

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMP Long Lartin**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**20 – 31 October 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](mailto: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](mailto: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	51
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	57
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix III: Prison population profile	73
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	77



# Introduction

Located near Evesham in Worcestershire, HMP Long Lartin is a high security prison holding some of the most serious offenders in the country. At this inspection the prison was holding just over 600 men, nearly all of whom were serving very long sentences, with two-thirds serving life sentences. It is probable that a small minority of these prisoners will never be released. The throughput of prisoners in the establishment, about three-quarters of whom were over the age of 30, was low, ensuring a stable and largely settled population. However, the risks presented by the population was evidenced by the fact that virtually all were at least category B and at the time of the inspection 129 prisoners required full category A status.

We last inspected Long Lartin in 2011 and reported on a prison that was ensuring reasonably good outcomes across all of our healthy prison tests. The findings of this inspection were very similar. There had been some deterioration in the provision of purposeful activity, but to an extent, this was balanced by improvements we observed in the provision of resettlement services.

Overall the prison was reasonably safe and respectful. Though nearly one-third of prisoners suggested they felt unsafe on their first night in the prison, arrangements to receive new prisoners were adequate, despite uncoordinated and sometimes unfocused induction activities. Some effective and improved arrangements were in place to evaluate risk and reduce the likelihood of violence. CCTV coverage and staff engagement ensured prisoners were well supervised and the number of violent incidents recorded was comparatively low. However, some of the incidents were very serious, not least a murder that took place in 2013, emphasising again the risks that the prison had to manage.

Self-harm incidents were similarly low, but since our last inspection seven prisoners had died, two from self-inflicted deaths. Support for those in crisis was mixed and despite some recent improvement, the case management and care for those in crisis needed to be better. This was particularly true for those at risk and also held in health care or the segregation unit.

Physical and procedural security at Long Lartin was necessarily extensive and sophisticated but we found that it was applied in a generally proportionate manner that facilitated prisoners' access to services and the regime. The use of formal disciplinary procedures had reduced markedly in recent years and the incentives and earned privileges arrangements seemed to be fair. Commendably, force was used less frequently than at similar prisons, but some improvements needed to be made to record keeping and arrangements that demonstrated accountability. The large segregation unit remained fairly full, although lengths of stay were reducing. The regime in segregation was improving, as was the quality of staff engagement with prisoners in segregation.

The quality of accommodation remained very varied and the older wings retained the 'night san' remote unlocking system that allowed access to sanitation. As we have reported before, this system led to some poor and degrading outcomes for prisoners. However, all prisoners had their own cell and much of the newer accommodation was very good. The majority of prisoners felt respected by staff and these good relationships were supported by an effective personal officer scheme and some useful consultation arrangements. The promotion of equality and diversity was similarly good but more could have been done for older prisoners and those with mobility issues. The quality of, and access to, health services were reasonably good and our survey indicated this was appreciated by prisoners. The exception was the prison's 10 bed inpatient unit where the prisoner's therapeutic needs were not met.

Prisoners had satisfactory access to time out of cell and most prisoners were engaged in activity, but the overall effectiveness of learning and skills provision was inadequate. Improvements were being implemented but it was too early to assess their effectiveness. The narrowness of provision meant the education provider had only claimed 42% of the funding for which it was contracted and eligible. There were some useful vocational opportunities but achievements in education, especially English

and mathematics, were not good enough. Classes were orderly but too much teaching required improvement. Some workshops provided good employment experiences for prisoners but the work was often mundane and repetitive with limited opportunities for learning. Both the library and the gym ensured some good outcomes for prisoners.

An up-to-date reducing reoffending policy, supported by a comprehensive analysis of need, was in place. Offender management arrangements worked well with most assessments and sentence plans completed to a good standard and in a timely manner. The exception was assessments undertaken by community offender managers which were often late. Sentence plans had an appropriate focus on risk factors and complemented sound public protection work. Most of the prison's resettlement work was good and tailored to the needs of the very few prisoners who were discharged from Long Lartin each year. Work to support family ties, however, was poor and needed to improve, as did the way visitors were treated when they came to the prison.

Long Lartin manages some significant risks but does so with confidence. The prison is calm and controlled and although there is more to do, improvement is evident and the prison is both competent and effective. We have made a small number of recommendations which we believe will assist further improvement.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

March 2015

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

Long Lartin is a dispersal prison in the high security estate. It holds category A and category B offenders and serves courts in the West Midlands, South Wales and the South East.

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

Public

## Region/Department

High security estate

## Number held

602

## Certified normal accommodation

625

## Operational capacity

625

## Date of last full inspection

17 – 26 August 2011

## Brief history

Long Lartin, which occupies the site of a former war department ordnance depot, was built in the 1960s and opened as a prison in 1971. Originally a category C prison, it was upgraded to provide dispersal level security in 1973. Further improvements in security were made between 1995 and 1997, and an additional wing, Perrie, was opened in June 1999. In 2009 a new purpose-built unit, Atherton, replaced older style wings, increasing the capacity of the prison.

## Short description of residential units

A, B, C: older-style wings, which currently hold vulnerable prisoners. They do not have in-cell sanitation and offer night sanitation.

D wing: older style wing, which holds mainstream offenders. It does not have in-cell sanitation and offers night sanitation.

Perrie wing: a modern unit with accommodation for up to 112 prisoners. Perrie Blue has 42 single cells and is used as a reintegration spur for more difficult prisoners, including those previously subject to close supervision conditions. Perrie Red has 74 single cells.

E and F Wing: a modern unit with accommodation for 184 prisoners. Each wing has one low mobility cell.

Segregation unit: accommodation for 40 prisoners, including eight high control, two gated, two safer custody, 14 punishment and two Listener cells. There are designated cells for Rule 45/close supervision centre prisoners.

Health care: accommodation for 10 prisoners, including one low mobility cell which has recently been refurbished to provide end of life care if required.

Detainee unit: accommodation for 14 detainees, including two quiet cells and one safer custody cell. The unit has been closed since August 2013.

IDTS: integrated drug treatment system accommodating up to four offenders at request of integrated substance misuse service

**Name of governor**

Tom Wheatley

**Escort contractor**

Serco: south east and east

GEOAmey: rest of the country

**Health service commissioner and providers**

NHS England

Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust

**Learning and skills providers**

Milton Keynes College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

David Waters



# 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:

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

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

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

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

## This report

- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and II respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix III of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.

# Summary

## Safety

**S1** *The reception process was swift but the prison needed to ensure that induction was delivered consistently and promptly. First night arrangements were weak and many prisoners felt unsafe on their first night. We found a calm, well controlled prison but, while violence and bullying were few, there continued to be some very serious incidents. There had been two self-inflicted deaths since our last inspection. Some lessons had been learned from Prisons and Probation Ombudsman investigations but support for prisoners in crisis still required improvement. Safeguarding arrangements were underdeveloped. Security and disciplinary procedures were broadly proportionate. The incentives and earned privileges scheme was viewed positively by most prisoners. Use of force was commendably low. The segregation unit environment and regime were reasonable and we found some evidence of good and much improved staff-prisoner interaction. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S2** *At the last inspection in 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Long Lartin were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 30 recommendations in the area of safety. At this inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, and 12 had not been achieved.*

**S3** Prisoners were allocated to this long-term high security prison from all over the country and most prisoners we spoke to found the escort experience to be reasonable. The reception area was compact but fit for purpose and more prisoners than at our last inspection reported that staff treated them well and that they were generally moved quickly to wings. Property is especially important to long-term prisoners and, in our survey, two-thirds of prisoners reported that not all their property had arrived with them. Staff reported problems with escort contractors not bringing property on transfer or soon enough after a prisoner's arrival.

**S4** First night interviews were still not conducted in private and hot food and drinks were not routinely provided in reception for new arrivals. Few recent arrivals we spoke to had had the opportunity to speak to peer mentors on their first night and, in our survey, only 62% of prisoners compared to 69% in similar prisons said they felt safe on their first night. More thought was needed to how best to support prisoners from the point of arrival and through their first night. While prison was not a new experience for many of the prisoners we spoke to, some expressed natural anxiety about the unknown.

**S5** Induction was poorly coordinated and we were not satisfied that all prisoners received it in a timely manner. Prisoners spent too long locked in their cells while undertaking induction and were not allocated to work or activities until they had completed it.

**S6** Systems to evaluate risk and monitor levels of violence had improved and were now good. The collection of data on the number and nature of violent incidents was effective and the overarching structures to monitor the progress of the violence reduction strategy were sound. The investigation of alleged violence was effective, the regular monitoring and review of individuals located on the vulnerable prisoner wings was useful and links between the safer custody team and security were excellent. Opportunities for violence remained evident but staff supervision of prisoners on wings was effective and this was supported by extensive

CCTV coverage. The number of incidents was comparatively low but some were very serious, including a murder in 2013.

- S7 The analysis of data to provide information about patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was good. A senior manager reviewed death-in-custody action plans each month and important elements from these were included in the prison's continuous improvement plan. The number of self-harm incidents was comparatively low and a few prisoners accounted for a disproportionate number of incidents. A small, but significant, number of prisoners in crisis were isolated in the segregation and inpatient units, which was not appropriate. Access to Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) was reasonable. Listeners all said that they felt unsupported by staff and their work undervalued.
- S8 Despite some imposing physical measures, security arrangements were broadly proportionate and the prison felt relaxed. Sophisticated intelligence systems contributed to appropriate security objectives and a reasonably safe environment, including monitoring of potential radicalisation. The strategic approach to reducing the supply of illegal drugs was effective. Illicit drug use was low with the random mandatory drug testing positive rate averaging 1.6% in the previous six months.
- S9 The incentives and earned privileges scheme was fair and well managed with appropriate differentials between the different levels. Most prisoners felt the scheme was applied fairly.
- S10 The number of adjudications had decreased by a fifth since our last inspection and was now comparable to similar prisons. Records demonstrated sufficient investigation and quality assurance was effective.
- S11 The communal areas and cells in the segregation unit were clean and well maintained but most exercise yards were bleak and cage-like. Staff-prisoner relationships in the segregation unit were much better than at our last inspection and were now good. The prison needed a more effective approach to managing prisoners refusing to locate from segregation. Little progress was made with too many prisoners. Rule 45 reviews and care plans required further development and integration. The segregation regime was better than previously but could improve further.
- S12 Use of force was much lower than at similar establishments and had reduced since the previous inspection. Most records that we reviewed were detailed and demonstrated numerous attempts to de-escalate. However, some records were incomplete. Special accommodation had only been used once in 2014 which was commendable considering the challenging population. Planned interventions were routinely filmed but were not always reviewed. Some learning was required from those that we viewed.
- S13 An integrated substance misuse service provided safe clinical management to 21 prisoners. Prescribing regimes were flexible and care was well coordinated. During multi-agency complex case reviews, prisoners had good access to psychosocial support and innovative interventions which included sleep and acupuncture sessions.

## Respect

**S14** *Prisoner accommodation varied greatly. The old wings had small cells with no integral sanitation, but newer wings provided bright, good quality accommodation. Staff-prisoner engagement was good and we saw some skilful interactions. The administrative aspects of equality and diversity were reasonable as was support across most protected characteristics. Care and support for older prisoners and those with limited mobility required improvement. Faith provision was adequate. Primary health care services were good but the inpatient regime was very poor and its role was unclear. Food was unpopular with prisoners. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S15** *At the last inspection in 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Long Lartin were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 39 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>1</sup> At this inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, 19 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

**S16** The quality of accommodation varied greatly, from poorer accommodation in the older part of the prison to brighter, mostly well-maintained accommodation in the newer wings. Night sanitation<sup>2</sup> arrangements were still in place on the older wings and did not work effectively. It was unacceptable that prisoners sometimes had to use a bucket in their cell which they emptied in the morning. Cells on the older wings were cramped but all cells were generally well equipped and looked after. Communal showers on some wings lacked privacy screening and were in poor condition. Prisoners had good access to telephones and showers and laundry facilities were good on all wings.

**S17** In our survey, more prisoners than at our last inspection said that staff treated them with respect, and our observations supported this. Most prisoners knew who their personal officer was and most of those who did found them helpful. Records of personal officer contacts were informative and detailed. Prisoner consultation was regular and responsive.

**S18** The promotion of equality and diversity was good. Equality meetings were well attended by staff from across the prison, although issues raised by prisoner representatives were not always addressed. Discrimination incident report forms were available on all wings and those that we sampled were responded to swiftly and demonstrated adequate investigation. Consultation arrangements were reasonably good and there were well attended prisoner forums for all protected characteristics. In our survey, black and minority ethnic and foreign national prisoners reported more negatively about safety than white and British prisoners respectively. Regular monitoring covered all protected characteristics but many areas had been out of range for a significant period and had not been explored adequately.

**S19** It was disappointing that most prisoners with limited mobility were living in un-adapted cells with no integral sanitation and were unable to access association areas on wings. The needs of older prisoners were not fully met. No meaningful work had been undertaken with these groups to determine what extra provision they needed. Faith provision was good; the chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison and provided valued support to prisoners.

<sup>1</sup> This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

<sup>2</sup> Cells without internal sanitation are fitted with electronic cell doors. These doors are controlled by staff to enable prisoners one at a time to access to communal facilities

- S20 Internal complaints were responded to swiftly and most responses were polite and focused. However, too many complaints against staff did not demonstrate adequate investigation. More prisoners than at the previous inspection said that it was easy to communicate with their solicitor and to attend legal visits but there were still significantly less than at similar prisons. Prisoners representing themselves could use laptops to work on their case but there were no trained legal services officers or independent immigration advice.
- S21 Health care governance was good and clinical services were appropriately integrated. Health services had become too dependent on locum GP arrangements which could affect the delivery of care. Prisoners' views on health care varied, but we observed effective provision and good professional interactions. The role of the inpatient unit was ill defined and not understood by staff. The care prisoners received there was very poor and their needs were not being met.
- S22 Staff and prisoners told us that access to tradeable prescribed medication was a concern but the measures we witnessed to manage this appeared appropriate. We found evidence that good intelligence, searching, testing and physical barriers all contributed to addressing the supply and use of illegal substances. There was little suggestion by prisoners that illegal drugs were readily available.
- S23 There was a good range of appropriate clinics and the quality of services that we observed was good. Access was generally good but there were inappropriately long waits for the optician and for smoking cessation services. Access to external hospital appointments was occasionally curtailed because of staffing issues, which could affect health outcomes for prisoners. Mental health services were appropriate, but there was no access to professional counselling services.
- S24 The kitchen was clean and well equipped but some serveries were grubby. Menus were reasonably varied and the quality of food that we tasted was good, but it was unpopular with prisoners. Consultation arrangements were good. Prisoners could eat out of cell informally, and self-cook opportunities were greatly appreciated by those who used them. The prison shop provided an adequate service and the on-site distribution workshop offered a commercial work area for prisoners.

## Purposeful activity

- S25 *Time out of cell was reasonable for most prisoners. There were sufficient activity places but the sequencing of attendance at activities required improvement. An improvement action plan was in place, but it was too early to identify any positive outcomes. The education provision was inadequate. Achievement outcomes were still too low, especially in English and mathematics. Too much teaching required improvement and arrangements for initial assessment and induction were inadequate. Library facilities were good and we found positive support in place for learners. There were good opportunities for recreational and accredited PE. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S26 *At the last inspection in 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Long Lartin were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, four had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

- S27 Time out of cell for most prisoners was reasonably good. Employed prisoners could have about 8.5 hours out of cell during the week and about six hours at weekends. Some prisoners who were unemployed or not required for work had about four to five hours out of cell.
- S28 The prison's learning and skills manager had begun to implement improvements but the outcomes were not yet evident. The Milton Keynes College had not secured the volume and range of classroom provision for which it was contracted. It was disappointing that in 2013 to 2014, the college claimed only 42% of the funding for which it was eligible. There were not enough learning and skills staff and some courses had not been offered. Quality assurance was inadequate and the self-assessment process was weak.
- S29 Success rates in English and mathematics had improved in 2013 to 2014, but were still inadequate. The development of English and mathematics required improvement, especially in the vocational areas. Outcomes on the art course were also low. Prisoners were developing good vocational and practical skills during workshop sessions.
- S30 Most prisoners were engaged in purposeful activities. However, the number of prisoners who were routinely over-allocated to workshop activities was too high. This practice was intended to maximise capacity but prisoners found it demotivating to be turned away often or redirected to another activity at short notice. The range of vocational work was good, but opportunities for prisoners to gain accreditation in vocational skills were limited. Provision at advanced and undergraduate level was limited.
- S31 Too much of the teaching required improvement. Planning was good in a few lessons which met individual needs well. However, too many individual learning plans were focused on completion of the qualification rather than on the acquisition of skills. Most classes were orderly and well managed. Learning mentors were used effectively during sessions.
- S32 The college's arrangements for induction and initial assessment of numeracy and literacy skills were inadequate. At the time of the inspection, the college had failed to carry out an initial assessment of 14% of the population.
- S33 Employability skills were developed well in the popular woodcraft and DHL workshops, but prisoners' attendance in the recycling workshop was low and prisoners rightly complained that the work they were required to do was repetitive and boring. No opportunities were offered to gain a vocational qualification in this area. The promotion of English and mathematics and of equality and diversity was weak, both in classrooms and in vocational training.
- S34 Gym time was appropriately apportioned among vulnerable and mainstream prisoners and 'early bird' sessions (held first thing in the morning), as well as weekend and evening sessions, were offered to all prisoners. There was a wide range of accredited courses for prisoners to study while using the gym. Gym staff and health care staff had a good relationship, but gym staff and the college had not developed effective working links.
- S35 Prisoners' access to the library was satisfactory and most used the library regularly. The number of active library users had increased. The range of courses available in the library was good and included creative writing and mentoring support. The library held almost 15,000 items, including books for foreign nationals, 'easy read' books, DVDs and CDs, giving prisoners a good range of resources.

## Resettlement

**S36** *Much of the strategic direction of resettlement was determined informally, but there was an up-to-date reducing reoffending policy, supported by a comprehensive needs analysis. Most prisoners knew their offender supervisors and contact was regular, but the consistency and quality of engagement required some improvement. OASys work was good. Public protection arrangements were good. Pathway provision was reasonable but provision for children and families was poor. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

**S37** *At the last inspection in 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Long Lartin were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

**S38** The reducing reoffending policy was comprehensive and informed by an up-to-date needs analysis. However, the policy did not specifically address the work of offender management. Despite this, offender management was regularly represented at the monthly reducing reoffending meetings where key developmental issues were discussed.

**S39** The allocation of offender supervisors and the review of sentence plans on arrival at Long Lartin were undertaken in a timely manner. Nearly all the OASys (offender assessment system) for which the prison was responsible were complete and up to date, but there remained a significant backlog of OASys held by community offender managers. The quality of OASys, risk assessments and risk management plans that we reviewed was good.

