.11** The quality of OASys risk assessments and sentence plans was inconsistent. In the sample of cases we examined, only three out of 12 had had an adequate and timely assessment of the likelihood of reoffending and three did not have a sentence plan. Although key factors associated with offending had been identified, related objectives were missing in most sentence plans. Offender supervisors told us that this was often because they restricted the objectives set in plans to the limited range of interventions that could be achieved in the prison (see also section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour), so that they could be completed in time for a recategorisation review. In addition, there were prisoners who had been transferred to the prison with sentence plans containing objectives which could not be met at Brixton but would not be transferred elsewhere to achieve them.
- 4.12** Offender supervisors recorded contacts with prisoners in P-Nomis (electronic case notes) and these tended to reflect purposeful interaction. Some other staff, such as wing officers and programme tutors, also used this platform but not enough was done to ensure that all

contacts with the prisoner, from staff across the prison, were recorded in P-Nomis. One contact each month was taken as a target for contact between offender supervisors and prisoners. This was broadly achieved, and exceeded at times of particular activity. However, we also found gaps of several months with no recorded contact.

- 4.13 In too many cases, the OMU was not the prime driver of work with prisoners. Allocations to work, interventions and resettlement support were often not related to an assessment and sentence plan.
- 4.14 There were processes to deal with the temporary backlog of assessments and promising initiatives to deal with pressures on the OMU, such as the training of prisoner peer mentors to answer low-level queries and weekly wing surgeries, which improved the access of prisoners to offender supervisors.
- 4.15 Processes for home detention curfew assessments were fair and transparent but many prisoners were frustrated by delays which denied them their entitlement to be assessed for early release. A significant backlog had been caused by the large influx of prisoners approaching or past their eligibility date; this had resulted in some prisoners never having had their suitability addressed before reaching their normal release date. Resources were being concentrated on dealing with outstanding cases but at the time of the inspection there were still 34 past their eligibility date who had not been assessed (see main recommendation S54).

Recommendations

- 4.16 **Objectives in sentence plans should address all risk and reoffending needs identified and not be restricted to those for which interventions are available at the establishment.**
- 4.17 **Offender supervisors should have regular planned contact with prisoners allocated to them.**
- 4.18 **Allocation to work and interventions should be informed by assessments and planning by the offender management unit.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.19 All contacts with the prisoner should be recorded in P-Nomis.

Public protection

- 4.20 Public protection procedures were good. Prisoners raising a public protection concern were identified on arrival, and in the cases we inspected the arrangements made had been satisfactory. Prisoners were informed promptly by offender supervisors about the restrictions placed on them and could make applications for child contact, and these were fully assessed.
- 4.21 The minutes of interdepartmental risk management team meetings contained good accounts of prisoners due for release. There was good attendance by the offender supervisors whose cases were being discussed, and procedures to follow up actions were effective. Other departments submitted reports but their representation at meetings was inconsistent. Communication with multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) in the cases we

inspected had been good and the senior probation officer from the OMU represented the prison at local meetings. Reviewed MAPPA levels before discharge or temporary release were clear.

- 4.22 There was a suitable period of assessment of behaviour in the category D unit before prisoners were considered for ROTL. Assessments for ROTL were thorough and informed by risk assessments from probation staff and offender supervisors as well as reports on prison behaviour. Temporary release was suitably staggered and structured, restrictions were applied and MAPPA levels were checked when required. Plans and purposes of home leave were clearly set out and sufficiently detailed.

Housekeeping point

- 4.23 Representatives of departments that work closely with a prisoner should attend the interdepartmental risk management team meetings concerning him.

Categorisation

- 4.24 Categorisation processes were inclusive, fair and transparent. Prisoners who were not successful were provided with a full account of the reasons so that they could address the issues in time for their next review.
- 4.25 Too many categorisation reviews were late, and at the time of the inspection some were nine months overdue. Managers were working to reduce the backlog and provide future resilience but at the time of this inspection 68 reviews were late (see main recommendation S54).

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.26 At the time of the inspection, there were seven prisoners serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection and 11 life-sentenced prisoners. There were no specific facilities for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) but they were appropriately placed at the establishment to take advantage of resettlement opportunities.
- 4.27 There were no delays in the submission of parole dossiers and ISPs had access to appropriate temporary release opportunities.

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.

- 4.28 *There was no overall assessment of needs on arrival but a wide range of information was provided to prisoners, and they were generally aware of who to turn to for help. Some individual services undertook pre-release assessments. Resettlement pathway work was mostly good, but the range of offending behaviour programmes did not meet the needs of the new population.*

- 4.29** There was no overall assessment of the resettlement needs of prisoners on arrival at the establishment but this was mitigated to some extent by a presentation from resettlement providers at induction which informed prisoners where they could apply to have their needs met. In most resettlement areas, there were peer supporters who informed and supported prisoners in getting access to services.
- 4.30** There was no overall check for outstanding resettlement needs before discharge but some pathway providers predicated their services on meeting prisoners due for release (for example, see section on accommodation).
- 4.31** There were practical arrangements for the release of prisoners at the end of their sentence. Those we saw leaving the prison had been given the opportunity to have stored clothing washed, were provided with a bag for their possessions and had the requirements of their licences explained to them.

Recommendations

- 4.32 All prisoners should have an assessment of their resettlement needs when they arrive and there should be a process to ensure that their needs are met in a timely fashion.** (Repeated recommendation 4.31)
- 4.33 The outstanding resettlement needs of prisoners should be checked in good time for these to be addressed before release.**

Accommodation

- 4.34** Accommodation advice and support were provided by a team of workers from St Giles Trust, who visited all those with three months or less to release. Immediate needs, such as maintaining a tenancy or rent arrears, were not reliably identified by an assessment during induction (see recommendation 4.32). These workers also responded to individual applications and referrals from departments or organisations working in the prison. There were seven peer advisers on the wings, who were receiving training and working towards a National Vocational Qualification. They represented St Giles Trust, took referrals and could provide basic advice.
- 4.35** The proportion of prisoners released without settled accommodation varied from 5% to 7%, which was low, and reports from St Giles showed that they engaged with all prisoners without an address. They made referrals to hostels and put prisoners in touch with the Trust's private rental service, as well as trying to find support from the prisoner's family. The minimum provided was bed and breakfast for one night, to give time for engagement with council homelessness services.
- 4.36** The most vulnerable prisoners due for discharge were supported by the St Giles 'through-the-gate' service, which provided support for those released to hostels to find settled accommodation.

Education, training and employment

- 4.37** The overall quality of the National Careers Service, provided by Prospects was good. There were sufficient staff to support the existing contract to carry out individual interviews with all prisoners during induction. However, the initial assessment process unnecessarily

duplicated interviews with A4e Justice, and prisoners were left without a clear understanding of which provider was dealing with the identification of their needs.

- 4.38** Prospects staff provided good through-the-gate support to direct prisoners to relevant education, training and employment in the community. Since the previous inspection, A4e Justice had introduced a pre-release course known as 'work ready' but it was poorly attended and prisoners did not find it helpful.
- 4.39** Access to the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) had improved and was easily available in all classrooms. Tutors in vocational training, such as industrial cleaning, were beginning to make effective use of this facility to help learners to research possible jobs and to prepare their CV. This was not yet consistent and managers recognised it as an area for further development. Prospects staff made insufficient use of the virtual campus to provide support to prisoners in gaining employment on release.
- 4.40** Staff located and managed high-quality ROTL placements that were relevant to the needs of the local labour market and finding jobs. Close links with further education colleges provided opportunities for progression to higher-level courses – for example, in fashion design. In recent months, the percentages of prisoners progressing into validated employment (32%) and further education and training (18%) were relatively high.