**S40** Sentence plans were appropriate and focused on addressing identified risk factors. Most prisoners were seen regularly by offender supervisors in addition to their annual sentence plan reviews, but the focus of such contact remained unclear in many cases.

**S41** There was evidence of good liaison between the offender management unit and other departments, including the psychology and programme teams, but there remained a need to develop further casework supervision, training and engagement skills. Although the number of sex offenders had declined in recent months, the development of a clear strategy was needed to manage prisoners who remained.

**S42** Public protection arrangements were good. Prisoners were identified, screened and managed well and there was evidence of good analysis through the interdepartmental risk management team. The multi-agency management of high-risk prisoners was of a high standard.

**S43** The prison released relatively few prisoners. Reintegration plans were well managed, focused on identified risk factors and incorporated multidisciplinary input, including community offender managers.

**S44** There was little need for accommodation support and provision was adequate. Despite the prison's needs analysis in 2013 indicating a demand for financial support, there was little in place. There was no money or debt management provision.

**S45** Good links between the prison, the education provider and the National Careers Service (NCS) had developed recently. The NCS offered a well-managed, effective interview process which helped prisoners to understand the education and training opportunities available to them. Information on prisoners was recorded on NOMIS and used to inform the prisoner's sentence planning.



- S46 The palliative care pathway was well described and a recent case demonstrated effective practice in this area. Support for prisoners leaving the prison was effective but there had been significant waits for transfer to hospital under the Mental Health Act, a problem which had been identified in the previous year's Independent Monitoring Board report.
- S47 There was good joint working between the integrated substance misuse service and other departments. The substance misuse service contributed to sentence management boards and completed transfer plans.
- S48 It was disappointing that in a long-term prison provision for children and families was underdeveloped; there was no family support worker or relationship course and, while there was provision for Storybook Dads<sup>3</sup>, no prisoner had used this for over six months. For men who were spending much of their family life in closed conditions, it was frustrating that visitors and prisoners told us that visits regularly did not start at the advertised time. We observed families experiencing unacceptable delays despite arriving early after long journeys.
- S49 A good range of accredited programmes was in place and the management of waiting lists for programmes was fair and clearly communicated to prisoners. Post- programme reviews were well managed, as was the level of support during post- programme reviews and beyond.

## Main concerns and recommendations

- S50 Concern: Some prisoners had received no induction after several weeks and because of this had been unable to access facilities, including employment, library and gym.

**Recommendation: Induction should start the day after a prisoner arrives at the establishment, take place without delay, and include purposeful activity between modules.** (Repeated recommendation I. 28)

- S51 Concern: In the wings with no internal sanitation some prisoners had to wait for over an hour to be unlocked to use a toilet and the practice of using a bucket in cell was still in operation. The population of these wings included prisoners with disabilities who could not access the toilet facilities when required.

**Recommendation: A to D wings should be refurbished to include integral sanitation in cells.**

- S52 Concern: The inpatient health care facility housed some of the most vulnerable and isolated men in the prison. The support available to them was inadequate and lacked direction, resulting in poor outcomes for prisoners.

**Recommendation: Prisoners who need 24-hour clinical support should have access to a dedicated unit which provides a positive therapeutic regime delivered by well trained staff.**

- S53 Concern: The range of accredited qualifications available in vocational subjects was too narrow. Too many courses were not running because of staff shortages. The industrial cleaning workshop had not been operational for several months. Classes in personal and social development were not being offered. The number of classes cancelled because the tutor was ill or on annual leave was too high.

---

<sup>3</sup> Prisoners are encouraged to record a story for their child to listen to at home which supports a parental bond.

**Recommendation: The range and availability of accredited qualifications should be increased and sufficient staff should be provided to cover classes and workshops.**

- S54 Concern: Arrangements for initial assessment and induction were inadequate. At the time of the inspection, 14% of men had not received an initial assessment of their prior educational history and attainment and could not attend education. Induction into education was carried out as part of the main prison induction, with a contribution of only 45 minutes by the college. Prisoners gained only a rudimentary understanding of the education options and facilities available to them.

**Recommendation: Prisoners should receive adequate and timely initial assessment and induction into education.**

- S55 Concern: Visits for long-term prisoners are extremely important, especially as many prisoners spend a considerable part of their life in custody, with families having very limited access and yet visits regularly did not start at the advertised time. We observed families experiencing unacceptable delays despite arriving early after long journeys and receiving quite limited support.

**Recommendation: Visits should start at the advertised time and the visits experience should be more welcoming and respectful.**

# Section 1. Safety

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.

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <p><b>I.1</b></p> | <p><i>Some prisoners reported long journeys to Long Lartin with no toilet breaks. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said that all their property had arrived with them. All prisoners were double cuffed between the van and reception when arriving at or leaving the prison.</i></p> |
|-------------------|---|
- I.2** Some prisoners reported long journeys to Long Lartin and said they had not been given adequate opportunity for toilet breaks. Food and drink was provided. Category A prisoners were escorted by prison staff while other prisoners were escorted by GeoAmey and Serco escort contractors.
  - I.3** There were, on average ten new receptions per week into Long Lartin. We were unable to observe any receptions during our inspection. In our survey, 60% of prisoners said they were treated well or very well by escort staff against 46% at the previous inspection.
  - I.4** All prisoners continued to be double handcuffed between the escort vehicle and reception without individual risk assessment. This happened despite the short distance, the presence of staff and the highly developed security, including aerial defences, of the area.
  - I.5** In our survey, only 67% of prisoners against the comparator of 77% reported that all their property had arrived with them. Prisoners told us and reception staff confirmed that escort staff often did not bring all a prisoner's property and, in some cases, no property was brought because of limited space in escorting vehicles. There were sometimes long delays before prisoners received the rest of their property due to a lack of space on subsequent escort vehicles and slow responses from the sending prison when missing property was followed up by staff at Long Lartin.

### Recommendation

- I.6 Prisoners' property should arrive with them on transfer or within a reasonable time after their arrival.**

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.7** *The reception area was adequate and more prisoners than at our last inspection reported that staff treated them well. First night interviews were still not conducted in private and hot food and drinks were not routinely provided for new arrivals. All prisoners were strip-searched when passing through reception. Prisoners arriving late in the day did not always get a shower but staff contacted the families of new arrivals. In our survey, fewer prisoners than in similar prisons said that they felt safe on their first night. Induction was poorly coordinated and we were not satisfied that all prisoners received it in a timely manner or at all. Prisoners spent too long locked in their cells while undertaking induction and awaiting allocation to activities.*
- 1.8** The reception area was clean and generally adequate for the number of prisoners passing through. Recent new arrivals told us that reception procedures were swift and, in our survey, 65% of prisoners against 42% at the 2011 inspection said that staff had treated them well or very well in reception. All prisoners passing through reception were strip-searched (see section on security). We were told by reception staff that cell-sharing risk assessments and first night interviews were still not carried out in private. Hot food and drinks were not routinely provided for prisoners in reception. The health care assessment took place in the health care centre.
- 1.9** Prisoners were located from reception to a wing for mainstream or vulnerable prisoners as appropriate. Late arrivals did not always receive a shower on their first night but new arrivals told us that staff contacted their family on their behalf. Night staff were familiar with the location of new prisoners. Prisoners we spoke to said they were given little information other than an induction booklet written in English. Few said they had met Listeners<sup>4</sup> or Insiders<sup>5</sup> on their first night. In our survey, only 62% of mainstream prisoners against the comparator of 69% said that they felt safe on their first night and responses from vulnerable prisoners on support wings were worse.
- 1.10** Induction was held every Monday and prisoners who had completed or were awaiting induction were locked in their cells during the core day while waiting to be allocated to activities. The whole process was uncoordinated and there was no central record of who had completed induction (see main recommendation S50). Some prisoners had not received an induction until they had been at the prison for several weeks and others had had no induction at all. In one prisoner's case notes it had been recorded that six weeks after his arrival he was unable to get employment as he had not completed his induction. Another prisoner had arrived at Long Lartin a week before our inspection with little of his property; he had been locked in his cell during the core day since arrival because he had not undertaken induction. He was keen to go to the library and the gym to occupy his time but was unable to do so.

<sup>4</sup> Prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners

<sup>5</sup> Prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life

## Recommendations

- I.11 Interviews with new arrivals in reception should take place in private.** (Repeated recommendation I.9)
- I.12 Prisoners should be able to have a shower on their first night.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.13** Hot food and drinks should be available in reception for new arrivals.

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.14** *Systems to evaluate risk and monitor levels of violence had improved and were very good. The investigation of alleged violence was effective, the regular monitoring and review of individuals located on the vulnerable prisoner wings was useful and links between the safer custody team and security were excellent. Opportunities for violence remained evident but staff supervision of prisoners on wings was good and this was supported by extensive CCTV coverage. The number of actual incidents was comparatively low but some of them were very serious. Although most prisoners said that they did not feel unsafe at the establishment, in our survey nearly half the respondents on A, B, and C vulnerable prisoner wings said that they had been victimised by staff and prisoners.*

- I.15** A full review of the violence reduction strategy had taken place since the previous inspection following some particularly serious violent incidents, including a murder in 2013. A new violence reduction policy had been published and systems to evaluate risk and monitor levels of violence had improved. The violence reduction strategy was relevant and based on a detailed analysis of recent patterns of violence in the prison. It was further supported by other local policies and procedures such as the regular review of prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner unit and improved levels of investigation into alleged and actual acts of violence.
- I.16** A safer custody committee met each month to monitor progress of the violence reduction and suicide prevention strategies. Meetings were always well attended and minutes reflected focused discussions about all forms of violence. Links between the security department and safer custody had greatly improved and were excellent. There was an unrestricted flow of relevant information, such as security reports, to the full-time safer custody officers.
- I.17** Comprehensive information was provided each month by the safer custody team about the number, type and location of violent incidents, and analysis of information to identify trends, patterns and problem areas was better than we usually see.
- I.18** Formal arrangements to deal with bullying (challenging antisocial behaviour [CAB]) and other forms of antisocial behaviour had also been reviewed and modified to produce a simple single-stage system to identify, monitor and change antisocial behaviour. This was based chiefly on incentives and earned privileges (IEP) sanctions supported by regular reviews to monitor behaviour changes. Our observations showed that, on the whole, protocols were

consistently followed and that effective oversight of the scheme by the violence reduction coordinator had improved. Over 150 prisoners had been managed under the CAB scheme so far in 2014.

- I.19** Prisoners found to be involved in violent incidents as a result of proven adjudication or following a formal investigation of bullying were immediately placed on the basic level of the IEP scheme. We found that allegations of violence, particularly bullying, were treated consistently and were investigated promptly by wing managers.
- I.20** Staff supervision had improved, which was helped by CCTV cameras in corridors and on all residential wings. Prison officers regularly patrolled landings and engagement between them and prisoners was better than we found at the previous inspection.
- I.21** However, opportunities for violence remained evident. Although there had only been 26 recorded assaults against staff and prisoners in the six months before this inspection, which was comparatively low and similar to the last inspection, some of these were extremely serious. In our survey, nearly half the respondents on A, B, and C vulnerable prisoner wings said that they had been victimised by staff and prisoners.

## Recommendation

- I.22 Perceptions of vulnerable prisoners about their safety should be explored and addressed.**

## Self-harm and suicide

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.23** *Effective analysis of data was carried out to provide information about patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour. The number of self-harm incidents was comparatively low and a few prisoners accounted for a disproportionate number of incidents. Management checks had driven up the quality of entries in some ACCT<sup>6</sup> documents but we found too many examples of poor case management and planning in some important areas, particularly in the health care centre and the segregation unit. Prisoners had reasonable access to Listeners but all the Listeners said that they felt unsupported by staff and their work was undervalued.*

- I.24** Protocols to prevent self-harm and suicide were managed by full-time safer custody officers supported by a small team of staff and a senior manager. The safer custody committee monitored the implementation of the strategy at well attended monthly meetings. A wide range of information, provided by an administration support worker, was used to identify trends and patterns of behaviour in the context of location, type, timing and peripheral circumstances of individual incidents. These trends were used to develop the strategy and update the improvement action plans.

<sup>6</sup> Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm

- I.25** Tragically there had been seven deaths in custody since the previous inspection, two of which were self-inflicted deaths, one in July 2013 and one in September 2014. A senior manager reviewed all death in custody action plans each month. Elements of these were included in the prison's continuous improvement plan, which was monitored by the safer custody committee each month.
- I.26** At the time of the inspection, there were nine open ACCT documents, five of which were for prisoners located in the health care centre and one in the segregation unit. This was comparatively low. Ninety-two had been opened during the six months before the inspection, about a quarter of these in the segregation unit, which was significantly more than we usually see.
- I.27** The number of incidents of self-harm was also reasonably low at 66 during the same period. Individual prisoners with a history of prolific self-harm accounted for about 30% of all incidents.
- I.28** Management checks had been introduced and there was evidence that they were helping to improve standards in some areas of care planning. We saw too many examples of ACCTs not demonstrating consistently good standards of care or active planning. Many records were lengthy and contained a multitude of entries, most of which were lacking in detail. Too many were generic and repetitive and only occasionally showed good quality interaction.
- I.29** The quality of care for prisoners in crisis located in the health care centre and segregation unit was particularly poor. These prisoners were not engaged in any formal education or work, they had virtually no contact with other prisoners and engagement between them and prison officers was limited. We were concerned that this lack of purposeful activity, deficiency of association, and distant staff-prisoner relationships were contributing to feelings of isolation and alienation which might have led to further self-harming behaviour.
- I.30** The Listeners scheme was well established and prisoners' access to them had improved since the last inspection. However, all the Listeners told us that they felt unsupported by staff and that their work was undervalued.

## Recommendations

- I.31** **The quality of care for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved.**
- I.32** **There should be pro-active and effective support for the Listener scheme.**

## 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.<sup>7</sup>**

**I.33** *Formal protocols had not been adequately developed to inform the policy on vulnerable adults in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness.*

**I.34** A policy to manage vulnerable prisoners in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness was underdeveloped. However, local vulnerability screening procedures and assessments of risk carried out during the prisoners' first few days at the prison were reasonably effective. These included cell-sharing risk assessments and reviews and initial health care screening interviews.

**I.35** Protocols were less clear on actions to be taken if information came to the attention of a member of staff that a prisoner at risk may have been abused or injured while in custody. Staff we spoke to said they were not aware of formal protocols, but appeared focused on relevant issues and generally aware of their personal responsibility to protect those at risk. Awareness training for staff had not been planned.

**I.36** There were no formal links between the prison and community safeguarding board to review current practices and to identify the threshold at which formal adult protection protocols should be brought in.

### Recommendation

**I.37** **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.**

## 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.38** *The prison is one of five high security dispersal prisons in the country. Physical, procedural and dynamic security arrangements were extensive. Within this context security arrangements were broadly proportionate to the risk posed by the population and contributed to a safe environment. Random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rates were low but too many suspicion tests failed to take place.*

<sup>7</sup> We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).



- I.39** Physical security at Long Lartin was extensive. CCTV coverage was widespread and most areas could only be accessed from a secure corridor where movement was controlled by electronically operated doors. However, security arrangements were broadly proportionate and did not unnecessarily restrict access to the regime. Notable exceptions were the practice of strip-searching all prisoners arriving at Long Lartin (see section on early days in custody) and those entering the segregation unit (see section on segregation) without an individual risk assessment, and the placing of prisoners on closed visits for reasons not related to visits. At the time of the inspection, the prison felt well controlled and relaxed.
- I.40** Sophisticated intelligence systems informed the setting of appropriate security objectives by the intelligence executive committee which steered the work of the security committee. The number of intelligence reports was comparatively high at over 3,000 between April and September 2014. These were processed efficiently and acted on quickly which contributed to a relatively safe environment. The prison had an appropriate focus on extremism and the risks of radicalisation which was well managed, this included good links with special branch and the local force intelligence unit.
- I.41** The random MDT positive rate averaged 1.6% during the previous six months against a target of 4.75%. One prisoner had tested positive for tramadol since testing for this opiate-based medication had been introduced a month previously. The MDT programme was reasonably well staffed but, while 16 suspicion tests had been completed in the previous six months (with a positive rate of only 25%), another 17 requests had not been received in time. The prison also conducted risk assessment and frequent drug testing. The MDT suite was not fit for purpose and we welcomed the planned move to a refurbished suite with appropriate holding facilities.
- I.42** There were few drug finds and occasional hooch finds. Our survey results and other evidence indicated that diverted medication in the vulnerable prisoner population was the main issue. Good information sharing between security, health and substance misuse services was apparent and proactive measures to tackle this problem had been introduced. The supply reduction strategy and action plan were detailed and supply reduction measures were comprehensive.

## Recommendations

- I.43 Strip-searching should only be undertaken following an individual risk assessment.**
- I.44 Prisoners should only be placed and remain on closed visits when there is sufficient intelligence relating directly to visits.**
- I.45 MDT facilities should be relocated to an appropriate testing and waiting environment.**

## Incentives and earned privileges<sup>8</sup>

### 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.46** *The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was fair and mostly well managed. In our survey, more prisoners than in similar prisons felt the scheme was applied fairly.*

**I.47** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy was comprehensive and understood by staff and prisoners. At the time of the inspection, about 50% of prisoners were on the enhanced level of the scheme, 44% on standard and 6% on basic level. More than half the prisoners on the basic regime had refused to relocate from the segregation unit (see section on segregation).

**I.48** In our survey, 58% of prisoners said that the scheme was fair against the comparator of 53% and 36% at the previous inspection; 45% said the different levels of the scheme encouraged them to change their behaviour compared with 30% in 2011. We found that the scheme was applied fairly, warnings were appropriate and there were numerous opportunities to improve behaviour before a demotion in level was considered. Review boards were timely but behaviour improvement targets were often too generic. The regime for prisoners on basic level included twice weekly association and a daily shower, telephone call and exercise.

### Housekeeping point

**I.49** Individual behaviour improvement targets should be set for prisoners on basic level.

## 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.50** *Adjudication hearings were of a good standard. Use of force was low but management oversight required improvement. The segregation unit provided a reasonable environment and relationships between staff and prisoners had improved and were now good. Too many prisoners were segregated for too long and progress to reintegrate them was ineffective.*

### Disciplinary procedures

**I.51** The number of adjudications had decreased by a fifth since our last inspection and was now similar to comparable prisons. Between April and September 2014, 9% of adjudications had been dismissed. The records of hearings that we sampled were of a good standard and

<sup>8</sup> In the 2010 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.

indicated that legal advice was offered when requested and that appropriate investigations were carried out before a finding of guilt. Ten per cent of adjudications were quality assured by the governor. Good data on adjudications were discussed at the quarterly adjudication standardisation meeting.