Recommendations

- 4.41 Senior managers should review the induction process and identify clear roles and responsibilities for the Prospects and A4e Justice staff, to provide clarity to prisoners and avoid duplication of effort.**
- 4.42 The current 'work ready' programme should be reviewed and an appropriate programme that meets all prisoners' employment preparation needs should be introduced.**

Health care

- 4.43** Prisoners were offered a health assessment before release and a health care summary was sent to the prisoner's GP or given to the prisoner. Health services staff attempted to assist patients without a GP to find one after release, but this remained a challenge. Care UK was participating in pan-London planning by NHS England to address the issue. Take-home medication was given to patients as appropriate.
- 4.44** There was no palliative care policy, although one was in production; working links with the local hospice were said to be very good.
- 4.45** Prisoners with mental health needs were effectively linked with community mental health teams, and there was regular attendance by community mental health team representatives at pre-release care programme approach reviews.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.46** There was effective preparation for the release of prisoners with substance use issues through the continuity of care meeting and good links with community drug and alcohol teams and community prescribers.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.47** Our survey showed that, since the previous inspection, there had been a considerable increase in the proportion of prisoners who knew where to go for help with finances (from 16% to 24%) and benefits (from 30% to 41%).
- 4.48** A debt adviser from Lambeth Debt Advice Service visited the prison two days a week to meet prisoners referred to him. He provided initial advice and contact with debtors for all prisoners, while those from Lambeth Borough who required it were provided with more extensive support. He saw around 20 prisoners a week in private interviews, with another 15 ongoing cases. The Single Homeless Project (SHP) had started working in the prison three weeks before the inspection and was developing money advice services.
- 4.49** The previous arrangement with Santander Bank to open 10 accounts a month had stalled but had been revived by SHP, working with HSBC and Santander.
- 4.50** There was no specific financial education provided to help prisoners develop skills with budgeting and debt management.

Recommendations

- 4.51 Prisoners' financial needs should be assessed on arrival and there should be services which meet the needs of all prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 4.51)
- 4.52 Financial education should be available to all prisoners.**

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.53** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at comparator establishments said that staff had supported and helped them to maintain contact with their families while they were in prison. However, there was a wide range of specialist help available from the Parents and Children Together (PACT) organisation and the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) family worker. Both organisations provided individual support, mainly by working with social services to facilitate renewed contact with children, advising on family law and helping with supervised child contact arrangements.
- 4.54** Useful family-orientated courses were offered. The Time to Connect course, run every three months, aimed at helping prisoners to improve the quality of their relationship with their children, and ended with a child-centred visit. The Building Better Relationships course involved partners in working on relationship skills and practical matters such as financial and household management. The Storybook Dads scheme (in which prisoners record stories for their children) was also run and a new Reading with Dads project was starting. Family visits were held during school holidays and were open to all prisoners, regardless of their incentives and earned privileges status.
- 4.55** PACT also provided volunteer visitors and a post-release support group, which maintained contact with former prisoners' families for 12 weeks after discharge.
- 4.56** Social visits were provided four days a week, including weekends, and allowed for sufficient provision to meet demand, although weekend visits needed to be booked well in advance. Visitors could book by telephone and online.

- 4.57** Visitors booked in at the visitors centre, which was staffed by Spurgeons, a family support voluntary organisation. The centre was too small and poorly laid out, but provided basic facilities and a wide range of information for visitors. Spurgeons staff provided advice to families and referred them to support services. Spurgeons had conducted a limited survey of visitors but it had not covered all aspects of social visits and did not inform development of the provision.
- 4.58** Supervision of visits sessions was adequate but not intrusive or over-restrictive, and we saw visitors being treated respectfully by staff. There was a children's play area, supervised by Spurgeons staff, and a high-quality snack bar, run by the prison bakery enterprise.
- 4.59** The closed visits booths were in open view of visitors, with no screening to afford a reasonable degree of privacy while meeting security requirements.

Recommendations

- 4.60** **The visitors centre should be expanded to meet the needs of the population.** (Repeated recommendation 4.61)
- 4.61** **A survey of visitors should be undertaken to inform the development of provision.**
- 4.62** **There should be better privacy for those on closed visits.** (Repeated recommendation 4.63)

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.63** With the change in the prison population, the range of accredited interventions had reduced to only the thinking skills programme. The programmes team had struggled to fill places on this programme because many prisoners had completed it earlier in their sentence or did not meet the risk and offence-type criteria.
- 4.64** Interventions indicated for some prisoners by their offending background were not available at the establishment and we were concerned that sentence plans were being tailored to include only those targets which could be achieved at the prison, while some prisoners with objectives set elsewhere could not access the interventions required (see also section on offender management and planning). It was not clear that current information about intervention needs among the current population was being used to inform provision.
- 4.65** There were constructive non-accredited interventions. The Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme, run by the chaplaincy, was a useful intervention. Transitional psychotherapy services, which had worked with sex offenders at the time of the previous inspection, were currently directed at those with complex needs. The 18 prisoners receiving the service at the time of the inspection had been persistent offenders who continued to be disruptive in the prison environment. The service continued to support these prisoners after their release.

Recommendation

- 4.66** **The range of accredited interventions should be reviewed in the light of the new population, and provision should match identified need.**

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendations

To NOMS

- 5.1 Cells designed for single occupancy should not be used to hold two prisoners. (S50)
- 5.2 Prisoners should not be transferred to Brixton with insufficient time left to serve to benefit from the regime. (S53)

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.3 Staff training and supervision processes should support staff in developing relationships with prisoners appropriate to a category C/D resettlement regime. (S51, repeated recommendation S55)
- 5.4 Processes for allocating work and monitoring attendance should be improved to ensure that all prisoners are purposefully engaged in learning and skills and work. (S52)
- 5.5 All prisoners should have an up-to-date OASys assessment and sentence plan. Recategorisation and home detention curfew decisions should be made on time. (S54)

Recommendation

To NOMS

Reintegration planning

- 5.6 The range of accredited interventions should be reviewed in the light of the new population, and provision should match identified need. (4.66)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.7 All first night cells should be clean and fully prepared for occupation. (1.14)
- 5.8 All newly arrived prisoners should be offered a free telephone call to inform family or friends of their arrival at the establishment (subject to public protection measures). (1.15)
- 5.9 The time taken to complete induction should be reduced, to avoid unnecessary periods of inactivity. (1.16)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.10** The prison should investigate and take action on prisoners' negative perceptions of their safety. (I.25, repeated recommendation I.20)
- 5.11** The safer custody and violence reduction strategy and action plan should be specific to Brixton and be clearly based on an analysis of data on violent incidents which includes the characteristics of those involved. (I.26)
- 5.12** Prisoners should feel confident in reporting incidents of bullying and victimisation. All incidents should be investigated thoroughly. (I.27)
- 5.13** An effective tool for managing perpetrators and supporting victims should be fully implemented, and trained bullying and violence reduction representatives should be in post. (I.28)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.14** Trend analysis should be used to inform a localised suicide and self-harm prevention strategy. (I.36, repeated recommendation I.30)
- 5.15** The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management recording should be improved and reviews should be sufficiently multidisciplinary. (I.37)
- 5.16** Prisoners' poor perception of access to Listeners when they need it should be explored and addressed. (I.38)
- 5.17** The constant supervision cell for those at risk of self-harm should not be located in the segregation unit. (I.39)