## The use of force

- I.52** There had been 51 incidents of use of force in the six months to September 2014, which was much lower than similar prisons and lower than at our last inspection. This was commendable given the challenging population. About half of all incidents had occurred in the segregation unit. The use of handcuffs and relocation to the segregation unit were not routine.
- I.53** Use of force documentation that we sampled was generally of a good standard and demonstrated numerous attempts to deescalate. However, some records were incomplete. Planned interventions were always filmed but not routinely reviewed. Record keeping of films was poor. Films that we watched showed good attempts to deescalate but the camera was not always focused on the incident and the briefing of staff before the intervention was sometimes poorly delivered.
- I.54** Special accommodation had only been used once in 2014 for a period of only two hours, which was commendable. Documentation authorising this extreme measure was good but the observation form had not been completed, which was poor and undermined accountability.
- I.55** A use of force committee met regularly but was often poorly attended. The committee focused on most aspects of the use of force but not on the quality of planned interventions.

## Recommendations

- I.56 Management oversight and accountability for all aspects of use of force, including planned interventions, should be improved.**
- I.57 The quality of officer entries on special accommodation observation forms should be improved and indicate meaningful engagement with prisoners.**  
(Repeated recommendation 7.20)

## Segregation

- I.58** The segregation unit was large and bright and communal areas and cells were well maintained. The exercise yards remained bleak and cage-like but one of the four yards now had exercise equipment. Prisoners were unable to exercise together regardless of their risk, which increased the sense of isolation.
- I.59** Strip-searching of new arrivals on the unit without a risk assessment was routine. Protocols for unlocking individual prisoners were proportionate to their risk and more than one prisoner at a time was unlocked. However, we observed staff using high control boxes<sup>9</sup> when no risk assessment was in place because they said it was easier than unlocking the cell door.

---

<sup>9</sup> steel boxes attached to high-control cell doors so that items can be passed from prisoners to staff and vice versa without contact

- I.60** During the six months to September 2014, 158 prisoners had been segregated which was higher than similar prisons. Some remained in segregation for long periods. The average length of stay was 34 days but this was much less than at our last inspection. A few prisoners had been held for more than 200 days.
- I.61** At the time of the inspection, 20 prisoners were segregated under rule 45 for reasons of good order, two for their own protection and seven serving cellular confinement. Most of those held for good order reasons were refusing to locate elsewhere in the prison and were on the basic regime. We felt that some of these men should have been segregated for their own protection rather than for good order. Progress towards reintegration was poor and too many prisoners were transferred to segregation units in other establishments.
- I.62** The regime had improved since our previous inspection but needed further enhancement. There was daily access to a shower, telephone call and exercise and prisoners could use a rowing machine. Some had attended corporate worship. Other improvements included access to in-cell electricity and televisions for a few prisoners. However, food was still served at cell doors, although this practice ceased during the inspection. Education staff no longer attended the unit and more could have been done to engage some of the longest staying residents.
- I.63** In our survey, 39% of respondents against the comparator of 25% said they had been treated well by staff in the unit. We found relationships to be much better than previously and we saw staff engaging positively with prisoners. Staff had a good knowledge of those in their care but this was not always reflected in daily history notes or electronic case notes.
- I.64** Multidisciplinary reviews were timely but targets were generic and personal officer attendance was poor. Personal officers completed care plans but the plans did not always reflect the reviews or demonstrate progression and more could have been done to encourage reintegration.
- I.65** During the six months to September 2014, 29 prisoners had been held in the segregation unit on self-harm monitoring, which was a high number. From the sample that we reviewed, we were not confident that all were held in exceptional circumstances.
- I.66** Comprehensive data on segregation were collated and monitoring was good.

## Recommendations

- I.67** **The regime in the segregation unit should be further improved and prisoners should be able to exercise together subject to a risk assessment.**
- I.68** **The environment and conditions in the segregation unit exercise yards should be improved.** (Repeated recommendation 7.41)
- I.69** **A more effective approach to reintegrating prisoners should be implemented.**
- I.70** **Prisoners undergoing self-harm monitoring should only be held in the segregation unit in exceptional circumstances.**

## Housekeeping points

- I.71** High control cells and safety cells should only be used subject to a robust risk assessment.

**I.72** Personal officers should attend multidisciplinary review boards.

## 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.73** *The substance misuse strategy was well managed and an integrated substance misuse service (ISMS) provided clinical and psychosocial support to prisoners. Psychosocial interventions included group work and complementary therapies, but mutual aid needed development. Clinical management was safe and prisoners' care was well coordinated.*

**I.74** The substance misuse strategy document was up to date and contained detailed action plans based on data provided by the ISMS. A comprehensive needs analysis had not been undertaken in the past three years. The drug and alcohol strategy committee met regularly, services were well coordinated and there was good information sharing between departments. Substance misuse awareness training now formed part of staff induction but it was not yet delivered to existing staff.

**I.75** All new arrivals were seen by the ISMS within three days and 147 prisoners were engaged in individual or group work. In our survey, 34% of vulnerable prisoners reported previous drug problems and 21% previous alcohol problems, twice as many as the main population. Psychosocial interventions were available to all. The previous FOCUS programme had been replaced with an 18-session 'Inside Out' course until a more intensive programme was available to meet the needs of the population. Sleep and acupuncture sessions proved popular with clients of the ISMS and with other prisoners and were innovative.

**I.76** The clinical team was stretched because of vacant posts, but there was good clinical leadership and dual diagnosis expertise. Treatment regimes were flexible and based on individual need, and care was coordinated during complex case reviews. At the time of the inspection, 21 prisoners were prescribed methadone and 17 were reducing their dosage. Prisoners were given the option of switching to subutex to complete treatment, and secondary detoxification was available if a prisoner relapsed. Designated in-patient beds could be accessed during stabilisation/detoxification. Controlled drugs were administered manually from treatment rooms on the wings and this was well supervised. The ISMS worked closely with pharmacy, health care and discipline staff to minimise the diversion of medication such as tramadol and pregablin.

## Recommendations

**I.77** **A comprehensive needs analysis should be carried out to inform future service developments.**

**I.78** **The ISMS should increase support to prisoners by developing a peer support scheme and mutual aid groups.**



## Section 2. Respect

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.

### 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 kept reasonably clean. The quality of accommodation varied greatly, with poorer accommodation in the older part of the prison and well-maintained accommodation in the newer wings. Night sanitation arrangements were still in place on the older wings and did not work effectively. Cells on the older wings were cramped but all cells were well looked after. Communal showers on some wings lacked privacy screening and were in poor condition. Association facilities were reasonable but not easily accessible to some prisoners on A to D wings. Prisoners had good access to telephones, showers and laundry facilities.*

**2.2** External areas were well maintained and mostly clean. Litter thrown out of cell windows was cleared. The quality of accommodation varied widely, from older worn accommodation on A to D wings to the better, well maintained accommodation provided on E, F and Perrie wings. Communal areas on the older wings were in poor condition but most cells across the prison were clean, adequately equipped and well looked after by the occupants. We found no graffiti and the offensive display policy was adhered to across the prison.

**2.3** All cells were occupied by one prisoner. Cells on A to D wings were cramped and had no integral sanitation and prisoners relied on a night sanitation system which was not working effectively (see main recommendation S51). A prisoner was allowed out for 15 minutes for sanitation and use of the showers at night, with up to six other prisoners waiting in a queue. Some had to wait up to one and a half hours for access to toilets. There were buckets in cells, which equated to 'slopping out', and occasionally prisoners resorted to the degrading practice of defecating into plastic bags and throwing these out of their cell windows.

**2.4** Prisoners had good access to showers and, in our survey, 94% said they could shower daily. Communal showers on the older wings and Perrie wing lacked adequate privacy screening and some were in poor condition.

**2.5** All prisoners except those on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme were able to wear their own clothes. Laundry facilities on all the wings were good and prisoners had free access to them. For those who had to or chose to wear prison clothing, there was a weekly kit change, when clothes and sheets were exchanged on a one-for-one basis. Sheets were washed in a central laundry in the prison. Prisoners and staff told us that there were sometimes problems obtaining clothes of the required size. Most prison clothing that we saw was reasonable.

**2.6** Wing notice boards were well maintained and contained a range of important information about services and routines in the prison, although most information was in English.

- 2.7** The application system worked reasonably well, although it was difficult to tell when or if responses had been received as this was often not recorded. Prisoners told us, and we observed, that wing staff dealt with prisoners' queries and prisoners did not need to submit formal applications.
- 2.8** Prisoners could write as many letters as they wished and mail was dealt with promptly. Censoring processes were carried out quickly and a new service had speeded up the translation of letters written in foreign languages.
- 2.9** There were sufficient telephones on each wing and all were suitably private. Few prisoners reported problems in getting access to a telephone and additional prisoner telephones were provided in workshop areas.

## Recommendations

- 2.10 Showers on Perrie wing should be refurbished and adequately screened.**
- 2.11 Responses to applications should be timely and the date of the response should be recorded in application logs.** (Repeated recommendation 3.23)

## 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.**

**2.12** *Relationships between staff and prisoners were good. Most prisoners knew who their personal officer was and found them helpful. Records of personal officer contacts were informative and detailed. There was regular prisoner consultation and issues were followed up.*

- 2.13** Relationships between staff and prisoners were good. In our survey, 79% of prisoners compared with 64% at the previous inspection reported that staff treated them with respect. We observed polite and respectful interactions and staff engaged well with prisoners during association and at other times when prisoners were unlocked.
- 2.14** Although, in our survey, fewer respondents than at comparator prisons said that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help, more than in comparator prisons said they had a nominated personal officer, and those who did thought that this officer was helpful. Most prisoners we spoke to were complimentary about staff and the help they received. The personal officer scheme was universally applied and wing entries in case notes that we looked at showed regular input from staff in all areas of the prison. They demonstrated a good knowledge of prisoners and good links with the offender management unit. Although management checks were not always evident, the quality of entries in electronic case notes remained detailed and informative.
- 2.15** Managers had made efforts to improve staff-prisoner relationships and this was reflected in the consultation meetings. Monthly prisoner consultative committee meetings were attended by a wide range of staff. Minutes showed that issues were followed up and prisoners were kept updated with progress.



## 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 characteristic<sup>10</sup> 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.**

**2.16** *The promotion of equality and diversity was good. Equality meetings were well attended by staff from across the prison but issues raised by prisoner representatives were not always addressed. Consultation arrangements were reasonably good and there were prisoner forums for all protected characteristics. Regular monitoring was in place but many areas had been out of range for a significant period and had not been explored adequately. The discrimination incident report form (DIRF) system worked well. Provision for most protected characteristics was reasonably good but older prisoners' needs were not being fully met and most of those with limited mobility were living in unadapted cells with no integral sanitation and unable to access association areas on the wings.*

### Strategic management

- 2.17** The equality support team was well resourced, effective and committed to the work. A comprehensive equality policy covered all protected characteristics. Monthly equality meetings were chaired by the deputy governor and well attended by staff from across the prison and prisoner representatives. A monthly report covering all the protected characteristics and quarterly equality monitoring data was discussed at the meetings. Much of these data had been out of range for the previous nine months and showed consistent over-representation of groups of prisoners in adjudications, segregation, complaints and on the basic regime. These findings were not investigated robustly enough to address underlying reasons for inequitable treatment.
- 2.18** There were equality, foreign national and disability prisoner representatives, although none had received training for their role. Prisoner representatives were known by most prisoners and we found many prominent displays celebrating equality and diversity across the prison. The equality team organised a monthly programme of activities to celebrate diversity. There were regular forums for prisoners from all minority groups but issues raised by prisoner representatives were not consistently addressed.
- 2.19** Systems were good for identifying new arrivals from most protected groups, but prisoners from Gypsy, Romany and Traveller backgrounds and those who identified themselves as gay or bisexual were often reluctant to disclose this.
- 2.20** The DIRF system was good. The prison had received 59 DIRFs during the previous six months and those that we sampled were responded to within appropriate timeframes and demonstrated adequate investigation. A 10% external quality assurance process was carried out by the police equality officer. DIRF forms were available on all wings and most prisoners we spoke to knew how to report an incident of discrimination. In the sample of ordinary complaints that we examined, we saw a number which concerned discrimination that had been appropriately transferred to a DIRF.

<sup>10</sup> The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

## Recommendations

- 2.21 Problems that are consistently identified by equality monitoring data should be fully investigated and action taken to address them.**
- 2.22 Equality representatives should receive regular training in their role.** (Repeated recommendation 4.11)

## Protected characteristics

- 2.23** At the time of the inspection, 45% of the population were from a black or minority ethnic background and 28.5% were Muslim. In our survey, 32% of black and minority ethnic prisoners against 22% of white prisoners reported feeling unsafe, although we did not find evidence to support this perception. Equality monitoring data for complaints and the segregation unit had been out of range for ethnicity and religion for nine months and this had not been investigated.
- 2.24** The prison had identified 15 Gypsy, Romany or Traveller prisoners and held regular meetings to discuss their needs. In our survey, 4% of prisoners said they were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background and 3% identified themselves as gay or bisexual.
- 2.25** There were 91 foreign national prisoners at the time of the inspection. Provision for this group was reasonable. A group of foreign national prisoner representatives met the foreign national liaison officer each month to raise issues, although these were not always fed back to the equality support team. Home Office immigration staff had attended the prison every month but prisoners did not have access to independent immigration advice (see section on legal rights). There was very little need for telephone interpretation but the prison was over reliant on prisoners to interpret in areas like reception. Foreign national prisoners who did not receive visits could apply for five minutes pin phone credit each month and could access a good supply of foreign language literature through the library.
- 2.26** The prison had identified 150 prisoners with disabilities, about a quarter of the population. In our survey, prisoners with disabilities felt less safe and reported higher levels of victimisation from other prisoners and staff. The equality and health care teams identified prisoners with physical and mental disabilities who were supported through care plans and a 'buddy' system (prisoners who supported prisoners with disabilities in daily activities). The disability liaison officer provided weekly drop-in support on each wing and responded to reasonable requests for support, although prisoners experienced significant delays in the installation of in-cell adaptations. Personal emergency evacuation plans were in place for prisoners with limited mobility and there were two adapted cells on mainstream wings. Most prisoners with limited mobility were vulnerable prisoners living in unadapted cells with no integral sanitation and unable to access association areas on wings (see section on residential units). Identification of prisoners with learning disabilities required improvement; at the time of the inspection 14% of prisoners had not received an education assessment (see section on purposeful activity).
- 2.27** The prison had identified five gay or bisexual prisoners and held regular consultation meetings with them. A civil partnership ceremony had recently been facilitated and gay and bisexual prisoners reported positively about their experience of Long Lartin.
- 2.28** There were 118 prisoners over the age of 50 at the time of the inspection. Provision for older prisoners included a weekly group in the library and gym activities, although these were poorly attended. Many older prisoners we spoke to felt provision did not meet their needs and that no meaningful consultation had been undertaken to establish what extra provision could be provided for them. Retired prisoners were unlocked during the core day,

received pension payments and did not have to pay for their television. Most older prisoners were vulnerable prisoners living on A, B and C wings with no integral sanitation (see main recommendation S51). Older prisoners we spoke to had problems accessing the toilet at night.

## Recommendations

- 2.29 Provision and support for older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities should be improved.**
- 2.30 Appropriately adapted cells should be available for both mainstream and vulnerable prisoners with disabilities.** (Repeated recommendation 4.33)

## 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.**

**2.31** *Faith provision was good. The chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison and provided valuable support to prisoners.*

- 2.32** In our survey, 61% of respondents said it was easy to attend religious services against the comparator of 51%, although fewer prisoners than at similar prisons said they were able to speak to a religious leader of their faith in private. There was a large, active chaplaincy supported by an administrator and provision for religious activities was good. A temporary gap in provision for the Catholic population was being covered by sessional chaplains while a recently recruited chaplain underwent security clearance.
- 2.33** The chaplaincy saw all new arrivals and prisoners could apply to attend services at this initial meeting. Worship facilities were good, the main chapel and multi-faith room were both bright and well equipped with facilities and resources for all faiths. The chaplaincy facilitated a range of well advertised religious services and groups, including Bible study, Qur'an study, Alpha course, Arabic language and 'living with loss' for prisoners who had experienced bereavement or loss. Major religious festivals were actively promoted.
- 2.34** The chaplaincy was well integrated into prison life; the managing chaplain attended a range of meetings, including the senior management team. Chaplains attended segregation and ACCT reviews, provided support for prisoners who had experienced bereavement, coordinated family days and managed an active group of volunteer prison visitors. The chaplaincy had developed links with community faith organisations.

## 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.**

**2.35** *Internal complaints were responded to swiftly and most responses addressed the issues raised. Investigations into complaints against staff required improvement.*

**2.36** Most internal complaints were responded to quickly and addressed the issues raised. However, 22% of the 1,781 complaints made during the previous six months related to prisoner property. Many of these complaints had to be sent to other establishments for a response and were sometimes delayed. Ten per cent of complaints were quality assured and a comprehensive monthly report was considered by senior managers.

**2.37** Complaints against staff were not always investigated at an appropriate level and some of the responses we saw did not demonstrate adequate investigation.

**2.38** There was an effective monitoring system to analyse complaints by protected characteristics, but the number of complaints made by mixed race and Muslim prisoners had been out of range for nine months and no investigation had taken place.

### Recommendation

**2.39 Responses to all complaints should be timely and investigated at an appropriate level and should fully address the issues raised.**

## 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.**

**2.40** *The facilities for legal visits were adequate. Access to advice in the prison was limited.*

**2.41** In our survey, the number of prisoners reporting that it was easy to communicate with their solicitor and attend legal visits had increased since our previous inspection, although it was still lower than at similar prisons. Legal visits took place in private rooms in the visits area and solicitors confirmed that adequate sessions were available to meet demand.

**2.42** Prisoners without legal representation could use laptops to work on their case. There were two legal services officers but neither had been trained in their role or allocated time to carry it out. Prisoners did not have access to independent immigration advice.