Safeguarding

- 5.18** An effective referral process should be in place to safeguard vulnerable adults. (I.43)

Security

- 5.19** The physical security and regime arrangements should be revised to reflect conditions which are appropriate to category D prisoners. (I.50)
- 5.20** Visits restrictions should only be imposed in response to visits-related activities. (I.51)
- 5.21** Intelligence reports should be processed within 48 hours of receipt by the security department. (I.52)
- 5.22** The drug and alcohol strategy should be informed by an up-to-date needs assessment and reflect the current challenges of drug availability, including new psychoactive substances such as spice. The supply reduction meeting should be held regularly, to ensure an appropriate focus on the current substance misuse challenges. (I.53)
- 5.23** The prison should ensure that all measures identified in the supply reduction strategy are in place. (I.54, repeated recommendation I.45)

Discipline

- 5.24** Recording and management oversight of the use of force, including special accommodation, should be effective. (1.67, repeated recommendation 1.57)
- 5.25** The use of force committee should regularly review video recordings of all planned use of force incidents and should analyse data to establish emerging trends and areas of particular concern. (1.68)
- 5.26** Sufficient investment should be made to resolve the structural and decorative issues in the segregation unit accommodation. (1.74)
- 5.27** The regime for prisoners in the segregation unit should be improved. (1.75, repeated recommendation 1.64)

Residential units

- 5.28** Toilets in cells on A, B and G wings should be appropriately screened. (2.9, repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 5.29** All showers should be clean, well maintained and screened to provide full privacy. (2.10)
- 5.30** Prisoner applications should be tracked to ensure completion and to raise prisoner confidence in the system. (2.11)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.31** Personal officers should contribute to sentence planning boards and offender assessment system (OASys) reviews where appropriate. (2.18, repeated recommendation 2.20)

Equality and diversity

- 5.32** Equality monitoring data should include foreign nationals and be assessed promptly to help ensure equality of outcomes for different minority groups. (2.26)
- 5.33** The prison should hold regular forums and consultation with prisoners across each of the main diversity strands. (2.27)
- 5.34** All discrimination incident report forms should be monitored effectively and checked by a senior manager to ensure a full and prompt investigation. (2.28)
- 5.35** Foreign national prisoners liable to deportation should have effective access to independent legal representation. Those who cannot afford to pay for it should be offered free advice. (2.40)
- 5.36** The Home Office should serve all decisions to detain a person under immigration powers at least one month before the end of a prisoner's custodial sentence expiry date. (2.41)
- 5.37** Prisoners with disabilities should have an up-to-date personal emergency evacuation and care plans where necessary, and all wing staff should be aware of them. (2.42)

Complaints

- 5.38** The prison should explore prisoner's limited confidence in the discrimination incident and general complaints processes and take action to address it. This should include informing prisoners of the results of regular analysis of the patterns and trends of complaints and the response to them. (2.55, repeated recommendation 2.42).

Health services

- 5.39** Prisoners should be able to report health care complaints confidentially. (2.69, repeated recommendation 2.57)
- 5.40** Did-not-attend rates and waiting times should be subject to sustained management action to drive them down. (2.80)
- 5.41** The out-of-hours medical cover should emulate the service provided in the community. (2.81)
- 5.42** The X-ray facility should be available to patients as required by clinicians. (2.82)
- 5.43** Medication administration should be adequately supervised, to ensure privacy and compliance, and reduce the risk of bullying and diversion (2.89, repeated recommendation 2.80)
- 5.44** Prison officers should be trained to recognise when a prisoner requires assistance from mental health practitioners. (2.98)

Catering

- 5.45** Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are meant to be eaten. (2.105, repeated recommendation 2.109)
- 5.46** Prisoners on the main wings should be able to eat out of their cells. (2.106, repeated recommendation 2.110)

Purchases

- 5.47** The cost of items in the prison shop list, including telephone credit, should be in line with that in the community (2.111, repeated recommendation 2.117).
- 5.48** The prison should ensure that arrangements for the distribution of shop goods do not increase the risk of victimisation. (2.112)

Time out of cell

- 5.49** Evening association should be available to all, to promote family contact. (3.6)
- 5.50** All category D prisoners should have privacy keys to their cells and they should not be locked in their cells during the evening and night. (3.7)
- 5.51** All prisoners should have at least one hour of outdoor exercise each day, in yards which are adequately equipped. (3.8)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.52** Prison managers should develop further the self-assessment and quality assurance process to ensure that actions to improve the provision are prioritised, specific and measurable, and aimed at improving further prisoners' outcomes. (3.17)
- 5.53** Managers should analyse participation and achievement data to identify variations in performance and set targets for improvement. (3.18)
- 5.54** Managers should ensure that there are enough relevant progression opportunities in education and vocational training to level 2 and above. Sufficient English and mathematics provision should be available to meet all prisoners' assessed needs. (3.27)
- 5.55** Prisoners' acquisition of work and employment skills should be systematically recognised and recorded to ensure that they are aware of their progress in the development of their employability skills. (3.28)
- 5.56** The standard of teaching and learning in education and vocational training should be raised further through effective and more extensive use of the observation of teaching and learning arrangements and through planned professional development for staff. (3.35)
- 5.57** Tutors should ensure that, in setting targets in individual learning plans and in the assessment of prisoners' work, they refer to the specific skills and knowledge that prisoners need to develop. (3.36)
- 5.58** The prison should increase the amount of support for prisoners with additional learning needs, particularly in English and mathematics. The number of peer mentors should be increased and they should be used throughout the learning, skills and work provision, to support teaching and learning. (3.37)
- 5.59** Prisoners achievements in vocational training and educational qualifications should be improved particularly in English and mathematics. (3.41)
- 5.60** Attendance in education and vocational training should be better managed to ensure that prisoners allocated to these activities attend regularly and that the use of places is maximised. (3.42)
- 5.61** Managers should analyse data on non-library users and implement strategies to increase usage, including making the library available at weekends. (3.47)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.62** Additional PE staff should be recruited as a matter of urgency, to ensure that all prisoners are able to access PE. (3.53)
- 5.63** The outside all-weather surface should be resurfaced to the latest standards, to ensure that continued use is made of the facility. (3.54)
- 5.64** An appropriate range of accredited vocational PE training courses should be provided, with opportunities for progression (3.55, repeated recommendation 3.42)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.65** The reducing reoffending strategy should be informed by a needs analysis that reflects the current population and uses offender assessment system (OASys) data to provide more

evidence of offending related need. It should be used to inform development objectives in the strategy. (4.7)

Offender management and planning

- 5.66** Objectives in sentence plans should address all risk and reoffending needs identified and not be restricted to those for which interventions are available at the establishment. (4.16)
- 5.67** Offender supervisors should have regular planned contact with prisoners allocated to them. (4.17)
- 5.68** Allocation to work and interventions should be informed by assessments and planning by the offender management unit. (4.18)

Reintegration planning

- 5.69** All prisoners should have an assessment of their resettlement needs when they arrive and there should be a process to ensure that their needs are met in a timely fashion. (4.32, repeated recommendation 4.31)
- 5.70** The outstanding resettlement needs of prisoners should be checked in good time for these to be addressed before release. (4.33)
- 5.71** Senior managers should review the induction process and identify clear roles and responsibilities for the Prospects and A4e Justice staff, to provide clarity to prisoners and avoid duplication of effort. (4.41)
- 5.72** The current 'work ready' programme should be reviewed and an appropriate programme that meets all prisoners' employment preparation needs should be introduced. (4.42)
- 5.73** Prisoners' financial needs should be assessed on arrival and there should be services which meet the needs of all prisoners. (4.51, repeated recommendation 4.51)
- 5.74** Financial education should be available to all prisoners. (4.52)
- 5.75** The visitors centre should be expanded to meet the needs of the population. (4.60, repeated recommendation 4.61)
- 5.76** A survey of visitors should be undertaken to inform the development of provision. (4.61)
- 5.77** There should be better privacy for those on closed visits. (4.62, repeated recommendation 4.63)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.78** Information about the establishment should be provided in holding rooms. (1.17)
- 5.79** Attendance at induction should be monitored, to ensure that all prisoners complete it. (1.18)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.80** The implementation of Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations should be included in the continuous improvement plan and reviewed regularly. (1.40)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.81** Prisoners should be notified in writing about the receipt of a 'red' warning. (1.59)

Residential units

- 5.82** Response times to cell call bells should be monitored to ensure that they are answered within five minutes. (2.12)

Equality and diversity

- 5.83** Equality and diversity action plans should be kept under review and set out future priorities for action, with deadlines. (2.29)
- 5.84** The prison should implement its paid carer scheme. (2.43)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.85** All prisoners should be seen by a chaplain within 24 hours of arriving in the prison. (2.50)

Health services

- 5.86** There should be a prison-wide strategy to promote health and well-being. (2.70)
- 5.87** Nurses should receive clinically certificated training, or equivalent, in the management of long-term conditions. (2.71)
- 5.88** The availability of condoms should be made known to prisoners. (2.72)
- 5.89** Prisoners should receive information on how to access health services, in a format they can read, when they enter the prison. (2.83)
- 5.90** Two staff members should transport controlled drugs around the prison when cells are unlocked, with one of these having a walkie-talkie radio. (2.90)

Time out of cell

- 5.91** All wings should publicise their most up-to-date core day timetable. (3.9)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.92** Prison managers should ensure that the condition and use of the PE facilities on A wing are monitored and supervised more effectively. (3.56)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.93** All contacts with the prisoner should be recorded in P-Nomis. (4.19)

Offender management and planning

5.94 Representatives of departments that work closely with a prisoner should attend the interdepartmental risk management team meetings concerning him. (4.23)

Examples of good practice

Health services

5.95 On-wing pharmacy-led clinics were delivered regularly. (2.91)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Deri Hughes Roberts	Inspector
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Jessica Kelly	Researcher
Njilan Morris-Jarra	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Nicola Rabjohns	Substance misuse inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Simon Denton	Pharmacist
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Rieks Drivjer	Ofsted inspector
Charles Searle	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Griffiths	Offender management inspector
Amanda Patterson	Offender management inspector
Karena Reed	CQC inspector
Sue McMillan	CQC 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, reception processes were functional and unwelcoming. First night arrangements were inadequate, with insufficient attention paid to vulnerability and safety issues. Induction was uncoordinated and unstructured. More prisoners than at similar prison felt unsafe and reported relatively high levels of victimisation by staff. However, levels of violence were relatively low and prisoners did not feel physically unsafe. Levels of self-harm were relatively low and prisoners felt well supported. Illegal drug use was high. Security arrangements were incompatible with a category C/D regime. Adjudications were well managed. There was little use of force but it was poorly monitored. Segregation was not overused but some prisoners were inappropriately segregated on the vulnerable prisoner wing. Substance misuse services were good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Thorough reception and first night procedures should be applied, to ensure that accommodation is prepared, a shower and a telephone call are available, and appropriate information, support and checks are carried out during prisoners' early days at the establishment. (S53)

Partially achieved

The physical security and regime arrangements should be reviewed and amended to reflect conditions which are appropriate to category C and D prisoners, respectively. (S54)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Transfers should be coordinated to arrive at Brixton during reception working hours. (1.4)

Achieved

Prisoners should not be held on escort vehicles for extended periods after arrival. (S54)

Achieved

Induction should start on the day after arrival and should provide prisoners with all the information necessary to access services and the regime. (1.12)

Achieved

The reasons for bullying and antisocial behaviour should be collated and trend analysis should be reintroduced to inform the local strategy. (1.19)

Partially achieved

The prison should investigate and take action on prisoners' negative perceptions of their safety. (1.20)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.25)

Managers should hold consultative meetings with vulnerable prisoners to gauge their perceptions on issues such as safety and access to the regime. (1.21)

No longer relevant

Wing staff should deliver the bullying and antisocial behaviour strategy, and the quality of management and support plans should be improved. (1.22)

Not achieved

There should be interventions for bullies, such as tackling antisocial behaviour, and support for victims. (1.23)

Not achieved

Trend analysis should be used to inform the localised suicide and self-harm prevention strategy. (1.30)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.36)

Access to and the use of Listeners should be reviewed, and identified improvements implemented. (1.31)

Not 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. (1.37)

Partially achieved

The prison should ensure that all measures identified in the supply reduction strategy are in place. (1.45)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.54)

The apparent low number of security information reports should be investigated and measures taken to ensure whole-prison involvement in security. (1.46)

Achieved

The regime and management of the basic level of the IEP scheme should be improved. Prisoners should have achievable individual targets and the opportunity to demonstrate progress which should be recorded consistently and regularly reviewed. (1.51)

Achieved

Recording and management oversight of the use of force, including special accommodation, should be effective. (1.57)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.67)

Any use of a baton should be investigated to give assurance that its use was appropriate and proportionate. (1.58)

Achieved

The regime for prisoners in the care and separation unit should be improved. (1.64)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.75)

Prisoners should not be segregated without the appropriate level of authority and management oversight. (1.65)

Achieved

Prisoners committed to recovery and located on the drug recovery unit should not be exposed to high levels of drug use. (1.74)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2013 the environment and living conditions were poor and the prison was very overcrowded. Our survey results in relation to interactions with and treatment by staff were very negative. We observed very mixed interactions. Diversity and equality had been neglected and the needs of some prisoners, particularly older prisoners and those with disabilities, were not being met. We found no evidence that black and minority ethnic or Muslim prisoners were discriminated against because of their race or religion, although they were more negative in our survey in some areas. Faith provision was very good. The number of complaints was low but there was inadequate quality assurance. Health provision was good. The food provided was acceptable. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Staff training and supervision processes should support staff in developing relationships with prisoners appropriate to a category C regime. (S55)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, S51)

Management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (S56)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Cells designed for single occupancy should not be used for two prisoners. (2.9)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, S50)

Toilets in cells on A, B and G wings should be appropriately screened. (2.10)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.9)

All showers should be screened to allow full privacy. (2.11)

Not achieved

Prisoners who receive prison-issue clothing should have sufficient sets of underwear each week. (2.12)

Achieved

Prison managers should ensure the consistent application of wing rules. (2.13)

Achieved

Personal officers should contribute to sentence planning boards and offender assessment system (OASys) reviews where appropriate. (2.20)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.18)

The prison should explore prisoners' limited confidence in the discrimination incident and general complaints processes and take action to address it. This should include a formal quality assurance process and informing prisoners of the results of regular analysis of the patterns and trends of complaints and the response to them. (2.42)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.55)

Complaints about staff should be properly investigated and responded to. (2.43)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be able to report health care complaints confidentially. (2.57)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.69)

All prison staff should receive basic life support training and sufficient staff should be trained to use the automated defibrillators to provide 24-hour cover across the prison. (2.58)

Partially achieved

All prisoners should be health screened on arrival and followed up within 72 hours for a secondary health assessment. (2.71)

No longer relevant

Medication administration should be adequately supervised, to ensure privacy and compliance, and reduce the risk of bullying and diversion. (2.80)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.89)