## Recommendation

- 2.43 Prisoners should have access to trained legal services staff and independent immigration advice.**

## 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.**

- 2.44** *Health care services were reasonably good and governance arrangements were sound. The quality of and access to most physical health care services were good, but prisoners had unacceptably long waits for optician and smoking cessation services. Inpatient health care was very poor. Pharmacy services were reasonably good and, though tradeable medication was an issue in the prison, medication administration was closely supervised. Mental health care was appropriate.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.45** Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust provided all primary health and mental health services. A comprehensive health needs assessment had recently been completed. Clinical governance arrangements were good and services benefited from being part of a large community based trust. Relationships between the service and the prison appeared appropriate, with an established partnership board. Opportunities for prisoners to influence health care were exercised through a patient forum.
- 2.46** Patients knew how to complain and complaints were addressed systematically. Some prisoners we spoke to were dissatisfied with the responses received and we saw some instances where a face-to-face meeting to try to resolve complex problems would have been appropriate. Oversight and learning from serious and untoward incidents was effective.
- 2.47** The health care team was operationally led by a senior nurse and benefited from the leadership and oversight of a clinical director who had an active clinical role in the prison. Staff appraisal appeared effective with good access to professional development opportunities. Staffing arrangements were appropriate to meet clinical need and there was on-site 24-hour health care cover seven days a week. We were advised that there were a number of vacancies and difficulties recruiting staff which at times had placed a strain on maintaining provision. GP cover was provided through locum arrangements which did not allow consistency of care. Services were largely provided in one central location complemented by treatment rooms on wings which were of a good standard. The clinical records that we examined were appropriate. Overall, the range and quality of health services was appropriate with access to weekend clinics and a helpline for prisoners for general health care enquiries.
- 2.48** Trust policies on infection control, control of communicable disease and information governance were used and health care staff had received appropriate training. Information about available health services was of limited quality and not widely distributed, though health champions had been identified to lead improvements in this area.

- 2.49** Clinical environments were clean and most were compliant with infection prevention standards following recent refurbishments. An infection control audit had recently been completed and actions identified.
- 2.50** Nursing staff with specialist skills had been identified to lead on specific chronic health conditions and arrangements to review and support prisoners with complex needs had been established. We saw evidence of multidisciplinary case discussions and care plans which highlighted problem areas but the description of planned interventions was limited.
- 2.51** There was evidence of health promotion initiatives and immunisation and other health screening programmes were available to prisoners. However, access to smoking cessation support was poor with very long waiting lists. Barrier protection was available but this was poorly advertised.
- 2.52** Health care staff could access an appropriate range of emergency equipment that was regularly checked and maintained. Automated external defibrillators were available and held in treatment areas on wings, but custody staff could not access this equipment and few had been trained to use it.
- 2.53** The response to managing health related incidents was appropriate. There were procedures to deal with emergencies and we found no inappropriate delays in paramedics entering the site when required.

## Recommendations

- 2.54** **There should be a consistent GP service so that prisoners can see the same clinician who should be an integral part of the primary health care team.**
- 2.55** **Care plans for prisoners with chronic health problems should demonstrate the involvement of the patient in formulating the care plan and should describe all necessary interventions.**
- 2.56** **Smoking cessation services should be accessible in a timely fashion to meet patient need.**
- 2.57** **Automated external defibrillators in residential settings should be accessible to custody officers, who should be trained to use them.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.58** Access to barrier protection for prisoners should be promoted.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.59** At the time of the inspection, we did not have an opportunity to see any prisoners arriving at reception. However, the clinical records that we examined demonstrated health screening on reception with appropriate follow up.
- 2.60** Staff had a good rapport with prisoners and dealt with their needs respectfully. A full range of primary care services was provided, but prisoners waited too long to see an optician. Applications for health services were triaged by an appropriate clinician to ensure that appointments were prioritised based on clinical need.

- 2.61** Our survey suggested that more prisoners than the comparator were positive about access to, and the quality of, health services. However, a significant minority of the prisoners we spoke to expressed disquiet about changes to their individual pain management plans. Clinical decisions appeared appropriate in most cases, but patients were not always consulted before changes to medication.
- 2.62** The health care team had access to a number of prison escorts each day to facilitate external health appointments. We were told that health professionals were often asked to cancel appointments because of staffing issues. This could lead to delays in prisoners accessing specialist treatments.
- 2.63** The inpatient unit had 10 beds and a palliative care suite. The area was managed by prison officers who had no health care qualifications and limited access to patient information. Health care staff visited the unit daily to see prisoners but they were not available to deliver permanent clinical input. The purpose of the unit was unclear. There was no therapeutic regime and prisoners were routinely locked in their rooms for most of the day. A number of prisoners were held on the unit for operational reasons. Prisoners' needs were not adequately assessed and there were no effective care arrangements to support them (see main recommendation S52).

## Recommendations

- 2.64 Access to optician services should be timely and should meet the needs of the prisoner population.**
- 2.65 Input from pain management specialists should be sought in cases involving long-term pain management. Prisoners should be involved in making decisions about their treatment.**
- 2.66 Prisoners should attend external hospital appointments within clinically appropriate time frames.**
- 2.67 Custody staff working in the inpatient unit and other areas should receive mental health awareness training.**

## Pharmacy

- 2.68** Medicines were supplied by Lloyds Pharmacy and delivered once a day during the week with appropriate contingencies if emergency medicines were required. About three-quarters of patients received their medicines in possession. Risk assessments were carried out and attached to SystmOne (electronic case records) but these were not systematically reviewed in line with policy. Prisoners were able to discuss their medicines with the pharmacist and these sessions were well publicised and attended.
- 2.69** Prescribing and administration of medicines was completed on SystmOne. A prescribing formulary was in place which was adopted appropriately. Supervised medicine was administered twice a day from wing treatment rooms. Changes were made to prescribing to accommodate this process rather than reflect the clinical needs of the prisoner. Supervised night sedation was given too early at 5pm. About a quarter of patients were prescribed potentially tradeable medication and spot checks revealed some supervised medicines in the possession of prisoners who had not been prescribed these items. However, the arrangements we observed were safe and well supervised by custody staff and appropriate steps were taken to review prescribing practice when required.

- 2.70** Adequate medicines were available to treat minor ailments, and simple remedies and paracetamol were available from the canteen without the need to see a doctor. There was limited provision for the supply of more potent medicines.
- 2.71** Medicines were mainly stored in secure cupboards with effective operational procedures to manage stock safely. The trolley on A wing was not secured to the wall but the area was only accessible by health care staff. Governance arrangements in the prison and in the Healthcare Trust were reasonable. Relevant issues were discussed at meetings and trends and learning points were identified and acted on.

## Recommendation

- 2.72 Supervised medicines should be administered according to the recommended dosage regimes to provide appropriate patient care.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.73** The in-possession policy should be adhered to and risk assessments should be regularly reviewed according to the policy.
- 2.74** All medicines trolleys should be secured.

## Good practice

- 2.75** *Prisoners were able to consult the pharmacist. These sessions were well attended and well publicised on repeat medication requests and at the monthly health champion meetings which the pharmacist attended.*

## Dentistry

- 2.76** The dentist offered assessments and a full range of NHS treatments. Applications were managed on a needs-led basis. Urgent referrals could be seen promptly, with the primary care team offering triage and pain relief when necessary.
- 2.77** The dental services and clinical records that we observed were very good. The dentist was unable to access the prescribing module on SystemOne which delayed prisoners' access to appropriate treatments.
- 2.78** The dental suite was of a good standard, but there was no separate area for decontamination of equipment. An externally-led infection control audit had taken place in the last 12 months and an appropriate action plan established in response to the findings. Dental equipment was appropriately maintained and waste materials were safely disposed of.

## Recommendations

- 2.79 The dentist should be able to access the prescribing module on SystemOne.**
- 2.80 Separate areas for decontamination of equipment should be established.**



## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.81** The mental health team delivered primary and secondary care services across the prison population through an appropriate mix of medical staff, mental health nurses, clinical psychologists and regular input from a forensic psychiatrist. About 90 prisoners were on the team's case load and 21 custody staff had undertaken mental health awareness training.
- 2.82** All prisoners in the segregation unit and inpatient unit were seen daily by the team. All referrals were seen and assessed appropriately and introduced to relevant services or placed on a waiting list to be seen by a key worker. Waiting times were equivalent to community services.
- 2.83** Primary care services offered a range of provision from self-help to psychology-led group work. However, there was no systematic access to general counselling services.
- 2.84** The team was supporting 31 prisoners with severe and enduring mental health problems using the care programme approach (CPA). Not all CPA requirements were being consistently met.

## Recommendations

- 2.85** **Counselling services should be available for prisoners with low to moderate mental health difficulties.**
- 2.86** **All prisoners with complex, severe and enduring mental health difficulties should be fully managed and supported in line with the care programme approach, with records subject to periodic audit.**

## 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.**

**2.87** *The main kitchen was clean and well equipped but some serveries were grubby. Menus were reasonably varied, the quality of food that we tasted was very good but it was unpopular with prisoners. Self-cook opportunities were greatly appreciated by those who used them.*

- 2.88** The main prison kitchen was clean and well ordered.
- 2.89** All staff and prisoners employed in the preparation and serving of food had received basic hygiene and food handling training but prisoners were no longer able to gain national vocational qualifications (see section on work and education).
- 2.90** Lunch and dinner were selected from a four-week rolling menu which offered a reasonable variety of healthy options. Menu options included portions of fruit and vegetables each day. Meals were served at reasonable times but breakfast packs were issued on the evening before they were to be eaten.

- 2.91** The quality of food that we tasted was very good and of the correct temperature. The menus met the needs of different diets, including vegetarian, vegan, kosher and halal. Halal food was stored and served separately from other foods. Kosher meals were bought in from a catering supplier.
- 2.92** We were told that checks of serveries during meal times were carried out by the catering manager or a member of catering staff but some, particularly on A and C wings, were grubby.
- 2.93** Regular meetings with servery workers took place, a food survey was carried out twice a year and prisoner representatives met the catering manager at formal consultation meetings. Food comments books were in place on all residential units and were readily accessible to prisoners. Despite this, prison food was unpopular with most prisoners. In our survey, only 12% of respondents said that the food was good or very good.
- 2.94** Prisoners could cook their own food in small kitchens on the residential units and dine out of their cells informally on wing landings. Although some wing kitchens were dirty and some of the equipment was poorly maintained, they were very popular with prisoners and we observed that they helped to normalise the prison environment.

## Recommendations

- 2.95** **Kitchens on the wings should be clean and properly maintained.**
- 2.96** **Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are to be eaten.**

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

**2.97** *Shop arrangements were adequate and the range of goods broadly met the need. Catalogue items took too long to reach prisoners. Consultation with minority groups about the canteen list had still not taken place.*

- 2.98** In our survey, 55% of respondents, against the comparator of 50% and 45% at the previous inspection, said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods, but black and minority ethnic respondents were less positive. With the exception of the limited range of religious items which the prison planned to increase through the chaplaincy, the range of goods broadly met the needs of the population.
- 2.99** New arrivals were offered reception packs. The on-site canteen distribution workshop enabled most prisoners to receive their first order swiftly. The workshop provided the opportunity for prisoners to work in a commercial environment (see section on provision of activity). A range of catalogues were available but orders incurred an administration charge and items took too long to reach the prisoner once they had arrived in the prison.
- 2.100** Consultation arrangements were responsive but there had still been no separate consultation with prisoners from minority groups.

## Recommendations

- 2.101 There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders.**
- 2.102 The prison should work with minority groups of prisoners to understand their negative perceptions of the shop list. (Repeated recommendation 8.15)**



## Section 3. Purposeful activity

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.

### 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.<sup>11</sup>**

**3.1** *Time out of cell for most prisoners was reasonably good. Employed prisoners could have about 8.5 hours out of cell during the week and about six hours at weekends.*

**3.2** Most prisoners had just over 8.5 hours out of cell on weekdays and about six hours at the weekend.

**3.3** A small but significant number of prisoners who were unemployed or temporarily not required for work had about four to five hours a day out of cell (see section on work and education). Retired prisoners and those who were formally unable to work received about six hours out of cell every day.

**3.4** The regime generally operated to time, although we saw occasional slippage with late unlocking. However, we were concerned that a number of prisoners who had been unlocked to attend an activity had been turned away from workshops and locked up because they were not required on that day. During roll checks in the morning and afternoon of the core day, we found 20 to 22% of the population were locked in their cells.

### Recommendation

**3.5 All prisoners should be able to access a full activity programme.**

<sup>11</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

## Learning and skills and work activities

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.6** *The management of learning and skills and work by the prison was effective, although recent improvement actions taken by the learning and skills manager had not yet had an impact. Leadership and management of learning and skills by Milton Keynes College were inadequate. The college offered only a fraction of the provision for which funding was available. Staffing and quality assurance were inadequate. Outcomes for prisoners in English and mathematics were inadequate. Prisoners found some workshop activity mundane and boring, with little opportunity to develop or accredit skills. The prison provided sufficient activity spaces but its policy of over-allocating prisoners to workshops was an inefficient way of ensuring that men were purposefully engaged. Teaching, learning and assessment required improvement. Though a few lessons were good, too many were dull and uninspiring. Induction and initial assessment arrangements were inadequate. The promotion of equality and diversity was weak. The prison library was well stocked, accessible and a good resource to support prisoners' wider learning.*

**3.7** *Ofsted<sup>12</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

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

### Management of learning and skills and work

**3.8** The leadership and management of learning and skills and work directly provided by the prison were effective. The learning and skills manager had implemented a range of well-conceived improvement measures but, at the time of the inspection, these were too recent to have made an impact.

**3.9** The leadership and management of learning and skills provided by the learning provider, Milton Keynes College, were inadequate. The college had failed to secure the volume and range of classroom provision for which it was contracted, offering only 92 places in education for a narrow range of courses. As a consequence, in 2013 to 2014, the college was able to claim only 42% of the funding for which it was eligible.

**3.10** Staffing in learning and skills was inadequate. Lessons were cancelled too often because of staff absence, or they were taken at short notice by substitute tutors. The college had been unable to appoint a suitably qualified tutor for industrial cleaning; the two tutors appointed

<sup>12</sup> 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>.

several months previously to teach personal and social development courses had still not received their security clearance. As a consequence, neither of these courses was offered at the time of the inspection. College managers had not successfully tackled these problems.

- 3.11 Quality assurance was inadequate. The self-assessment process was weak. The prison had not produced a self-assessment report in 2013, and the 2014 self-assessment report did not include all stakeholders. Judgements were broadly accurate but there was not enough focus on weaknesses and areas for improvement.
- 3.12 Quality improvement group meetings, arranged by the prison's learning and skills manager, had recently started and were a welcome step in the right direction. The college's observation of teaching and learning was appropriate, but arrangements to support teachers with their professional development and to help them improve classroom practice were ineffective.
- 3.13 The college's arrangements for gaining feedback from learners were weak. They had carried out several surveys, but very few prisoners had responded. Learner focus groups had been established for vulnerable prisoners and for mainstream prisoners, but participation in these groups was poor and had not led to any improvements in provision.

## Recommendation

- 3.14 **Robust quality assurance procedures should be put in place which should include contributions from all stakeholders, including prisoners.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.15 Sufficient activity places were provided. A few prisoners did not engage in purposeful activities because of health, age or disability. The number of prisoners who were routinely over-allocated to workshop activities was too high. Prison staff worked hard to ensure that most prisoners not required in the workshops were allocated to an alternative activity, but too many prisoners were simply returned to their cells.
- 3.16 The range of classroom-based courses was too narrow, although opportunities to enrol on vocational courses were good. The prison offered limited provision at advanced level, and only a few prisoners were enrolled on Open University degree programmes. The prison offered an appropriate number of places in vocational workshops, although opportunities for prisoners to gain accreditation in vocational skills were limited.
- 3.17 The prison ran several workshops on a commercial basis, which provided opportunities for prisoners to work in realistic working environments in woodcraft, recycling, warehousing and distribution. Further work opportunities for prisoners were provided as wing cleaners, and in the kitchens and laundry.

## Recommendation

- 3.18 **The policy of over-allocating prisoners to workshops should be reviewed and more efficient ways of allocation to purposeful activity should be found.**

## Quality of provision

- 3.19** Too much teaching, learning and assessment required improvement, although there were a few examples of well-taught sessions. In one class, the teacher motivated and challenged the learners very effectively, making the learning interesting and engaging, and ensuring that they made good progress. However, in another lesson, learners faced little challenge and worked slowly with no real sense of urgency. Individual coaching was generally good.
- 3.20** A few lessons were planned well with clear learning aims which met the needs of each learner. However, too many lesson plans consisted of a simple list of tasks which learners had to complete with little or no reference to what they were meant to be learning by completing them. Learners' diaries were too often used simply to record the completion of tasks rather than the learning that had taken place.
- 3.21** Classes were generally orderly and well managed, creating an effective and purposeful learning environment. However, there were occasions when two classes were taught at the same time in the same classroom. Learners found this distracting and it contributed to a slowing of their progress. Learning mentors supported learners well in many lessons.
- 3.22** The promotion of equality and diversity in the classroom and in vocational training was inadequate. Teachers missed many opportunities to integrate equality and diversity into lessons. For example in an art lesson, the teacher failed to explore fully art from different cultures. The development of learners' English and mathematics skills was weak in the classroom and in workshops. Teachers and trainers did not always take advantage of naturally occurring opportunities to reinforce learners' literacy and numeracy skills.
- 3.23** Arrangements for induction and initial assessment were inadequate (see main recommendations S50 and S54). Induction into education was too short to ensure that new prisoners understood what the college was able to offer. The college did not routinely carry out an initial assessment of prisoners' numeracy and literacy skills. Information about prisoners' educational history from previous institutions did not always travel with them. At the time of the inspection, the college had no initial assessment information for 14% of the prison population.
- 3.24** The college did not routinely analyse progression between levels to help plan the curriculum and clear progression routes. Learners had insufficient opportunities above level 2 and, as a result, some felt frustrated by the lack of challenge provided by the prison environment.
- 3.25** The wood workshops and warehousing and distribution provided good employment experience for prisoners, often leading to an accredited qualification. However, too much prison work was at a low level and not accredited. The work in the recycling workshops and the laundry was mundane and repetitive and provided a low level of challenge. Prisoners were often unproductive in these areas and complained about the lack of learning opportunities. Instructors provided effective supervision in many of the workshops, but opportunities to learn and develop new skills were limited (see main recommendation S53).

## Recommendations

- 3.26** **The college should improve the planning of individual learning to provide more focus on learning.**
- 3.27** **The number of accredited qualifications for learning at work should be increased.**



### **3.28 Equality and diversity should be integrated more explicitly into learning in education, training and work.**

#### **Education and vocational achievements**

**3.29** Success rates on the most significant courses in English and mathematics were inadequate in 2013 to 2014, though they had improved from the previous year. Outcomes on the art course were also low. The development of prisoners' basic skills in English and mathematics required further improvement, especially during vocational training sessions. Prisoners employed in the recycling workshops did not develop any particular skill or make progress. Attendance and punctuality in education and in vocational training were generally acceptable. Outcomes were good on a few courses. The development of prisoners' practical and vocational skills was particularly good in the wood-trades workshop.