Prisoners should be given privacy and confidentiality during their dental consultations and risks assessed on an individual basis. (2.90)

Achieved

Structured support should be provided for prisoners with learning disabilities and other vulnerabilities. (2.100)

Partially achieved

Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are meant to be eaten. (2.109)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.105)

Prisoners on the main wings should be able to eat out of their cells. (2.110)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.106)

Lunch should not be served before 12 noon and the evening meal not before 5pm. (2.111)

Achieved

The cost of items on the prison shop list, including telephone credit, should be in line with that in the community. (2.117)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.111)

There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders. (2.118)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2013 The amount of time out of cell was inconsistent and insufficient. The published core day was not always followed. Plans for new and improved learning and skills provision were well advanced but current provision was poorly managed. There were far too few activity places available and not all of these were utilised. The range of education and vocational activities was poor and there were few opportunities for progression. Opportunities to accredit work and vocational skills gained were missed. Few prisoners took qualifications but, for those who did, achievements were mostly good. Library provision was poor and underused. Despite inadequate facilities, recreational PE provision was good. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The total number of high-quality activity places should be increased to allow more prisoners to be purposefully employed. (S57)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Category C prisoners should be able to spend more time out of cell, and daily evening association should be provided. (3.8)

Partially achieved

Category D prisoners should be allowed free access to outdoor exercise areas. (3.9)

Achieved

Observations of teaching and learning should be improved to include all areas of learning and skills, and share best practices to improve the quality of teaching, learning and assessment. (3.17)

Partially achieved

The initial assessment of prisoners' literacy and numeracy needs should be used effectively to better inform planning and provision of support. (3.18)

Partially achieved

Sentence planning should link effectively with the allocation process, and improved activities allocations should maximise places. (3.19)

Not achieved

The variety and range of activities for vulnerable prisoners should be improved. (3.22)

No longer relevant

The range and variety of vocational training courses should be considerably increased. (3.23)

Achieved

The quality of teaching and learning should be improved. (3.26)

Partially achieved

Access to the virtual campus should be improved and employability and practical skills should be accredited. (3.27)

Partially achieved

All prisoners with identified needs in literacy and numeracy should be appropriately supported. (3.28)

Partially achieved

Achievement rates for learners on numeracy and English courses should be improved. (3.30)

Partially achieved

Attendance and punctuality should be improved. (3.31)

Partially achieved

Access to the library and the range of services and materials available should be substantially improved. (3.35)

Not achieved

Effective management information systems and data collection should be introduced to improve the library provision. (3.36)

Partially achieved

PE facilities should be improved, including the outside all-weather area and the provision of a dedicated classroom for theory lessons. (3.41)

Partially achieved

An appropriate range of accredited vocational PE training courses should be provided, with opportunities for progression. (3.42)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 3.55)

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 strategic planning of resettlement services was reasonably good. The use of release on temporary licence was developing well but there was little additional resettlement support for category D prisoners. Offender management was weak. Too many prisoners lacked an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment or up-to-date sentence plan, and offender supervisors had very limited contact with prisoners. Prisoners were frustrated by their inability to progress and too many waited too long for transfer. Home detention curfew procedures and public protection arrangements were sound. Reintegration planning was compromised by the lack of a comprehensive initial assessment and few prisoners knew where to go to for help. Resettlement pathway work was reasonable. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

All prisoners should have an up-to-date risk assessment and sentence plan which is overseen by regular and meaningful contact with an allocated offender supervisor. (S58)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should not be transferred to Brixton without an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, and with insufficient time left to serve to benefit from the regime. (4.14)

Not achieved

Categorisation reviews should be completed by the due date, and sex offenders should not be automatically denied category D status. (4.22)

Not achieved

The transfer of prisoners to appropriate establishments should be prompt. (4.23)

Not achieved

All prisoners should have an assessment of their resettlement needs when they arrive and there should be a process to ensure that their needs are met in a timely fashion. (4.31)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.32)

Better coordination of links with employers should be developed between resettlement staff and other internal prison agencies. (4.39)

Achieved

The virtual campus to aid job search should be better used and prisoners should be more prepared for interviews on release. (4.40)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be given appropriate support and advice to access community health services on release, and prescribed medication should always be provided. (4.43)

Achieved

Prisoners' financial needs should be assessed on arrival and there should be services which meet the needs of all prisoners. 4.51)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.51)

There should be sufficient visits places for vulnerable prisoners. (4.60)

No longer relevant

The visitors centre should be expanded to meet the needs of the population. (4.61)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.60)

Prisoners should be able to play with their children in the play area, subject to child protection measures. (4.62)

Partially achieved

There should be better privacy for those on closed visits. (4.63)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.62)

The prison should develop and improve the range of initiatives and support to encourage and enable prisoners to maintain contact with family and friends. (4.64)

Achieved

Provision of the healthy sexual practice programme should be increased to meet demand. (4.72)

No longer relevant

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-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	0	711	95.8
Recall	0	28	3.8
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0.0
Remand	0	0	0.0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0.0
Detainees	0	2	0.3
Total	0	741	100.0

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	8	1.1
Less than six months	0	1	0.1
six months to less than 12 months	0	15	2.0
12 months to less than 2 years	0	130	17.5
2 years to less than 4 years	0	302	40.8
4 years to less than 10 years	0	249	33.6
10 years and over (not life)	0	18	2.4
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	7	0.9
Life	0	11	1.5
Total	0	741	100.0

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:		
Under 21 years	-	-
21 years to 29 years	261	35.2
30 years to 39 years	244	32.9
40 years to 49 years	162	21.9
50 years to 59 years	63	8.5
60 years to 69 years	11	1.5
70 plus years	0	0
Please state maximum age here:	0	0
Total	741	100.0

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	0	660	89.1
Foreign nationals	0	81	10.9
Total	0	741	100.0

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	0	0
Uncategorised sentenced	0	0	0
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	0	0
Category C	0	621	83.8
Category D	0	119	16.1
Other	0	1	0.1
Total	0	741	100.0

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	0	225	30.4
Irish	0	14	1.9
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	10	1.3
Other white	0	46	6.2
	0	295	39.8
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	33	4.5
White and black African	0	8	1.1
White and Asian	0	3	0.4
Other mixed	0	10	1.3
	0	54	7.3
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	24	3.2
Pakistani	0	16	2.2
Bangladeshi	0	24	3.2
Chinese	0	4	0.5
Other Asian	0	14	1.9
	0	82	11.0
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	170	22.9
African	0	76	10.3
Other black	0	58	7.8
	0	304	41.0
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	1	0.1
Other ethnic group	0	3	0.4
	0	4	0.5
Not stated	0	2	0.3
Total	0	741	100.0

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	0	0.0
Church of England	0	129	17.4
Roman Catholic	0	144	19.4
Other Christian denominations	0	115	15.5
Muslim	0	201	27.1
Sikh	0	10	1.3
Hindu	0	9	1.2
Buddhist	0	12	1.6
Jewish	0	3	0.4
Other	0	19	2.6
No religion	0	99	13.5
Total	0	741	100.0

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	Not Available		
Total			

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0.0	146	19.7
1 month to 3 months	0	0.0	290	39.1
3 months to six months	0	0.0	145	19.6
six months to 1 year	0	0.0	118	15.9
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	32	4.3
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	0	0.0
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	0	0.0	731	100.0

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0.0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	0	271	36.6
Total	0	271	36.6

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 month to 3 months	0	0.0	1	14.3
3 months to six months	0	0.0	0	0.0
six months to 1 year	0	0.0	5	71.4
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	1	14.3
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	0	0.0
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	0	0.0	7	0.9

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.⁷ 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 8 October 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Brixton was 705. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 220 prisoners.