#### **Recommendations**

**3.30 Success rates for all prisoners should be improved.**

**3.31 English and mathematics should be integrated more effectively into classroom teaching and vocational training.**

#### **Library**

**3.32** Worcestershire County Council provided the library, which was staffed by a qualified librarian assisted by three prison orderlies. The library was welcoming and well stocked, with a good range of books, DVDs and CDs, reflecting the needs of the population. However, no accreditation was offered for library orderlies, a weakness identified at the previous inspection.

**3.33** Prisoners' access to the library was appropriate, with a one-hour timetabled visit each week. Registered appellants were given additional time. The library was open for morning, afternoon and evening sessions during the week, and in the morning at weekends. The proportion of prisoners who were active library users was high. However, for a few prisoners, library access was restricted because their timetabled library session clashed with other activities.

**3.34** The library ran a range of successful study groups such as a writers' group, a book club and retired prisoners reading group. The 'Six Book Challenge', an initiative to encourage prisoners to read six books and record their views on each, was successfully managed by library staff. The library also promoted literacy effectively through the 'Toe by Toe'<sup>13</sup> reading scheme. Another project run by library staff, the 'big book share', made key stage 1 materials available to help prisoners understand what their children were doing at school, as well as colouring sheets for prisoners to send to their children.

#### **Recommendation**

**3.35 There should be accredited training for prisoner orderlies working in the library.**  
(Repeated recommendation 6.32 )

---

<sup>13</sup> A phonics-based approach to helping prisoners learn to read (usually delivered as part of the Shannon Trust reading plan)

## Physical education and healthy living

### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.36** *The promotion of PE and healthy living was good. Prisoners had access to a good range of PE activities at different times during the day and at weekends to maximise participation. Gym sessions were well attended. PE staff were enthusiastic, well qualified and carried out thorough induction for new prisoners. Their good links with health care ensured that prisoners' health and fitness needs were met effectively. The range of qualifications that prisoners could achieve was very good. Links between PE and education staff were weak.*

**3.37** The provision and promotion of PE and healthy living were good. The gym was well resourced and access to PE activities was very good, resulting in well-attended sessions. PE sessions were offered in the morning and afternoon each weekday, including early morning and evening sessions. Scheduled sessions were rarely cancelled. Prisoners also had access to the gym at weekends.

**3.38** Induction to PE activity was thorough, well attended and delivered by enthusiastic staff. Regular inductions took place for prisoners during which individual training plans were put in place, often in consultation with health care and healthy living initiatives. These included plans for older prisoners or for specific health strategies, such as smoking cessation. PE officers were well qualified and experienced in their specialist roles and had good relationships with community sports organisations.

**3.39** The range of PE activities and facilities was very good and included a fitness suite with free weights, resistance and cardiovascular equipment, a full-size sports hall and an outdoor, all-weather, multi-sport facility. There was also a separate fitness suite in the main prison block for use during the evenings and weekends.

**3.40** The range of PE provision met prisoners' needs well. The programme of recreational PE was particularly good and the comprehensive range of vocational qualifications was very good. However, gym staff had not developed effective links with the college, for example to promote the development of English and mathematics through participation in PE and healthy living activities.

### Recommendation

**3.41** **Links between the gym and the learning provider should be improved, particularly with a view to promoting the development of prisoners' English and mathematics skills.**

## Section 4. Resettlement

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.

### 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 policy covered the resettlement pathways but little on offender management work. Related policies on public protection and safeguarding children were appropriate. Much of the strategic direction of the offender management unit (OMU) was determined informally by the department's three managers. A needs analysis had been undertaken in 2013. The monthly reducing reoffending meeting was attended by OMU representatives. Officer offender supervisors were regularly redeployed away from the department, reducing the available resources.*

**4.2** The reducing reoffending and offender management functions were managed separately and, although there was a comprehensive reducing reoffending policy which covered the work of the resettlement pathways, it did not specifically address the work of offender management. Other policies, including safeguarding and public protection, were in place and were appropriate.

**4.3** A comprehensive needs analysis had been undertaken by the psychology department during 2013 which had been used to inform the work of the reducing reoffending strategy group.

**4.4** The reducing reoffending strategy group met monthly to discuss key developmental issues and was well attended by staff from across the establishment, including the OMU. The three OMU managers determined much of the department's strategic direction through informal meetings and discussions. This was reasonably successful. However, changes were planned over the next year, including the appointment of new offender supervisors, an increase in the probation officer complement and the reorganisation of public protection administration. There was, therefore, a need to plan such work strategically in the wider context of the prison's development.

**4.5** The model of offender management was appropriate, with dedicated uniform officers undertaking the role of offender supervisors. However, OMU staff continued to be redeployed across the establishment and it was estimated that this had recently amounted to about 2,000 hours a month. While this was not significantly affecting the running of the department and most core work was up to date, it was causing frustration and fewer opportunities for offender supervisors to have a more dynamic relationship with the prisoners they were responsible for. In our survey, only 51% of prisoners against the comparator of 60% said that they had done anything at Long Lartin to reduce the risk of them reoffending in the future.

## Recommendation

- 4.6 Offender supervisors should not be redeployed out of the department except in exceptional circumstances.**

## 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.**

**4.7** *Prisoners were seen quickly after arrival and sentence plans were undertaken appropriately. There remained a backlog of OASys which were the responsibility of community offender managers. The quality of OASys and sentence planning was good but contact beyond reviews required further development. Work with the significant number of sex offenders in denial needed attention. Public protection arrangements were robust.*

- 4.8** The offender management unit consisted of eight officer offender supervisors, including one vacancy at the time of the inspection, and two probation officers attached to the public protection unit. Caseloads were quite high at about 85, but prisoners were usually seen within three weeks of arrival and sentence plans were reviewed within three months. Offender supervisors were responsible for about 70% of all cases held, consisting of 382 lifers and 45 medium-risk determinate prisoners. Almost all the OASys for this group of prisoners were up to date. However, for the remaining 184 prisoners (45 indeterminate for public protection and 139 high/very high risk determinate) who were the responsibility of the national probation service, there remained a significant backlog of about 38% of OASys. Although there were systems to monitor delays and take appropriate action, further improvement was needed. All prisoners had an annual sentence plan.
- 4.9** During the inspection, colleagues from HM Inspectorate of Probation reviewed in detail the cases of 12 prisoners, six of whom were the responsibility of offender supervisors and six community offender managers. A further 15 cases were reviewed in less detail. The quality of cases was good. Most included appropriate risk management plans, even when prisoners were not likely to return to the community for many years. Sentence plans were appropriate and focused on suitable targets. Targets for prisoners in denial or those who had completed required course work were usually orientated to developing further skills or enhancing their motivation, although it was not always clear how this was to be achieved. Quality assurance of OASys by the two probation officers was good and more robust than we often find.
- 4.10** Sentence planning meetings usually comprised the prisoner, offender supervisor and offender manager, although it was encouraging that other departments made written contributions. In our survey, 54% of prisoners against 43% at the previous inspection said they had been involved in the development of their plans.
- 4.11** In addition to OASys and sentence planning, most prisoners were seen regularly by their offender supervisor. Frequency of contact varied but was usually between three and six months. Contact was often made when offender supervisors were redeployed to wing duties and was rarely planned or focused on individual work to reinforce learning from offending behaviour programmes or other sentence plan targets. A range of databases monitored the work, recorded prisoner progress and ensured timely reviews. However, offender

supervisors did not receive casework supervision or regular training to aid their work with this group of challenging offenders.

- 4.12** Case records were variable and too often information was buried in files or on P-NOMIS. There was little evidence that information on the progress of prisoners was routinely shared with offender managers.
- 4.13** The number of sex offenders had declined since our last inspection and now consisted of 73 convicted of a sexual offence and 33 with previous sexual offences. We were told that most of these prisoners were in denial of their offence and/or refused to engage in work focused on addressing the offence; the exact number was not clear and no monitoring was undertaken. For this group of deniers there was evidence of regular liaison between offender supervisors and other departments, including psychology, to identify work that could be undertaken, but there was no clear strategy to manage the group or their progress. Prisoners who were willing to engage were usually transferred to an alternative establishment reasonably quickly.

## Recommendations

- 4.14** **The role of offender supervisors should be developed beyond OASys and sentence planning. There should be appropriate training and supervision for staff undertaking such work, especially in addressing individual risk factors.**
- 4.15** **OASys should be completed in a timely fashion by community offender managers.**
- 4.16** **There should be quality assurance of the frequency and quality of offender supervisor contact with prisoners.** (Repeated recommendation 9.12)
- 4.17** **A strategy should be developed to manage sex offenders who are unsuitable or unwilling to undertake the sex offenders' treatment programme at another prison.**

## Housekeeping point

- 4.18** Relevant information about a prisoner should be recorded on P-NOMIS, and shared with the offender manager in the community.

## Public protection

- 4.19** Prisoners with a current or past conviction for a violent or sexual offence were subject to initial risk assessments by the two probation officers acting as dedicated public protection officers. Interdepartmental risk management meetings and pre-release boards were appropriately constituted and coordinated. Ninety-six per cent of the population were eligible for multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) and work on public protection was robust.
- 4.20** We examined the cases of six prisoners subject to MAPPA who had been released in the previous six months and nine due to be released in the next six months. We assessed that all necessary notifications, classifications and actions required for MAPPA had been completed appropriately.

- 4.21** The monthly interdepartmental risk management meeting was well attended by public protection, OMU, security and other departments. Arrangements were thorough for applying differing levels of mail and telephone monitoring and restrictions on visits and contacts. We found evidence of consistent liaison with community agencies, including social services departments. Some child protection training had been undertaken for visits staff earlier in the year but the group had been disbanded and there was no regular training for staff across the establishment.

## Recommendation

- 4.22** **Child protection training should be available for all staff, with priority for staff who have direct contact with children.**

## Categorisation

- 4.23** Recategorisation reviews were generally well managed. Staffing problems had caused some delays with the completion of category A reviews by the psychology department earlier in the year, but these had been resolved by the time of the inspection. During the first half of 2014 to 2015, 20 prisoners had been recategorised from B to C and five were still awaiting a transfer at the time of the inspection.

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.24** At the time of the inspection, the prison was holding 427 indeterminate sentenced prisoners, 70% of the population. There were no specific forums or facilities for this group of prisoners. Information given to prisoners on arrival by offender supervisors gave a good level of information on what they could expect at Long Lartin and how their sentences would be managed.
- 4.25** Sixty-four prisoners were past their tariff, the longest being 28 years beyond his minimum sentence. We examined a number of such cases and felt that reasonable efforts were being made to help these prisoners progress.

## 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.**

- 4.26** *Although few prisoners were released from Long Lartin, those that were were well managed. Pathway provision was generally appropriate and reflected the level of need. The exception to this was the finance, benefit and debt pathway which required further attention. There was limited family support for prisoners with children and we were particularly concerned about the lengthy delays for visits.*

- 4.27** Few prisoners were released to the community. In the previous six months, nine prisoners had been released, including three who had transferred to immigration holding facilities.

- 4.28** Pre-release arrangements were well managed by the OMU. All such prisoners were identified about 18 months before release and regular reviews were undertaken in the ensuing period. We reviewed prisoners released so far in 2014: planning was comprehensive and involved prison based probation staff and community offender managers.

### Accommodation

- 4.29** There was no accommodation service and demand was low. Almost all prisoners were expected to stay in probation approved premises on release and otherwise offender supervisors worked with community managers to find appropriate facilities. No prisoner had been released in the previous two years without accommodation.

### Education, training and employment

- 4.30** The quality of the service provided by the National Careers Service was good. Careers advisers regularly carried out very effective interviews with newly arrived prisoners and skills action plans were discussed and agreed with them. The advisers kept central records of actions to meet prisoners' individual needs so that other agencies and prison staff were able to use this information when placing prisoners in education or work or preparing sentence plans.

### Health care

- 4.31** Very few prisoners were released from Long Lartin in need of health care support. Pre-release and transfer arrangements for prisoners with physical and mental health needs appeared appropriate. Five prisoners had been transferred to NHS facilities under the Mental Health Act in the last year, all of whom had faced significant delays between initial referral and transfer.
- 4.32** Palliative care arrangements were available in the health care inpatient service and a recent case demonstrated effective practice in this area.

### Recommendation

- 4.33** **The transfer of patients to external health care beds should be achieved within Department of Health transfer target timescales.**

### Drugs and alcohol

- 4.34** A fully integrated substance misuse service provided well coordinated care to prisoners. Recovery workers attended sentence planning boards and completed detailed transfer plans.

### Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.35** The prison's needs analysis undertaken in August/September 2013 indicated that 31% of prisoners completing a questionnaire believed that finances were linked to their offending and 20% said they would like some help. Despite this, there was little provision available under this pathway. A money management course was no longer provided under the education contract and no debt management was available for prisoners.

- 4.36** In our survey, only 9% of prisoners said they were aware of support regarding their finances. In the prison's needs analysis, over 60% of prisoners said they were unaware of any such help.

### Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.37** In our survey, only 17% of prisoners said it was easy for their family and friends to attend visits and we found that visitors travelled from across England and Wales. In group discussions, prisoners reported that visitors were not always treated well by staff and were often left waiting for long periods before entering the prison. During the inspection, visitors and prisoners confirmed the long delays and we observed families experiencing unacceptable delays despite arriving early after long journeys (see main recommendation S55).
- 4.38** The visitors' centre was large but worn and there was no system for identifying first-time visitors as they arrived. We observed visitors waiting for long periods in a room without staff or volunteers to answer questions or offer support. Visitors were then called one at a time to be booked in. Prisoners were not moved to visits until their visitor(s) had booked in and visitors sometimes arrived in the visits hall only to experience further delays while the prisoner was brought from the wings.
- 4.39** The visits hall offered a reasonable environment for prisoners and their visitors. There was also a small play area for children, vending machines and a snack bar which offered a limited selection of drinks and snacks. There were seven family days a year and a pilot to hold these in the gym was taking place during the inspection.
- 4.40** Nearly half the prisoners at Long Lartin had children under the age of 18, and many of these prisoners would spend a significant portion of their family life in prison a long way from home. Despite this need, there was no family support worker and provision for rebuilding and maintaining family ties was underdeveloped. There was no initial assessment of family support need when prisoners arrived at Long Lartin and no interventions for children and families apart from visits. There was provision for Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children), but no prisoner had used this for over six months (see main recommendation S54).

### Recommendation

- 4.41** **A trained family support worker should be appointed to support prisoners to build and maintain family ties.**

### Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.42** Three accredited programmes were provided: thinking skills, resolve violence reduction and the self-change programme. This range of programmes was appropriate for the population and reflected the needs analysis undertaken 12 months previously. Information about course dates was available to prisoners and the psychology department was transparent about how prisoners were prioritised.
- 4.43** The level of support for prisoners on programmes was good and facilitators made considerable efforts to keep them engaged. Post-programme support continued for six months and offender supervisors attended post-programme reviews consistently.



## 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, or in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

### Main recommendation To NOMS

- 5.1 A to D wings should be refurbished to include integral sanitation in cells. (S51)

### Main recommendations To the governor

- 5.2 Induction should start the day after a prisoner arrives at the establishment, take place without delay, and include purposeful activity between modules. (S50)
- 5.3 Prisoners who need 24-hour clinical support should have access to a dedicated unit which provides a positive therapeutic regime delivered by well trained staff. (S52)
- 5.4 The range and availability of accredited qualifications should be increased and sufficient staff should be provided to cover classes and workshops. (S53)
- 5.5 Prisoners should receive adequate and timely initial assessment and induction into education. (S54)
- 5.6 Visits should start at the advertised time and the visits experience should be more welcoming and respectful. (S55)

### Recommendation To NOMS

- 5.7 A strategy should be developed to manage sex offenders who are unsuitable or unwilling to undertake the sex offenders' treatment programme at another prison. (4.17)

### Recommendation To the escort contractors

- 5.8 Prisoners' property should arrive with them on transfer or within a reasonable time after their arrival. (1.6)

### Recommendations To the governor

#### Early days in custody

- 5.9 Interviews with new arrivals in reception should take place in private. (1.11)

**5.10** Prisoners should be able to have a shower on their first night. (1.12)

### **Bullying and violence reduction**

**5.11** Perceptions of vulnerable prisoners about their safety should be explored and addressed. (1.22)

### **Self-harm and suicide**

**5.12** The quality of care for prisoners at risk of self-harm should be improved. (1.31)

**5.13** There should be pro-active and effective support for the Listener scheme. (1.32)

### **Safeguarding**

**5.14** 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)

### **Security**

**5.15** Strip-searching should only be undertaken following an individual risk assessment. (1.43)

**5.16** Prisoners should only be placed and remain on closed visits when there is sufficient intelligence relating directly to visits. (1.44)

**5.17** MDT facilities should be relocated to an appropriate testing and waiting environment. (1.45)

### **Discipline**

**5.18** Management oversight and accountability for all aspects of use of force, including planned interventions, should be improved. (1.56)

**5.19** The quality of officer entries on special accommodation observation forms should be improved and indicate meaningful engagement with prisoners. (1.57)

**5.20** The regime in the segregation unit should be further improved and prisoners should be able to exercise together subject to a risk assessment. (1.67)

**5.21** The environment and conditions in the segregation unit exercise yards should be improved. (1.68)

**5.22** A more effective approach to reintegrating prisoners should be implemented. (1.69)

**5.23** Prisoners undergoing self-harm monitoring should only be held in the segregation unit in exceptional circumstances. (1.70)

### **Substance misuse**

**5.24** A comprehensive needs analysis should be carried out to inform future service developments. (1.77)

- 5.25** The ISMS should increase support to prisoners by developing a peer support scheme and mutual aid groups. (1.78)

### Residential units

- 5.26** Showers on Perrie wing should be refurbished and adequately screened. (2.10)
- 5.27** Responses to applications should be timely and the date of the response should be recorded in application logs. (2.11)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.28** Problems that are consistently identified by equality monitoring data should be fully investigated and action taken to address them. (2.21)
- 5.29** Equality representatives should receive regular training in their role. (2.22)
- 5.30** Provision and support for older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities should be improved. (2.29)
- 5.31** Appropriately adapted cells should be available for both mainstream and vulnerable prisoners with disabilities. (2.30)

### Complaints

- 5.32** Responses to all complaints should be timely and investigated at an appropriate level and should fully address the issues raised. (2.39)

### Legal rights

- 5.33** Prisoners should have access to trained legal services staff and independent immigration advice. (2.43)

### Health services

- 5.34** There should be a consistent GP service so that prisoners can see the same clinician who should be an integral part of the primary health care team. (2.54)
- 5.35** Care plans for prisoners with chronic health problems should demonstrate the involvement of the patient in formulating the care plan and should describe all necessary interventions. (2.55)
- 5.36** Smoking cessation services should be accessible in a timely fashion to meet patient need. (2.56)
- 5.37** Automated external defibrillators in residential settings should be accessible to custody officers who should be trained to use them. (2.57)
- 5.38** Access to optician services should be timely and should meet the needs of the prisoner population. (2.64)
- 5.39** Input from pain management specialists should be sought in cases involving long-term pain management. Prisoners should be involved in making decisions about their treatment. (2.65)

- 5.40** Prisoners should attend external hospital appointments within clinically appropriate time-frames. (2.66)
- 5.41** Custody staff working in the inpatient unit and other areas should receive mental health awareness training. (2.67)
- 5.42** Supervised medicines should be administered according to the recommended dosage regimes to provide appropriate patient care. (2.72)
- 5.43** The dentist should be able to access the prescribing module on SystemOne. (2.79)
- 5.44** Separate areas for decontamination of equipment should be established. (2.80)
- 5.45** Counselling services should be available for prisoners with low to moderate mental health difficulties. (2.85)
- 5.46** All prisoners with complex severe and enduring mental health difficulties should be fully managed and supported in line with the care programme approach, with records subject to periodic audit. (2.86)

#### Catering

- 5.47** Kitchens on the wings should be clean and properly maintained. (2.95)
- 5.48** Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are to be eaten. (2.96)

#### Purchases

- 5.49** There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders. (2.101)
- 5.50** The prison should work with minority groups of prisoners to understand their negative perceptions of the shop list. (2.102)

#### Time out of cell

- 5.51** All prisoners should be able to access a full activity programme. (3.5)

#### Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.52** Robust quality assurance procedures should be put in place which should include contributions from all stakeholders, including prisoners. (3.14)
- 5.53** The policy of over-allocating prisoners to workshops should be reviewed and more efficient ways of allocation to purposeful activity should be found. (3.18)
- 5.54** The college should improve the planning of individual learning to provide more focus on learning. (3.26)
- 5.55** The number of accredited qualifications for learning at work should be increased. (3.27)
- 5.56** Equality and diversity should be integrated more explicitly into learning in education, training and work. (3.28)
- 5.57** Success rates for all prisoners should be improved. (3.30)

**5.58** English and mathematics should be integrated more effectively into classroom teaching and vocational training. (3.31)

**5.59** There should be accredited training for prisoner orderlies working in the library. (3.35)

### Physical education and healthy living

**5.60** Links between the gym and the learning provider should be improved, particularly with a view to promoting the development of prisoners' English and mathematics skills. (3.41)

### Strategic management of resettlement

**5.61** Offender supervisors should not be redeployed out of the department except in exceptional circumstances. (4.6)

### Offender management and planning

**5.62** The role of offender supervisors should be developed beyond OASys and sentence planning. There should be appropriate training and supervision for staff undertaking such work, especially in addressing individual risk factors. (4.14)

**5.63** OASys should be completed in a timely fashion by community offender managers. (4.15)

**5.64** There should be quality assurance of the frequency and quality of offender supervisor contact with prisoners. (4.16)

**5.65** Child protection training should be available for all staff, with priority for staff who have direct contact with children. (4.22)

### Reintegration planning

**5.66** The transfer of patients to external health care beds should be achieved within Department of Health transfer target timescales. (4.33)

**5.67** A trained family support worker should be appointed to support prisoners to build and maintain family ties. (4.41)

## Housekeeping points

### Early days in custody

**5.68** Hot food and drinks should be available in reception for new arrivals. (1.13)

### Security

**5.69** Individual behaviour improvement targets should be set for prisoners on basic level. (1.49)

### Discipline

**5.70** High control cells and safety cells should only be used subject to a robust risk assessment. (1.71)

**5.71** Personal officers should attend multidisciplinary review boards. (1.72)

#### Health services

**5.72** Access to barrier protection for prisoners should be promoted. (2.58)

**5.73** The in-possession policy should be adhered to and risk assessments should be regularly reviewed according to the policy. (2.73)

**5.74** All medicines trolleys should be secured. (2.74)

#### Offender management and planning

**5.75** Relevant information about a prisoner should be recorded on P-NOMIS, and shared with the offender manager in the community. (4.18)

## Example of good practice

#### Health services

**5.76** Prisoners were able to consult the pharmacist. These sessions were well attended and well publicised on repeat medication requests and at the monthly health champion meetings which the pharmacist attended. (2.75)

## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Kieron Taylor	Team leader
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Andy Lund	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Anne Clifford	Editor/observer
Rachel Prime	Researcher
Helen Ranns	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Steve Eley	Health services inspector
Deborah Hylands	Pharmacist
Jai Sharda	Ofsted inspector
Steve Hunsley	Ofsted inspector
Ian Handscombe	Ofsted inspector
Iolo Madoc-Jones	Offender management inspector
Nicola McCloskey	Offender management inspector





## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

### Safety

#### **Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection in 2011, reception and first night procedures were satisfactory with an appropriate focus on risk, although many vulnerable prisoners said they had felt unsafe on their first night. Most prisoners had an induction but the programme needed to explain prison routines and services. Despite the seriousness of some incidents, the level of recorded violence was low, although many vulnerable prisoners indicated that they felt unsafe. Anti-bullying interventions were limited. The incidence of self-harm was low but monitoring procedures and the management of continuous observation cells required improvement. Security arrangements were sophisticated, generally proportionate and supported the broader work of the establishment. Use of force was well managed. Work with prisoners in the segregation unit was challenging but the regime was poor and there was very limited staff engagement and case management. The prison was addressing a significant problem with the diversion and abuse of prescribed medication. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

The governance of safer custody should be urgently improved to provide greater priority and strategic direction. The prison should ensure it understands and addresses vulnerable prisoners' concerns about their safety and that interventions to supervise bullies and tackle their behaviour are effective. (HP 49)

#### **Partially achieved**

Prisoners on assessment care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents should only be located in the segregation unit when there are exceptional circumstances to warrant this. Normal clothing should only be removed from prisoners in exceptional circumstances when justified through a risk assessment and subject to appropriate authorisation. (HP 50)

#### **Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

Prisoners travelling on prison transport should be offered regular toilet breaks. (1.1)

#### **Not achieved**

Interviews with new arrivals in reception should take place in private. (1.9)

#### **Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.11)

Prisoners should be allowed to make a free telephone call within 24 hours of arriving at the prison. (1.12)

#### **Achieved**

Reception procedures should be expedited and new arrivals should not be held in reception for extended periods. (1.17)

**Achieved**

There should be a dedicated first night location for vulnerable and mainstream prisoners. (1.22)

**Not achieved**

The induction programme should cover information on the rules and regimes in the prison. (1.27)

**Achieved**

Induction should start the day after a prisoner arrives at the establishment, take place without delay, and include purposeful activity in between modules. (1.28)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated as main recommendation, S50)

There should be support interventions for victims of bullying, as stated in the policy document. (3.1)

**Achieved**

Monitoring of and interventions for the perpetrators and victims of violence and bullying should be improved. (3.7)

**Achieved**

The governance of safer custody, including violence reduction and bullying, should be improved. (3.8)

**Achieved**

Proper authority should be given and recorded for all use of special accommodation, including the removal of prisoner clothing. (3.14)

**Achieved**

All staff should receive regular refresher training in suicide and self-harm procedures. (3.19)

**Achieved**

There should be appropriate staffing to ensure that all mandatory and suspicion drug testing is carried out within identified timescales and without gaps in provision. (3.52)

**Not achieved**

Telephone interpreter services should be used during adjudications for prisoners with poor English. (7.13)

**Achieved**

The person who authorises use of force should not certify the document. (7.17)

**Achieved**

Authorisation for use of special accommodation should specify whether clothing is removed from a prisoner, and the reasons for doing so should be documented. (7.18)

**Achieved**

The quality of officer entries on special accommodation observation forms should be improved and indicate meaningful engagement with prisoners. (7.20)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.56)

The quality of staff entries in segregation unit prisoner files should be improved and evidence levels of care. (7.28)

**Not achieved**

Strip-searches should only be performed following a risk assessment to determine whether this is necessary. (7.29)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners in the segregation unit] should be allowed access to relevant regime facilities, including cell cleaning equipment on request, without the need for formal written application. (7.31)

**Not achieved**

The use of cardboard furniture should be determined by a risk assessment, which is regularly reviewed. (7.32)

**Achieved**

Residential staff should attend the fortnightly segregation unit review boards. (7.35)

**Not achieved**

The environment and conditions in the segregation unit exercise yards should be improved. (7.41)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 1.67)

Following risk assessment, prisoners should be allowed to exercise together and share some activities in association. (7.42)

**Not achieved**

The regime in the segregation unit should be improved and include more purposeful activity. (7.43)

**Partially achieved**

Segregation unit officers should engage more positively with prisoners in the unit and show awareness of their care and well-being. (7.44)

**Achieved**

Prisoners on the basic level of the scheme should have the opportunity for daily association. (7.46)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners on basic should be allowed to use phones in the evening. (7.51)

**Achieved**

## Respect

**Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection in 2011, the accommodation for prisoners varied greatly. Vulnerable prisoners were held on the older and poorer condition wings where the continued operation of night sanitation arrangements was unacceptable. Access to amenities was generally good. Staff prisoner relationships were reasonably good on the vulnerable prisoner wings but much worse on the mainstream wings. The personal officer scheme seemed reasonably effective. Prisoners had negative perceptions about the quality of the food, although we judged the provision as satisfactory. Communal dining and self-cook arrangements were appreciated by prisoners. Work to promote diversity was comprehensive, proactive and effective. There were adequate arrangements to deal with applications and complaints but prisoners expressed limited confidence in the timeliness or fairness of systems. The chaplaincy provided a very good service in a very challenging context. The provision of health services was similarly very good, but the transfer of patients to external mental health facilities remained a significant concern. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

A to D wing cells should be refurbished to include integral sanitation. (HP51)

**Not achieved**

The prison should explore the negative prisoner perceptions about relationships with uniformed staff, particularly on the mainstream wings, and take action to improve them. (HP52)

**Achieved**

The Prison Service should develop a service-wide strategy to inform and assist staff to engage with and support Muslim prisoners. (HP53)

**Not achieved**

## Recommendations

A, B, C and D wings should be refurbished to provide decent and well-maintained living conditions for prisoners. (2.1)

**Not achieved**

Showers on A and B wings should be fully refurbished. (2.13)

**Not achieved**

Responses to applications should be timely and the date of the response should be recorded in application logs. (3.23)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.11)

Someone of appropriate competence should be tasked to deal with more complex complaints. (3.25)

**Not achieved**

There should be consistent quality assurance of responses to complaints. (3.26)

**Achieved**

Staff should make more effort to deal with prisoner queries informally. (3.29)

**Achieved**

There should be sufficient trained staff with allocated time to provide legal services promptly. (3.30)

**Not achieved**

Legal services officers should have access to up-to-date training. (3.31)

**Not achieved**

All accommodation used for Muslim Friday prayers should be appropriate. (3.37)

**Partially achieved**

Detainees should be able to attend religious celebrations with mainstream prisoners, subject to an individual risk assessment. (3.43)

**No longer relevant**

Data on all relevant equality strands should be monitored over time to ensure discrimination does not take place. (4.3)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should be able to self-identify their equality needs during their induction, and the equality support team should record these needs centrally. (4.5)

**Achieved**

An equality needs analysis should be conducted annually and acted on. (4.7)

**Not achieved**

Equality representatives should receive regular training in their role. (4.11)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.22)

There should be a multidisciplinary panel, including external representation, to evaluate and quality control an agreed proportion of discrimination incident reporting forms on a regular basis. (4.15)

**Partially achieved**

The Gypsy, Traveller and Romany group should meet monthly and include participants from the mainstream wings. (4.18)

**Achieved**

Wing foreign national officers should receive training and support for their role. (4.23)

**Not achieved**

There should be regular immigration surgeries for foreign national prisoners to receive appropriate legal advice on their status. (4.29)

**Not achieved**

Appropriately adapted cells should be available for both mainstream and vulnerable prisoners with disabilities. (4.33)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.29)

There should be a further disability access improvement assessment to assess progress against the recommendations of the March 2009 Dial/Scope report. (4.39)

**Achieved**

There should be a forum for older prisoners to meet and discuss their needs. (4.40)

**Partially achieved**

Wing staff should be able to identify prisoners who require assistance in an emergency and the type of assistance needed. (4.41)

**Achieved**

Gay and bisexual prisoners on the mainstream wings should have access to and be supported by the gay, bisexual and transgender group. (4.43)

**Partially achieved**

The area next to the health care waiting room should be converted into an additional waiting room for patients. (5.1)

**Partially achieved**

There should be a separate healthcare waiting area for vulnerable prisoners. (5.2)

**Not achieved**

Patients with complex or lifelong conditions should have care plans, which should be reviewed by the date stipulated. (5.19)

**Achieved**

All patients should be clearly identifiable to ensure that medication is given to the correct person. (5.24)

**Achieved**

Patients should not have to wait for excessive periods in the health care waiting room before and following their appointments. (5.29)

**Achieved**

The pharmacy staff should monitor the use of special sick medication. (5.37)

**Achieved**

Discipline staff working in the inpatient and segregation units should receive regular appropriate mental health training. (5.56)

**Not achieved**

All prison staff should have at least annual mental health training. (5.57)

**Not achieved**

Day care facilities should be identified and staffed appropriately to provide support services to inpatients, older prisoners and prisoners who need additional support. (5.60)

**Not achieved**

Patients requiring external specialist mental health services should be transferred without delay. (5.65)

**Not achieved**

The arrangements for consulting prisoners about the food should be improved. (8.5)

**Achieved**

Lunch should be served between 12 noon and 1.30pm and dinner between 5pm and 6.30pm. (8.10)

**Achieved**

The prison should work with minority groups of prisoners to understand their negative perceptions of the shop list. (8.15)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.101)

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection in 2011, time out of cell was predictable and reasonable, although many prisoners were locked in their cell during the working part of the day. The prison had broadly sufficient activity to meet the needs of the population. The range of work on offer was reasonable and most was well planned and of a good standard. Vocational training was more limited, although also of a good standard, and more was planned. The quality of education provision was generally good with meaningful progression opportunities. There was a welcoming library with good access for prisoners. PE offered a balance of accredited and recreational provision. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

There should be better use of specific targets in individual learning plans to help learners progress. (6.7)

**Not achieved**

The prison should continue to develop and implement quality improvement measures to cover all aspects of learning and skills. (6.9)

**Not achieved**

There should be a clear and accurate system to measure planned prisoners' attendance at work.

(6.12)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should continue to receive regular reviews of their initial objectives identified by the careers information and advice support service. (6.14)

**Achieved**

Employability skills gained in prison work activities should be recognised and recorded. (6.15)

**Partially achieved**

The prison should introduce sufficient literacy support for prisoners participating in food hygiene programmes. (6.18)

**No longer relevant**

All workshops should be fully utilised at all times. (6.19)

**Achieved**

The range of accredited vocational courses should be extended and the number of places for prisoners increased. (6.20)

**Not achieved**

There should be adequate ventilation in the bricklaying workshop. (6.25)

**No longer relevant**

There should be accredited training for prison orderlies working in the library. (6.32)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.36)

There should be appropriate PE activities to meet the needs of prisoners in the segregation unit. (6.36)

**Achieved**

The range of internally and externally accredited gym courses should be increased. (6.46)

**Achieved**

## Resettlement

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

*At the last inspection in 2011, the reducing reoffending policy was comprehensive. Strategic objectives were appropriate and were reviewed through the monthly management team meeting. OASys (offender assessment system) assessments were largely up to date, and assessment and sentence planning arrangements were reasonable. Focus on risk had improved but needed to develop further. The frequency and focus of offender supervisor contact with prisoners varied and there was insufficient supervision, training and development of caseworkers. Public protection arrangements were robust and appropriate. Reintegration planning was good for the few prisoners released each year. Provision under the resettlement pathways was appropriate and broadly met need, although interventions for those with alcohol problems were inadequate. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### **Main recommendation**

The prison should have clearer expectations and standards for engaging prisoners in work associated with reducing reoffending that goes beyond offending behaviour courses. There should be appropriate training and supervision for staff undertaking such work, especially in addressing individual risk factors. (HP54)

**Partially achieved**

### **Recommendations**

Sentence plan objectives should be tailored to individual need, and the purpose behind the objectives should be clearly understood by prisoners. (9.5)

**Achieved**

The prison should develop a strategy to deal with delays in OASys (offender assessment system) assessments undertaken by community-based offender managers. (9.11)

**Not achieved**

There should be quality assurance of the frequency and quality of offender supervisor contact with prisoners. (9.12)

**Partially achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.16)

Prison staff overseeing visits should receive safeguarding children training. (9.16)

**Partially achieved**

The drug strategy document should be updated using information drawn from an up-to-date needs analysis, and should include alcohol. (9.27)

**Partially achieved**

Staff training targets for drug and alcohol awareness and relevant programme awareness should be met. (9.29)

**Partially achieved**

A suitable room for hosting a vulnerable prisoner FOCUS programme should be found and used without further delay. (9.35)

**No longer relevant**

There should be an annual visitors' survey to ascertain views, implement appropriate changes, and improve the experience of visitors. (9.37)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should be able to attend visits for their full duration. (9.38)

**Not achieved**

A wider and healthier range of refreshments should be available in the visits hall. (9.41)

**Not achieved**

A parenting course should be provided for prisoners. (9.42)

**Not achieved**



## Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced		602	98.0
Recall		9	1.5
Convicted unsentenced		0	0
Remand		1	0.2
Civil prisoners		0	0
Detainees		2	0.3
<b>Total</b>		<b>614</b>	<b>100</b>

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		2	0.3
Less than 6 months		0	0
6 months to less than 12 months		0	0
12 months to less than 2 years		0	0
2 years to less than 4 years		5	0.8
4 years to less than 10 years		24	3.9
10 years and over (not life)		155	25.2
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)		48	7.8
Life		380	62.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>614</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:		
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	159	25.9
30 years to 39 years	193	31.4
40 years to 49 years	144	23.5
50 years to 59 years	82	13.4
60 years to 69 years	30	4.9
70 plus years	6	1.0
Please state maximum age here:	86	
<b>Total</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British		523	85.2
Foreign nationals		91	14.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>614</b>	<b>100</b>

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced		0	0
Uncategorised sentenced		0	0
Category A		129	21.0
Category B		473	77.0
Category C		5	0.8
Category D		0	0
Other		7	1.2
<b>Total</b>		<b>614</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>White</b>			
British		332	54.1
Irish		12	2.0
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		1	0.2
Other white		34	5.5
<b>Mixed</b>			
White and black Caribbean		18	2.9
White and black African		1	0.2
White and Asian		0	0
Other mixed		5	0.8
<b>Asian or Asian British</b>			
Indian		7	1.1
Pakistani		32	5.2
Bangladeshi		8	1.3
Chinese		0	0
Other Asian		15	2.4
<b>Black or black British</b>			
Caribbean		83	13.5
African		27	4.4
Other black		27	4.4
<b>Other ethnic group</b>			
Arab		3	0.5
Other ethnic group		4	0.7
Not stated		5	0.8
<b>Total</b>			

<b>Religion</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist		0	0
Church of England		120	19.5
Roman Catholic		87	14.2
Other Christian denominations		62	10.1
Muslim		175	28.5
Sikh		5	0.8
Hindu		1	0.2
Buddhist		22	3.6
Jewish		10	1.6
Other		21	3.4
No religion		111	18.1
<b>Total</b>		<b>614</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Other demographics</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Veteran (ex-armed services)		4	0.7
<b>Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>0.7</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			28	4.6
1 month to 3 months			58	9.4
3 months to 6 months			111	18.1
6 months to 1 year			69	11.2
1 year to 2 years			105	17.1
2 years to 4 years			108	17.6
4 years or more			126	20.5
<b>Total</b>			<b>605</b>	<b>98.7</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry		0	0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions)		263	42.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>263</b>	<b>42.8</b>

**Unsentenced prisoners only**

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month				
1 month to 3 months				
3 months to 6 months			1	50.0
6 months to 1 year			1	50.0
1 year to 2 years				
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
<b>Total</b>			<b>2</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		446	72.6
Sexual offences		60	9.8
Burglary		12	2.0
Robbery		39	6.3
Theft and handling		1	0.1
Fraud and forgery		0	0
Drugs offences		27	4.4
Other offences		29	4.7
Civil offences		0	0
Offence not recorded /holding warrant		0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>614</b>	<b>100</b>



## Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

### Prisoner survey methodology

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

### Sampling

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

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 20 October 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Long Lartin was 604. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 204 prisoners.