We received a total of 177 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 80%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Five respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 18 questionnaires were not returned and 20 were returned blank.

⁷ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes a 75% response rate (65% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	57
B	31
C	26
D	8
G	54
Segregation unit	1

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Brixton.

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 significant⁸ difference in prisoners' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Brixton in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other Category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 36 Category C training prisons since April 2008.
- The current survey responses from HMP Brixton in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Brixton in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

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

Survey summary

Section I: About You

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

Q1.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See shortened methodology	
Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	62 (35%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	59 (33%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	43 (24%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	170 (96%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	47 (27%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	64 (37%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	42 (24%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Life</i>	2 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)	
	<i>Yes</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	168 (96%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	177 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	177 (100%)
	<i>No</i>	0 (0%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	58 (34%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	8 (5%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 15 (9%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	36 (21%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	20 (12%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Arab</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	6 (3%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	<i>Yes</i>		7 (4%)
	<i>No</i>		163 (96%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	<i>None</i>	28 (16%)	<i>Hindu</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	52 (30%)	<i>Jewish</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	30 (17%)	<i>Muslim</i> 36 (20%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	12 (7%)	<i>Other</i> 9 (5%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	4 (2%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>		169 (97%)
	<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>		2 (1%)
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>		27 (16%)
	<i>No</i>		146 (84%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>No</i>		166 (95%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	<i>Yes</i>		66 (38%)
	<i>No</i>		108 (62%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	<i>Yes</i>		88 (51%)
	<i>No</i>		86 (49%)

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>	105 (60%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	63 (36%)
	<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>	105 (60%)
	Yes	44 (25%)
	No	23 (13%)
	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>	105 (60%)
	Yes	3 (2%)
	No	63 (36%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	103 (59%)
	No	63 (36%)
	Don't remember	8 (5%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	127 (73%)
	No	41 (24%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	33 (19%)
	Well	86 (49%)
	Neither	42 (24%)
	Badly	9 (5%)
	Very badly	3 (2%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that applies to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	89 (51%)
	Yes, I received written information	42 (24%)
	No, I was not told anything	45 (26%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	145 (85%)
	No	25 (15%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	111 (64%)
	2 hours or longer	57 (33%)
	Don't remember	6 (3%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	139 (81%)
	No	26 (15%)
	Don't remember	6 (4%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?		
	<i>Very well</i>		23 (13%)
	<i>Well</i>		96 (55%)
	<i>Neither</i>		36 (21%)
	<i>Badly</i>		11 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		6 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		2 (1%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	30 (18%)	<i>Physical health</i> 24 (14%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	40 (24%)	<i>Mental health</i> 23 (14%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 11 (7%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	59 (35%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 40 (24%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Other</i> 14 (8%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	35 (21%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> 43 (25%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	25 (15%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	<i>Yes</i>		31 (18%)
	<i>No</i>		95 (56%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>		43 (25%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>		114 (66%)
	<i>A shower</i>		18 (10%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>		28 (16%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>		54 (31%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>		40 (23%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>		49 (28%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>		30 (17%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>		62 (37%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>		97 (57%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>		22 (13%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>		23 (14%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>		49 (29%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>		49 (29%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>		32 (19%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>		39 (23%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>		30 (18%)
	<i>Health services</i>		53 (32%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>		41 (25%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>		71 (43%)

Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	120 (69%)
	No	47 (27%)
	Don't remember	6 (3%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	20 (12%)
	Within the first week	88 (51%)
	More than a week	54 (31%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	20 (12%)
	Yes	80 (47%)
	No	61 (36%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	24 (14%)
	Within the first week	63 (37%)
	More than a week	70 (41%)
	Don't remember	15 (9%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	17 (10%)	40 (24%)	21 (13%)	31 (19%)	19 (11%) 38 (23%)
	Attend legal visits?	16 (11%)	38 (26%)	25 (17%)	10 (7%)	9 (6%) 50 (34%)
	Get bail information?	3 (2%)	15 (11%)	10 (7%)	16 (12%)	20 (15%) 73 (53%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	Not had any letters					51 (30%)
	Yes					48 (29%)
	No					69 (41%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	Yes					56 (33%)
	No					17 (10%)
	Don't know					96 (57%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	86 (53%)	68 (42%)	9 (6%)		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	160 (94%)	10 (6%)	0 (0%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	118 (72%)	39 (24%)	8 (5%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	127 (75%)	38 (22%)	4 (2%)		
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	49 (30%)	80 (48%)	36 (22%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	102 (61%)	63 (38%)	2 (1%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	26 (15%)	98 (58%)	45 (27%)		

Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	Very good		10 (6%)
	Good		64 (37%)
	Neither		50 (29%)
	Bad		32 (18%)
	Very bad		17 (10%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?		
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know		4 (2%)
	Yes		70 (41%)
	No		97 (57%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?		
	Yes		64 (37%)
	No		18 (10%)
	Don't know		90 (52%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	Yes		92 (53%)
	No		23 (13%)
	Don't know/ N/A		57 (33%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	Yes		90 (52%)
	No		9 (5%)
	Don't know/ N/A		74 (43%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	I don't want to attend		21 (12%)
	Very easy		65 (38%)
	Easy		33 (19%)
	Neither		23 (13%)
	Difficult		4 (2%)
	Very difficult		3 (2%)
	Don't know		23 (13%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?		
	Yes		128 (75%)
	No		38 (22%)
	Don't know		5 (3%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option).		
		Not made one	Yes
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	19 (12%)	66 (40%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	19 (13%)	33 (22%)
			No
			79 (48%)
			96 (65%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?		
	Yes		94 (57%)
	No		36 (22%)
	Don't know		34 (21%)

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>).			
		<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	61 (37%)	38 (23%)	66 (40%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	61 (39%)	26 (17%)	70 (45%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes			29 (18%)
	No			132 (82%)
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>			47 (28%)
	<i>Very easy</i>			20 (12%)
	<i>Easy</i>			25 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i>			45 (27%)
	<i>Difficult</i>			18 (11%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>			11 (7%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)		
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>		10 (6%)
	Yes		50 (29%)
	No		91 (53%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		20 (12%)
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>		10 (6%)
	Yes		58 (35%)
	No		81 (48%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		19 (11%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?		
	Yes		9 (5%)
	No		159 (95%)
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>		130 (80%)
	<i>Very well</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>Well</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i>		10 (6%)
	<i>Badly</i>		5 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		7 (4%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?		
	Yes		125 (74%)
	No		43 (26%)

Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	117 (70%)
	No	49 (30%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	46 (27%)
	No	125 (73%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Never</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	63 (37%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	41 (24%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	8 (5%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	83 (48%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	56 (33%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	14 (8%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	83 (50%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	30 (18%)
	<i>Neither</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	13 (8%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?			
	Yes	64 (37%)		
	No	107 (63%)		
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?			
	Yes	30 (18%)		
	No	137 (82%)		
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that applies to you.)			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	107 (66%)	<i>At meal times</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	20 (12%)	<i>At health services</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Visits area</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	12 (7%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	4 (2%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	4 (2%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	6 (4%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>At work</i>	3 (2%)	<i>In your cell</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>During movement</i>	19 (12%)	<i>At religious services</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>At education</i>	3 (2%)		
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?			
	Yes	38 (22%)		
	No	133 (78%)		

Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Medication</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Debt</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	2 (1%)
	<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>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	11 (6%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	48 (29%)
	No	120 (71%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Medication</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Debt</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (2%)
	<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	102 (66%)
	Yes	15 (10%)
	No	37 (24%)

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	19 (11%)	12 (7%)	66 (39%)	31 (18%)	30 (18%)	11 (7%)
	The nurse	16 (10%)	22 (14%)	74 (47%)	27 (17%)	12 (8%)	8 (5%)
	The dentist	29 (18%)	3 (2%)	36 (23%)	19 (12%)	33 (21%)	38 (24%)
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	23 (14%)	19 (11%)	65 (38%)	21 (12%)	28 (16%)	14 (8%)
	The nurse	20 (13%)	21 (13%)	62 (39%)	31 (19%)	14 (9%)	11 (7%)
	The dentist	44 (28%)	21 (14%)	41 (26%)	20 (13%)	10 (6%)	19 (12%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						14 (8%)
	<i>Very good</i>						17 (10%)
	<i>Good</i>						61 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i>						34 (20%)
	<i>Bad</i>						28 (17%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						13 (8%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes						77 (45%)
	No						94 (55%)
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>						94 (55%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						28 (16%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						28 (16%)
	<i>No</i>						20 (12%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes						49 (28%)
	No						123 (72%)
Q9.7	Are your 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>						123 (73%)
	Yes						26 (15%)
	No						19 (11%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	50 (30%)
	No	118 (70%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	25 (15%)
	No	143 (85%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	44 (26%)
	Easy	15 (9%)
	Neither	19 (11%)
	Difficult	2 (1%)
	Very difficult	9 (5%)
	Don't know	79 (47%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	17 (10%)
	Easy	19 (11%)
	Neither	18 (11%)
	Difficult	2 (1%)
	Very difficult	14 (8%)
	Don't know	99 (59%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	10 (6%)
	No	157 (94%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	7 (4%)
	No	158 (96%)
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>	116 (71%)
	Yes	37 (23%)
	No	11 (7%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	143 (86%)
	Yes	16 (10%)
	No	7 (4%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	121 (75%)
	Yes	30 (19%)
	No	11 (7%)

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	16 (10%)	13 (8%)	41 (25%)	31 (19%)	32 (20%)	31 (19%)
	Vocational or skills training	24 (16%)	12 (8%)	55 (37%)	26 (17%)	23 (15%)	10 (7%)
	Education (including basic skills)	13 (9%)	25 (17%)	69 (46%)	26 (17%)	13 (9%)	5 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	44 (29%)	7 (5%)	28 (19%)	35 (23%)	20 (13%)	16 (11%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					33 (21%)	
	Prison job					70 (44%)	
	Vocational or skills training					25 (16%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					43 (27%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					24 (15%)	

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	30 (22%)	50 (37%)	40 (30%)	15 (11%)
	Vocational or skills training	25 (23%)	49 (46%)	17 (16%)	16 (15%)
	Education (including basic skills)	17 (15%)	53 (47%)	30 (27%)	13 (12%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	31 (29%)	46 (43%)	20 (19%)	10 (9%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				27 (17%)
	<i>Never</i>				44 (27%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>				48 (29%)
	<i>About once a week</i>				39 (24%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>				5 (3%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				61 (38%)
	<i>Yes</i>				38 (23%)
	<i>No</i>				63 (39%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				36 (22%)
	<i>0</i>				41 (25%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				56 (34%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				30 (18%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				3 (2%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				22 (13%)
	<i>0</i>				19 (11%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				51 (30%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				46 (27%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				30 (18%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				9 (5%)
	<i>0</i>				3 (2%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				21 (13%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				28 (17%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				104 (63%)
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>				15 (9%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>				30 (18%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>				25 (15%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>				31 (18%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>				20 (12%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>				34 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				13 (8%)

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	42 (26%)
	No	122 (74%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	61 (37%)
	No	106 (63%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	35 (21%)
	No	131 (79%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	24 (15%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	22 (13%)
	<i>Easy</i>	40 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	11 (7%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	111 (66%)
	No	56 (34%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that applies to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	56 (34%)
	<i>No contact</i>	52 (31%)
	<i>Letter</i>	22 (13%)
	<i>Phone</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Visit</i>	36 (22%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	97 (60%)
	No	66 (40%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	61 (37%)
	No	103 (63%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	103 (62%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Involved</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	13 (8%)

Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that applies to you.)			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			103 (62%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			31 (19%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>			21 (13%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>			12 (7%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>			3 (2%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			14 (8%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			103 (62%)
	<i>Yes</i>			43 (26%)
	<i>No</i>			13 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			6 (4%)
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>			103 (62%)
	<i>Yes</i>			7 (4%)
	<i>No</i>			43 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			12 (7%)
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>			103 (62%)
	<i>Yes</i>			23 (14%)
	<i>No</i>			27 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			13 (8%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	<i>Yes</i>			11 (7%)
	<i>No</i>			80 (48%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			75 (45%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	<i>Yes</i>			21 (13%)
	<i>No</i>			143 (87%)
Q13.12	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that applies to you.)			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	32 (22%)	46 (31%)	70 (47%)
	Accommodation	33 (23%)	51 (35%)	62 (42%)
	Benefits	30 (20%)	49 (33%)	70 (47%)
	Finances	33 (25%)	24 (18%)	76 (57%)
	Education	36 (27%)	30 (22%)	69 (51%)
	Drugs and alcohol	41 (30%)	42 (31%)	54 (39%)
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>			0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>			83 (52%)
	<i>No</i>			77 (48%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Brixton 2014