We received a total of 167 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 81%. This included four questionnaires completed via interview. Eighteen respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 11 questionnaires were not returned and 11 were returned blank.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	17
B	22
C	20
D	17
E	23
F	24
P	13

Q	20
Healthcare	3
Segregation unit	8

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Long Lartin.

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

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

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Long Lartin in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other high security prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in four high security prisons since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMP Long Lartin in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Long Lartin in 2011
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals
- 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
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who are aged 50 and over and those under 50
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of vulnerable prisoners (A, B and C wings) and the rest of the establishment
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who were IPP or life sentenced and all other sentenced prisoners

# Survey summary

## Section I: About You

<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	Under 21 .....	2	(1%)
	21 - 29.....	52	(32%)
	30 - 39.....	50	(30%)
	40 - 49.....	38	(23%)
	50 - 59.....	15	(9%)
	60 - 69.....	8	(5%)
	70 and over .....	0	(0%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>		
	Yes .....	158	(96%)
	Yes - on recall.....	4	(2%)
	No - awaiting trial.....	0	(0%)
	No - awaiting sentence .....	1	(1%)
	No - awaiting deportation.....	1	(1%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	Not sentenced .....	2	(1%)
	Less than 6 months .....	0	(0%)
	6 months to less than 1 year .....	0	(0%)
	1 year to less than 2 years.....	0	(0%)
	2 years to less than 4 years .....	4	(2%)
	4 years to less than 10 years .....	14	(9%)
	10 years or more .....	57	(35%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection) .....	7	(4%)
	Life.....	79	(48%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)</b>		
	Yes .....	29	(18%)
	No.....	133	(82%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	Yes .....	165	(99%)
	No.....	1	(1%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	Yes .....	163	(98%)
	No.....	3	(2%)
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	80 (50%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....
	White - Irish .....	5 (3%)	Asian or Asian British - other .....
	White - other.....	9 (6%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	18 (11%)	Mixed race - white and black African...
	Black or black British - African .....	6 (4%)	Mixed race - white and Asian.....
	Black or black British - other .....	3 (2%)	Mixed race - other .....
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....	2 (1%)	Arab .....
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	13 (8%)	Other ethnic group.....
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	2 (1%)	

<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?</b>		
	Yes .....		7 (4%)
	No.....		150 (96%)
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>		
	None.....	29 (18%)	Hindu..... 0 (0%)
	Church of England .....	26 (16%)	Jewish..... 2 (1%)
	Catholic .....	22 (13%)	Muslim..... 57 (35%)
	Protestant.....	1 (1%)	Sikh .....
	Other Christian denomination .....	8 (5%)	Other .....
	Buddhist.....	5 (3%)	12 (7%)
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>		
	Heterosexual/ Straight .....		154 (97%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		1 (1%)
	Bisexual.....		3 (2%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b>		
	Yes .....		45 (27%)
	No.....		119 (73%)
<b>Q1.13</b>	<b>Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?</b>		
	Yes .....		11 (7%)
	No.....		150 (93%)
<b>Q1.14</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>		
	Yes .....		73 (44%)
	No.....		92 (56%)
<b>Q1.15</b>	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>		
	Yes .....		77 (47%)
	No.....		87 (53%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>		
	Less than 2 hours .....		38 (23%)
	2 hours or longer .....		112 (67%)
	Don't remember .....		16 (10%)
<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>		
	My journey was less than two hours .....		38 (23%)
	Yes .....		53 (33%)
	No.....		59 (36%)
	Don't remember .....		12 (7%)
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>		
	My journey was less than two hours .....		38 (23%)
	Yes .....		12 (7%)
	No.....		108 (65%)
	Don't remember .....		7 (4%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>		
	Yes .....		98 (59%)
	No.....		51 (31%)
	Don't remember .....		16 (10%)



<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	122 (73%)
	No.....	38 (23%)
	Don't remember .....	6 (4%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	39 (23%)
	Well.....	60 (36%)
	Neither .....	48 (29%)
	Badly.....	9 (5%)
	Very badly .....	6 (4%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (2%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me .....	70 (42%)
	Yes, I received written information .....	13 (8%)
	No, I was not told anything .....	82 (49%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (2%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes .....	109 (66%)
	No.....	52 (32%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (2%)

### Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>			
	Less than 2 hours .....	80 (50%)		
	2 hours or longer .....	64 (40%)		
	Don't remember .....	16 (10%)		
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>			
	Yes .....	117 (71%)		
	No .....	37 (23%)		
	Don't remember .....	10 (6%)		
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>			
	Very well.....	30 (19%)		
	Well.....	76 (47%)		
	Neither .....	32 (20%)		
	Badly.....	15 (9%)		
	Very badly .....	5 (3%)		
	Don't remember .....	4 (2%)		
<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>			
	Loss of property .....	52 (32%)	Physical health .....	23 (14%)
	Housing problems.....	7 (4%)	Mental health .....	31 (19%)
	Contacting employers .....	3 (2%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	14 (9%)
	Contacting family .....	50 (31%)	Getting phone numbers.....	45 (28%)
	Childcare .....	2 (1%)	Other .....	8 (5%)
	Money worries.....	16 (10%)	Did not have any problems.....	51 (31%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal .....	28 (17%)		

<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>	
	Yes .....	36 (23%)
	No.....	69 (44%)
	Did not have any problems .....	51 (33%)
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	Tobacco.....	84 (52%)
	A shower .....	35 (21%)
	A free telephone call.....	23 (14%)
	Something to eat.....	59 (36%)
	PIN phone credit.....	26 (16%)
	Toiletries/ basic items .....	64 (39%)
	Did not receive anything .....	41 (25%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	Chaplain .....	74 (46%)
	Someone from health services.....	103 (64%)
	A Listener/Samaritans .....	23 (14%)
	Prison shop/ canteen .....	27 (17%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	41 (25%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	What was going to happen to you .....	52 (33%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	41 (26%)
	How to make routine requests (applications) .....	51 (33%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	43 (28%)
	Health services .....	71 (46%)
	Chaplaincy .....	62 (40%)
	Not offered any information.....	52 (33%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	Yes .....	103 (62%)
	No.....	53 (32%)
	Don't remember .....	10 (6%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	Have not been on an induction course .....	20 (12%)
	Within the first week.....	44 (27%)
	More than a week.....	87 (54%)
	Don't remember .....	11 (7%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	Have not been on an induction course .....	20 (13%)
	Yes .....	51 (32%)
	No.....	64 (40%)
	Don't remember .....	25 (16%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	Did not receive an assessment.....	48 (31%)
	Within the first week.....	9 (6%)
	More than a week.....	58 (38%)
	Don't remember .....	39 (25%)

### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to...</b>						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	24 (15%)	62 (38%)	18 (11%)	24 (15%)	18 (11%)	18 (11%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	17 (11%)	57 (38%)	30 (20%)	12 (8%)	8 (5%)	28 (18%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	5 (4%)	7 (5%)	26 (20%)	5 (4%)	10 (8%)	75 (59%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters.....</i>						20 (12%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>						85 (52%)
	<i>No.....</i>						57 (35%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						106 (65%)
	<i>No.....</i>						6 (4%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>						50 (31%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	142 (86%)	17 (10%)	7 (4%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	154 (94%)	10 (6%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	108 (66%)	39 (24%)	16 (10%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	125 (76%)	38 (23%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	57 (35%)	71 (44%)	33 (20%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	102 (62%)	61 (37%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	37 (23%)	66 (40%)	61 (37%)			
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>						
	<i>Very good.....</i>						0 (0%)
	<i>Good.....</i>						20 (12%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>						40 (24%)
	<i>Bad.....</i>						48 (29%)
	<i>Very bad.....</i>						57 (35%)
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know.....</i>						2 (1%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>						91 (55%)
	<i>No.....</i>						72 (44%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						77 (47%)
	<i>No.....</i>						24 (15%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>						63 (38%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						77 (48%)
	<i>No.....</i>						39 (24%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A.....</i>						44 (28%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						88 (54%)
	<i>No.....</i>						20 (12%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A.....</i>						55 (34%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i> .....	21 (13%)
<i>Very easy</i> .....	52 (32%)
<i>Easy</i> .....	49 (30%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	13 (8%)
<i>Difficult</i> .....	7 (4%)
<i>Very difficult</i> .....	10 (6%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	13 (8%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	129 (79%)
<i>No</i> .....	26 (16%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (5%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are applications dealt with fairly?</i>	10 (7%)	68 (45%)	74 (49%)
<i>Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	10 (7%)	51 (37%)	76 (55%)

**Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	111 (69%)
<i>No</i> .....	29 (18%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	22 (14%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are complaints dealt with fairly?</i>	33 (21%)	34 (22%)	89 (57%)
<i>Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	33 (22%)	40 (27%)	76 (51%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	41 (26%)
<i>No</i> .....	118 (74%)

**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> .....	28 (18%)
<i>Very easy</i> .....	10 (6%)
<i>Easy</i> .....	30 (19%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	60 (38%)
<i>Difficult</i> .....	23 (15%)
<i>Very difficult</i> .....	5 (3%)

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

<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	92 (58%)
<i>No</i> .....	56 (35%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (5%)

<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	71 (45%)
	<i>No</i> .....	71 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	12 (8%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&amp;R)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>No</i> .....	151 (94%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i> .....	115 (71%)
	<i>Very well</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	13 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	13 (8%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	7 (4%)

### Section 7: Relationships with staff

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	126 (79%)
	<i>No</i> .....	33 (21%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	111 (70%)
	<i>No</i> .....	48 (30%)
<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	56 (35%)
	<i>No</i> .....	106 (65%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	27 (17%)
	<i>Rarely</i> .....	46 (29%)
	<i>Some of the time</i> .....	42 (26%)
	<i>Most of the time</i> .....	25 (16%)
	<i>All of the time</i> .....	15 (9%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	10 (6%)
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	71 (44%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	55 (34%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	25 (16%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i> .....	10 (6%)
	<i>Very helpful</i> .....	45 (28%)
	<i>Helpful</i> .....	60 (37%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	22 (14%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i> .....	13 (8%)

## Section 8: Safety

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>		
	Yes .....	85 (52%)	
	No.....	79 (48%)	
<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>		
	Yes .....	44 (27%)	
	No.....	117 (73%)	
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>		
	Never felt unsafe .....	79 (51%)	At meal times..... 10 (6%)
	Everywhere .....	22 (14%)	At health services..... 11 (7%)
	Segregation unit.....	17 (11%)	Visits area..... 9 (6%)
	Association areas .....	24 (16%)	In wing showers .....
	Reception area .....	11 (7%)	In gym showers .....
	At the gym .....	12 (8%)	In corridors/stairwells.....
	In an exercise yard .....	11 (7%)	On your landing/wing .....
	At work.....	24 (16%)	In your cell .....
	During movement.....	23 (15%)	At religious services.....
	At education .....	12 (8%)	
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>		
	Yes .....	56 (34%)	
	No.....	108 (66%)	
<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) .....	22 (13%)	
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....	11 (7%)	
	Sexual abuse .....	2 (1%)	
	Feeling threatened or intimidated.....	34 (21%)	
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	9 (5%)	
	Medication.....	5 (3%)	
	Debt .....	2 (1%)	
	Drugs.....	3 (2%)	
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	13 (8%)	
	Your religion/religious beliefs .....	15 (9%)	
	Your nationality .....	11 (7%)	
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	13 (8%)	
	You are from a traveller community .....	2 (1%)	
	Your sexual orientation .....	2 (1%)	
	Your age.....	5 (3%)	
	You have a disability.....	8 (5%)	
	You were new here.....	8 (5%)	
	Your offence/ crime .....	11 (7%)	
	Gang related issues.....	9 (5%)	
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>		
	Yes .....	68 (42%)	
	No.....	93 (58%)	

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

Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) .....	24 (15%)
Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....	10 (6%)
Sexual abuse .....	3 (2%)
Feeling threatened or intimidated .....	27 (17%)
Medication .....	7 (4%)
Debt .....	0 (0%)
Drugs .....	1 (1%)
Your race or ethnic origin .....	15 (9%)
Your religion/religious beliefs .....	16 (10%)
Your nationality .....	8 (5%)
You are from a different part of the country than others .....	7 (4%)
You are from a traveller community .....	1 (1%)
Your sexual orientation .....	2 (1%)
Your age .....	3 (2%)
You have a disability .....	11 (7%)
You were new here .....	8 (5%)
Your offence/ crime .....	11 (7%)
Gang related issues .....	3 (2%)

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

Not been victimised .....	77 (52%)
Yes .....	32 (21%)
No .....	40 (27%)

### Section 9: Health services

**Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?**

	Don't know	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
The doctor	10 (6%)	13 (8%)	51 (31%)	29 (18%)	41 (25%)	20 (12%)
The nurse	7 (4%)	24 (15%)	67 (43%)	29 (18%)	24 (15%)	6 (4%)
The dentist	14 (9%)	9 (6%)	33 (21%)	29 (18%)	49 (31%)	26 (16%)

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

	Not been	Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
The doctor	7 (4%)	19 (12%)	55 (34%)	27 (17%)	33 (20%)	21 (13%)
The nurse	8 (5%)	32 (20%)	66 (42%)	28 (18%)	15 (9%)	9 (6%)
The dentist	18 (12%)	37 (24%)	58 (37%)	19 (12%)	14 (9%)	10 (6%)

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

Not been .....	1 (1%)
Very good .....	24 (15%)
Good .....	46 (28%)
Neither .....	36 (22%)
Bad .....	33 (20%)
Very bad .....	22 (14%)

**Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?**

Yes .....	81 (49%)
No .....	83 (51%)

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

Not taking medication .....	83 (51%)
Yes, all my meds .....	40 (24%)
Yes, some of my meds .....	27 (16%)
No .....	14 (9%)

<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>	
	Yes .....	59 (36%)
	No.....	103 (64%)
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems.....</i>	103 (65%)
	Yes .....	27 (17%)
	No.....	29 (18%)

### Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	35 (21%)
	No.....	128 (79%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	20 (12%)
	No.....	142 (88%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy.....	15 (10%)
	Easy .....	25 (16%)
	Neither .....	13 (8%)
	Difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know .....	92 (59%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy.....	8 (5%)
	Easy .....	17 (11%)
	Neither .....	16 (10%)
	Difficult.....	11 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	5 (3%)
	Don't know .....	100 (64%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	8 (5%)
	No.....	152 (95%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	6 (4%)
	No.....	153 (96%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem .....</i>	124 (81%)
	Yes .....	23 (15%)
	No.....	7 (5%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....</i>	142 (90%)
	Yes .....	11 (7%)
	No.....	5 (3%)



<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i> .....	126 (81%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	20 (13%)
	<i>No</i> .....	9 (6%)

### Section II: Activities

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	6 (4%)	14 (9%)	62 (39%)	30 (19%)	35 (22%)	12 (8%)
	Vocational or skills training	21 (14%)	6 (4%)	35 (23%)	24 (16%)	34 (23%)	31 (21%)
	Education (including basic skills)	10 (7%)	11 (7%)	53 (35%)	27 (18%)	34 (22%)	18 (12%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	26 (17%)	6 (4%)	30 (20%)	26 (17%)	30 (20%)	34 (22%)

<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i> .....	21 (13%)
	<i>Prison job</i> .....	119 (75%)
	<i>Vocational or skills training</i> .....	25 (16%)
	<i>Education (including basic skills)</i> .....	50 (32%)
	<i>Offending behaviour programmes</i> .....	31 (20%)

<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	13 (9%)	50 (34%)	71 (48%)	14 (9%)
	Vocational or skills training	24 (20%)	44 (37%)	36 (31%)	14 (12%)
	Education (including basic skills)	20 (16%)	63 (49%)	33 (26%)	12 (9%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	29 (24%)	47 (39%)	29 (24%)	17 (14%)

<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	12 (8%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....	31 (19%)
	<i>About once a week</i> .....	98 (62%)
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....	11 (7%)

<b>Q11.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>	
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....	20 (13%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	91 (57%)
	<i>No</i> .....	48 (30%)

<b>Q11.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	24 (15%)
	<i>0</i> .....	45 (28%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	42 (27%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	33 (21%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	14 (9%)

<b>Q11.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	12 (8%)
	<i>0</i> .....	16 (10%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	61 (38%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	32 (20%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	38 (24%)

<b>Q11.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>0</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	13 (8%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	127 (81%)

<b>Q11.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....	25 (16%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....	14 (9%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....	31 (20%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....	34 (22%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....	30 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	12 (8%)

### Section 12: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	51 (33%)
	<i>No</i> .....	103 (67%)

<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	88 (56%)
	<i>No</i> .....	68 (44%)

<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	43 (27%)
	<i>No</i> .....	114 (73%)

<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	22 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	19 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	16 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	33 (21%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	56 (36%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (1%)