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

Key to tables

		HMP Brixton 2014	Category C Training Prisons comparator	HMP Brixton 2014	HMP Brixton 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		177	5815	177	182
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	3%	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	98%
1.3	Are you on recall?	4%	9%	4%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	6%	6%	6%	17%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	10%	3%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	9%	4%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	58%	25%	58%	54%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	4%	4%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	20%	12%	20%	26%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	19%	16%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	6%	5%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	38%	37%	38%	51%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	51%	51%	51%	53%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	36%	46%	36%	45%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	64%	73%	64%	75%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	4%	8%	4%	8%
2.4	Was the van clean?	59%	66%	59%	60%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	73%	81%	73%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	72%	68%	71%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	51%	62%	51%	46%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	24%	16%	24%	42%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85%	88%	85%	87%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	64%	50%	64%	54%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Brixton 2014	Category C Training Prisons comparator	HMP Brixton 2014	HMP Brixton 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				
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	85%	81%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	74%	68%	65%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	75%	61%	75%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	18%	17%	18%	16%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	24%	14%	24%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	3%	3%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	35%	19%	35%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	2%	1%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	21%	14%	21%	16%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	15%	14%	15%	14%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	14%	12%	14%	13%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	14%	13%	14%	13%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	7%	5%	7%	5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	24%	18%	24%	19%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	25%	37%	25%	30%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	66%	76%	66%	7%
3.6	A shower?	10%	29%	10%	14%
3.6	A free telephone call?	16%	42%	16%	8%
3.6	Something to eat?	31%	60%	31%	41%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	23%	51%	23%	10%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	28%	44%	28%	24%
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?	37%	51%	37%	34%
3.7	Someone from health services?	57%	69%	57%	50%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	13%	31%	13%	9%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	14%	21%	14%	15%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	29%	52%	29%	17%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	19%	42%	19%	10%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	23%	45%	23%	20%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	18%	44%	18%	19%
3.8	Health services?	32%	55%	32%	22%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	25%	49%	25%	25%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Brixton 2014	Category C Training Prisons comparator	HMP Brixton 2014	HMP Brixton 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				
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	83%	69%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	91%	88%	62%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	53%	61%	53%	42%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	86%	83%	86%	73%
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%	48%	34%	41%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	37%	51%	37%	48%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	15%	13%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	29%	42%	29%	27%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	33%	44%	33%	26%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	53%	67%	53%	65%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	94%	94%	94%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	72%	79%	72%	75%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	75%	68%	75%	78%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	30%	37%	30%	23%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	61%	68%	61%	62%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	15%	24%	15%	16%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	43%	25%	43%	29%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	44%	41%	39%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	37%	57%	37%	34%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	54%	52%	54%	57%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	58%	52%	55%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	57%	49%	57%	52%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	82%	75%	77%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	46%	59%	46%	61%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	26%	44%	26%	41%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	59%	57%	48%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	37%	32%	37%	35%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	27%	32%	27%	23%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	19%	18%	15%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	27%	29%	27%	19%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Brixton 2014	Category C Training Prisons comparator	HMP Brixton 2014	HMP Brixton 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				
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	29%	53%	29%	50%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	35%	47%	35%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	6%	5%	2%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	33%	39%	33%	47%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	74%	78%	74%	68%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	71%	75%	71%	68%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	27%	29%	27%	23%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	20%	14%	11%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	52%	70%	52%	52%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	51%	63%	51%	47%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	37%	33%	37%	40%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	14%	18%	22%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	22%	25%	22%	22%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	11%	8%	7%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	6%	5%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	15%	14%	11%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	5%	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	5%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	5%	7%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	4%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	4%	7%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Brixton 2014	Category C Training Prisons comparator	HMP Brixton 2014	HMP Brixton 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				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	29%	29%	31%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	11%	7%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	3%	4%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	13%	12%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	4%	6%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	3%	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%	6%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	3%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	4%	9%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	2%	3%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	29%	40%	29%	33%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	46%	31%	46%	37%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	60%	54%	60%	51%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	25%	13%	25%	15%
	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?	57%	47%	57%	54%
9.2	The nurse?	60%	58%	60%	50%
9.2	The dentist?	56%	42%	56%	46%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	51%	42%	51%	50%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	45%	48%	45%	42%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	74%	84%	74%	85%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	29%	28%	29%	24%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	58%	50%	58%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Brixton 2014	Category C Training Prisons comparator	HMP Brixton 2014	HMP Brixton 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				
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	30%	23%	30%	22%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	15%	17%	15%	15%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	33%	35%	30%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	21%	21%	21%	15%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%	6%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	7%	4%	3%
For those with drug or alcohol problems:					
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	77%	62%	77%	65%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	70%	63%	70%	50%
For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:					
10.9	Was the support helpful?	73%	78%	73%	87%
SECTION 11: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	33%	43%	33%	19%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	45%	38%	45%	23%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	62%	52%	62%	43%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	23%	21%	23%	18%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	44%	60%	44%	37%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	16%	16%	16%	8%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	27%	24%	27%	25%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	15%	13%	15%	11%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	78%	82%	78%	67%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	48%	42%	48%	27%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	77%	73%	77%	57%
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?	60%	57%	60%	44%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	85%	78%	85%	76%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	55%	60%	55%	51%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	71%	71%	71%	60%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	61%	53%	61%	42%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	27%	45%	27%	18%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	23%	48%	23%	11%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	20%	34%	20%	36%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	45%	49%	45%	33%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	63%	74%	63%	61%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Brixton 2014	Category C Training Prisons comparator	HMP Brixton 2014	HMP Brixton 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				
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	20%	17%	20%	10%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	26%	34%	26%	24%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	37%	45%	37%	46%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	21%	23%	21%	26%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	38%	26%	38%	44%
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?	67%	83%	67%	76%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2 No contact?	47%	35%	47%	38%
13.2 Contact by letter?	20%	37%	20%	31%
13.2 Contact by phone?	16%	24%	16%	24%
13.2 Contact by visit?	33%	32%	33%	30%
13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	60%	70%	60%	61%
For those who are sentenced:				
13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?	37%	69%	37%	49%
For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5 Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	60%	55%	60%	53%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6 Nobody?	48%	48%	48%	64%
13.6 Offender supervisor?	32%	35%	32%	29%
13.6 Offender manager?	18%	26%	18%	14%
13.6 Named/ personal officer?	5%	13%	5%	6%
13.6 Staff from other departments?	21%	16%	21%	12%
For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	69%	65%	69%	39%
13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	11%	22%	11%	25%
13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	37%	29%	37%	26%
13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	6%	7%	4%
13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	13%	16%	13%	13%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
13.12 Employment?	40%	32%	40%	32%
13.12 Accommodation?	45%	36%	45%	35%
13.12 Benefits?	41%	38%	41%	30%
13.12 Finances?	24%	25%	24%	16%
13.12 Education?	30%	33%	30%	35%
13.12 Drugs and alcohol?	44%	43%	44%	36%
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?	52%	55%	52%	51%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (Ethnicity and Religion)HMP Brixton 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	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		101	72	36	140
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	4%	8%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			91%	50%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	1%	9%	3%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	31%	4%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	14%	9%	18%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1%	7%	6%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	42%	31%	49%	35%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59%	80%	61%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	52%	49%	39%	54%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	87%	77%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	80%	60%	71%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	80%	66%	85%	72%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	56%	61%	54%	58%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62%	81%	58%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	86%	91%	91%	88%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	28%	42%	37%	34%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	47%	59%	44%	55%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	97%	77%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	35%	15%	34%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	42%	41%	36%	45%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	33%	50%	34%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	29%	49%	28%	40%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	49%	59%	64%	51%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	50%	58%	56%	51%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	69%	85%	51%	81%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	51%	65%	53%	58%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	17%	44%	23%	31%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	27%	46%	32%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	7%	6%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64%	87%	58%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	65%	77%	56%	74%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	10%	20%	3%	17%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	54%	47%	43%	54%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	39%	34%	39%	37%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	16%	21%	17%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	24%	22%	17%	24%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	17%	12%	14%	14%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	4%	6%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	0%	6%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	4%	6%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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 you have a disability? (By prisoners)	3%	0%	3%	2%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	30%	27%	34%	27%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	17%	7%	16%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	7%	10%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	0%	16%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	0%	10%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	2%	0%	3%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	41%	52%	42%	47%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	56%	65%	53%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	42%	51%	36%	47%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	25%	34%	22%	30%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	45%	23%	38%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	37%	54%	25%	49%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	15%	16%	16%	16%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	19%	41%	24%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	20%	10%	19%	14%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	25%	31%	21%	29%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	21%	19%	29%	18%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	42%	51%	44%	46%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	64%	65%	58%	64%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	14%	30%	12%	22%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	39%	34%	40%	36%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	19%	20%	21%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (Disability) HMP Brixton 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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		27	146
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	62%	58%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	11%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	30%	40%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	69%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	54%	50%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	70%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	96%	71%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	50%	58%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	85%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	30%	34%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	43%	55%

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		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	30%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	44%	44%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	29%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	36%	38%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	56%	53%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	56%	51%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	76%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	57%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	38%	26%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	27%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	65%	76%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	55%	73%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	17%	13%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	46%	52%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	52%	34%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	16%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	32%	20%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	17%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	4%

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)	9%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	44%	26%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	18%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	3%
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)	5%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	38%	47%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	52%	61%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	78%	39%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	58%	23%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	25%	37%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	26%	46%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	11%	17%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	37%	26%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	32%	13%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	29%	27%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%	19%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	48%	45%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	55%	65%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	17%	20%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	26%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	26%	21%