### Section 13: Preparation for release

<b>Q13.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	135 (88%)
	<i>No</i> .....	17 (11%)

<b>Q13.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i> .....	19 (13%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	43 (28%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	47 (31%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	22 (14%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	50 (33%)

<b>Q13.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	130 (86%)
	No.....	22 (14%)
<b>Q13.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	Not sentenced .....	2 (1%)
	Yes .....	121 (78%)
	No.....	32 (21%)
<b>Q13.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	34 (22%)
	Very involved.....	27 (17%)
	Involved .....	38 (25%)
	Neither .....	16 (10%)
	Not very involved .....	20 (13%)
	Not at all involved.....	20 (13%)
<b>Q13.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that applies to you.)</b>	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	34 (23%)
	Nobody.....	45 (30%)
	Offender supervisor .....	48 (32%)
	Offender manager .....	37 (25%)
	Named/ personal officer .....	28 (19%)
	Staff from other departments .....	21 (14%)
<b>Q13.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	34 (22%)
	Yes .....	49 (32%)
	No.....	50 (32%)
	Don't know .....	22 (14%)
<b>Q13.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	34 (22%)
	Yes .....	47 (30%)
	No.....	36 (23%)
	Don't know .....	38 (25%)
<b>Q13.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>	
	Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced.....	34 (22%)
	Yes .....	15 (10%)
	No.....	58 (38%)
	Don't know .....	47 (31%)
<b>Q13.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>	
	Yes .....	7 (5%)
	No.....	57 (38%)
	Don't know .....	86 (57%)
<b>Q13.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (15%)
	No.....	129 (85%)

**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>	Yes	No
Employment	24 (17%)	21 (15%)	97 (68%)
Accommodation	25 (18%)	18 (13%)	96 (69%)
Benefits	24 (18%)	14 (10%)	99 (72%)
Finances	31 (23%)	10 (7%)	96 (70%)
Education	27 (19%)	29 (21%)	84 (60%)
Drugs and alcohol	35 (26%)	22 (16%)	80 (58%)

**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> .....	2 (1%)
Yes .....	72 (50%)
No.....	70 (49%)

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Long Lartin 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 Long Lartin 2014	High secure prisons comparator	HMP Long Lartin 2014	HMP Long Lartin 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>167</b>	<b>682</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>180</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	0%	1%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	99%	100%	99%	99%
1.3	Are you on recall?	2%	1%	2%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	4%	15%	4%	14%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	18%	12%	18%	12%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	98%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	42%	28%	42%	32%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	3%	4%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	35%	19%	35%	24%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	10%	3%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	27%	29%	27%	29%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	10%	7%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	44%	43%	44%	46%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	47%	39%	47%	47%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	68%	66%	68%	65%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	43%	48%	43%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	11%	9%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	59%	61%	59%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	74%	73%	74%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	60%	60%	60%	46%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	42%	46%	42%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	8%	6%	8%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	67%	77%	67%	69%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	50%	53%	50%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	73%	71%	58%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Long Lartin 2014	High secure prisons comparator	HMP Long Lartin 2014	HMP Long Lartin 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	65%	65%	42%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	69%	67%	69%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	32%	25%	32%	29%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	4%	3%	4%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	1%	2%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	31%	23%	31%	37%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	1%	1%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	10%	14%	10%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	17%	15%	17%	17%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	14%	14%	14%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	19%	15%	19%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	9%	9%	9%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	28%	20%	28%	36%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	34%	37%	34%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	52%	49%	52%	60%
3.6	A shower?	22%	21%	22%	28%
3.6	A free telephone call?	14%	21%	14%	14%
3.6	Something to eat?	36%	45%	36%	55%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	16%	16%	16%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	39%	43%	39%	
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	46%	43%	46%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	64%	60%	64%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	14%	27%	14%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	17%	21%	17%	10%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	33%	46%	33%	29%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	26%	36%	26%	27%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	33%	35%	33%	25%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	28%	30%	28%	24%
3.8	Health services?	46%	43%	46%	31%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	40%	39%	40%	27%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62%	69%	62%	59%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	89%	88%	95%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Long Lartin 2014	High secure prisons comparator	HMP Long Lartin 2014	HMP Long Lartin 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	37%	48%	37%	56%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	69%	79%	69%	
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	52%	60%	52%	37%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	49%	56%	49%	40%
4.1	Get bail information?	9%	9%	9%	6%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	53%	57%	53%	65%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	65%	64%	65%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	86%	84%	86%	64%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	94%	94%	95%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	66%	79%	66%	67%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76%	76%	76%	84%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	35%	50%	35%	32%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	62%	66%	62%	60%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	23%	26%	23%	22%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	12%	22%	12%	11%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	55%	50%	55%	45%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	47%	56%	47%	52%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	50%	48%	38%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	54%	61%	54%	56%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	61%	51%	61%	
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	79%	89%	79%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	48%	58%	48%	39%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	40%	45%	40%	40%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	69%	72%	69%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	28%	31%	28%	13%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	35%	40%	35%	30%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	26%	28%	26%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	26%	29%	26%	23%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme</b>					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	58%	53%	58%	36%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	41%	45%	30%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	4%	6%	6%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Long Lartin 2014	High secure prisons comparator	HMP Long Lartin 2014	HMP Long Lartin 2011
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
6.4	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?	39%	25%	39%	
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	79%	79%	64%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	70%	75%	70%	70%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	35%	37%	35%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	25%	27%	25%	21%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	94%	88%	94%	95%
For those with a personal officer:					
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	70%	63%	70%	50%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	52%	54%	52%	64%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	27%	24%	27%	35%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	34%	39%	34%	37%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:					
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	15%	14%	17%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	10%	7%	13%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	4%	1%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	21%	24%	21%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	7%	6%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	6%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	3%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	6%	8%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	9%	9%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	5%	7%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	5%	8%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	5%	1%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	4%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	6%	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	3%	5%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	11%	7%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	4%	6%	5%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	42%	51%	42%	44%
Since you have been here, have staff:					
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	19%	15%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	6%	6%	5%



## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Long Lartin 2014	High secure prisons comparator	HMP Long Lartin 2014	HMP Long Lartin 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	25%	17%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	7%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	8%	9%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	10%	11%	10%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	6%	5%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	5%	4%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	2%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	3%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	4%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	5%	7%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	4%	5%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	11%	7%	10%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	3%	2%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	44%	53%	44%	42%
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	39%	37%	39%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	58%	59%	58%	66%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	26%	21%	26%	16%
	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?	48%	43%	48%	49%
9.2	The nurse?	65%	58%	65%	59%
9.2	The dentist?	69%	55%	69%	54%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	44%	39%	44%	42%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	56%	49%	60%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	83%	79%	83%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	37%	35%	37%	30%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	48%	61%	48%	
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	22%	15%	22%	19%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	15%	12%	12%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Long Lartin 2014	High secure prisons comparator	HMP Long Lartin 2014	HMP Long Lartin 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	26%	19%	26%	19%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	16%	14%	16%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	5%	5%	5%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	6%	4%	
	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%	64%	77%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	69%	67%	69%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	69%	84%	69%	57%
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	48%	38%	48%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	27%	31%	27%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	42%	49%	42%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	24%	22%	24%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	75%	66%	75%	74%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	16%	14%	16%	17%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	32%	33%	32%	56%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	16%	20%	22%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	91%	85%	91%	91%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	37%	41%	37%	40%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	80%	76%	80%	79%
	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?	47%	49%	47%	59%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	84%	85%	84%	90%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	58%	58%	58%	74%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	76%	78%	76%	78%
	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?	50%	52%	50%	54%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	69%	46%	69%	75%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	57%	48%	57%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	30%	37%	30%	41%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	28%	44%	52%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	81%	81%	81%	93%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	19%	14%	19%	11%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	33%	35%	33%	23%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Long Lartin 2014	High secure prisons comparator	HMP Long Lartin 2014	HMP Long Lartin 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	57%	46%	57%	62%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27%	31%	27%	26%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	17%	18%	17%	
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	89%	90%	89%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	32%	28%	32%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	35%	43%	35%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	17%	26%	17%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	38%	37%	38%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	86%	86%	86%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	79%	88%	79%	91%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	54%	52%	54%	43%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	39%	40%	39%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	41%	41%	41%	
13.6	Offender manager?	32%	26%	32%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	24%	21%	24%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	18%	22%	18%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	40%	56%	40%	53%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	39%	33%	39%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	12%	12%	12%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	8%	5%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	15%	12%	15%	4%
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?	18%	16%	18%	
13.12	Accommodation?	16%	16%	16%	
13.12	Benefits?	13%	15%	13%	
13.12	Finances?	9%	14%	9%	
13.12	Education?	26%	19%	26%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	22%	22%	22%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	51%	60%	51%	51%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Long Lartin 2014

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

#### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>67</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>107</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	97%	100%	100%	99%	98%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	28%	9%			32%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	100%	99%	98%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	100%	96%	99%	97%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			70%	37%	84%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	7%	0%	5%	4%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	73%	10%	64%	29%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	23%	32%	14%	30%	20%	32%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	10%	7%	7%	4%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	52%	38%	78%	36%	59%	37%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	57%	62%	55%	60%	56%	63%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	39%	46%	28%	44%	39%	45%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	55%	83%	61%	73%	55%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	52%	76%	54%	68%	54%	71%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	77%	64%	70%	69%	75%	65%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	65%	66%	61%	64%	59%	67%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	61%	65%	62%	62%	67%	59%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	89%	87%	85%	89%	93%	85%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	51%	55%	50%	52%	51%	53%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	79%	92%	72%	88%	77%	91%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	96%	90%	95%	95%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	42%	36%	36%	26%	39%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14%	11%	22%	11%	12%	12%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	46%	61%	32%	59%	49%	59%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	43%	52%	29%	51%	40%	51%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	55%	45%	61%	45%	61%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59%	53%	62%	53%	65%	49%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70%	88%	69%	82%	70%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	72%	62%	70%	68%	69%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	59%	59%	50%	60%	53%	62%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	45%	54%	44%	47%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	5%	7%	5%	6%	5%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	81%	75%	81%	78%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	66%	72%	74%	69%	68%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	17%	32%	38%	23%	18%	29%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	89%	97%	93%	94%	88%	97%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	49%	53%	50%	51%	44%	56%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	22%	34%	25%	25%	28%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	31%	36%	32%	36%	29%	37%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	17%	24%	11%	23%	12%	25%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11%	7%	11%	8%	9%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	8%	11%	14%	8%	7%	11%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	3%	7%	0%	6%	4%	6%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	45%	41%	37%	44%	43%	41%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	19%	15%	18%	11%	19%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	17%	3%	23%	7%	15%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	10%	12%	10%	13%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	8%	2%	12%	4%	7%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	5%	9%	0%	8%	4%	9%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	32%	43%	29%	41%	37%	40%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	49%	65%	41%	61%	50%	62%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	32%	64%	23%	53%	32%	60%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	30%	41%	19%	40%	22%	43%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	16%	31%	15%	28%	15%	31%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	73%	76%	72%	77%	68%	80%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	20%	13%	20%	15%	18%	14%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	36%	29%	40%	29%	32%	31%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	23%	17%	16%	20%	20%	18%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	64%	71%	73%	67%	65%	70%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	35%	26%	57%	25%	43%	24%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	35%	50%	43%	44%	39%	46%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	82%	81%	75%	82%	80%	81%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	20%	18%	12%	21%	15%	20%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	60%	55%	50%	59%	58%	56%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	29%	26%	29%	28%	33%	25%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability and age over 50) HMP Long Lartin 2014

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

#### Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>142</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	98%	100%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	21%	9%	19%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	33%	44%	14%	46%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	12%	2%	9%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	25%	38%	22%	37%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			30%	27%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	7%	14%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	49%	35%	46%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	62%	65%	58%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	56%	38%	43%	41%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	72%	78%	70%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	66%	74%	64%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	84%	62%	57%	72%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	64%	64%	65%	64%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	59%	65%	65%	62%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	79%	91%	92%	87%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	62%	49%	57%	52%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	87%	86%	95%	84%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91%	96%	92%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	35%	36%	50%	34%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	14%	12%	17%	11%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	66%	52%	57%	54%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	50%	47%	65%	44%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	48%	57%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	49%	56%	65%	53%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	74%	82%	92%	77%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	70%	68%	68%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	57%	60%	61%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	49%	61%	42%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	3%	5%	6%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	81%	92%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	59%	75%	70%	70%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	23%	26%	48%	21%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	97%	92%	95%	93%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	56%	49%	52%	52%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	31%	24%	26%	27%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	49%	27%	39%	34%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	28%	17%	17%	22%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	6%	13%	7%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	9%	9%	13%	9%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	12%	5%	13%	6%



## Key to tables

## Diversity Analysis

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	7%	2%	13%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	19%	0%	8%	4%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	50%	38%	30%	45%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	17%	22%	16%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	12%	7%	8%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	7%	10%	13%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	7%	3%	13%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	1%	8%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	24%	0%	5%	7%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	41%	52%	37%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	66%	56%	57%	58%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	80%	37%	70%	46%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	64%	24%	26%	39%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	26%	13%	28%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	76%	76%	65%	77%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	18%	13%	17%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	36%	30%	35%	31%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	19%	20%	13%	21%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	65%	71%	74%	67%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	12%	37%	9%	33%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	45%	54%	42%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	81%	82%	70%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	15%	21%	22%	19%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	49%	58%	43%	59%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	34%	24%	35%	26%



## Prisoner survey responses; Life and IPP sentenced prisoners HMP Long Lartin 2014

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

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	IPP and Life sentenced prisoners	All other sentenced 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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	0%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	16%	20%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	100%	96%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	33%	49%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	3%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	30%	41%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	4%	2%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	34%	20%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	7%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	39%	50%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	45%	49%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	71%	66%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	72%	76%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	56%	65%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	48%	36%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	71%	62%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>		
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	58%	41%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	62%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72%	56%
When you first arrived:		
3.4 Did you have any problems?	64%	76%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	27%	39%
3.4 Did you have any housing problems?	2%	7%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	2%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting family?	25%	40%
3.4 Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	2%
3.4 Did you have any money worries?	11%	8%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	IPP and Life sentenced prisoners	All other sentenced 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		
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	15%	21%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	18%	10%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	24%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	9%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	21%	35%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	55%	48%
3.6	A shower?	20%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	18%	10%
3.6	Something to eat?	42%	29%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	17%	15%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	35%	44%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	47%	44%
3.7	Someone from health services?	64%	65%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	15%	13%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	14%	18%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	37%	29%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	28%	25%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	33%	32%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	28%	25%
3.8	Health services?	48%	42%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	41%	39%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	58%	68%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	87%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	69%	67%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	58%	46%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	52%	46%
4.1	Get bail information?	6%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	53%	53%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	70%	61%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	88%	81%

## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	IPP and Life sentenced prisoners	All other sentenced 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 able to have a shower every day?	92%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	64%	69%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	70%	83%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	33%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	58%	66%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	19%	25%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	13%	9%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	56%	53%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	51%	43%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	48%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57%	54%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	60%	63%
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	78%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	73%	63%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	34%	18%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	28%	23%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	66%	50%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	4%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	84%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72%	69%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	35%	33%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	21%	30%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	95%	93%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	56%	47%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	30%	24%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	38%	30%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	18%	8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	27%	12%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	5%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	IPP and Life sentenced prisoners	All other sentenced 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	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	10%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	11%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	10%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	10%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	10%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	9%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	48%	36%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	19%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	3%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	4%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	21%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	10%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	12%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	11%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	11%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	41%	36%

**Key to tables**

		IPP and Life sentenced prisoners	All other sentenced 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		
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	67%	47%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	30%	20%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	55%	42%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	44%	28%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	30%	13%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	18%	7%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	33%	18%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	20%	12%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	3%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	7%	0%
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	50%	45%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	28%	26%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	44%	37%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	33%	14%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	80%	71%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	11%	21%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	30%	33%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	22%	18%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	73%	62%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	67%	42%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	35%	25%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	39%	51%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	80%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	21%	15%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	31%	32%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	62%	52%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	21%	35%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	18%	12%
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	89%	83%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	10%



## Prisoner responses (Vulnerable Prisoners' wings) HMP Long Lartin 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

		A, B and C wings (Vulnerable prisoners' wings)	D, E, F, P and Q wings (main population)
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>59</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	98%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	4%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	0%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	7%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	24%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	25%	53%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	49%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	40%	19%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	11%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	47%	44%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	48%	46%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	68%	66%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	75%	74%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	63%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	49%	37%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	78%	60%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	51%	49%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	76%	72%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	66%	67%
When you first arrived:			
3.4	Did you have any problems?	70%	66%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	27%	36%

### Key to tables

		A, B and C wings (Vulnerable prisoners' wings)	D, E, F, P and Q wings (main population)
	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		
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	3%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	24%	33%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	15%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	29%	10%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	14%	14%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	29%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	19%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	25%	27%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	58%	46%
3.6	A shower?	16%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	18%	12%
3.6	Something to eat?	33%	40%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	16%	17%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	33%	42%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	53%	43%
3.7	Someone from health services?	75%	60%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	22%	11%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	20%	16%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	37%	34%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	30%	27%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	39%	32%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	25%	31%
3.8	Health services?	56%	42%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	44%	40%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	58%	68%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	93%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	64%	76%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	58%	52%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	47%	52%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	9%



**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings (Vulnerable prisoners' wings)	D, E, F, P and Q wings (main population)
	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		
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	58%	47%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	78%	63%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	93%	85%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	94%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	74%	61%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	78%	78%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	44%	32%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	48%	74%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	21%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	9%	12%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	62%	52%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	42%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	54%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	41%	77%
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	78%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	72%	66%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	31%	21%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	35%	19%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	65%	58%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	2%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	67%	72%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	31%	33%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	20%	28%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	98%	92%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	59%	44%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	25%	24%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	47%	23%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	16%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	14%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings (Vulnerable prisoners' wings)	D, E, F, P and Q wings (main population)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	28%	14%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	11%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	14%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	11%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	12%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	17%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	5%
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	49%	35%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	19%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	11%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	12%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	9%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	11%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	18%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%

## Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A, B and C wings (Vulnerable prisoners' wings)	D, E, F, P and Q wings (main population)
	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		
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	43%	38%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	66%	52%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	33%	25%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	63%	43%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	51%	25%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	34%	16%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	21%	9%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	33%	19%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	25%	10%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	11%	2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	9%	1%
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	55%	47%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	36%	24%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	56%	38%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	28%	23%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	89%	73%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	11%	20%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	32%	34%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	21%	21%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	65%	72%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	61%	58%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	19%	38%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	43%	41%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	80%	86%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	26%	17%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	35%	33%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	61%	54%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	28%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	21%	16%
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	89%	85%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	5%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	11%	17%