

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Deerbolt

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

1–12 December 2014

Glossary of terms

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

Crown copyright 2015

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

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

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

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

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	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	57
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix III: Prison population profile	73
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	77

Introduction

HMP Deerbolt is a young adult establishment managing male prisoners aged 18 to 21. Located near Barnard Castle in County Durham it provides a place for up to 513 convicted young men who come from across the north of England. At our last inspection in 2011 we considered it to be a safe and respectful prison that provided a fairly purposeful regime and some solid resettlement support. At this inspection, the evidence again suggests that the prison is performing reasonably well.

Most prisoners felt safe and early days support was particularly good. The population however, had changed and it now held mainly those convicted of violent or other serious offences. While most violent incidents were low level, some were more serious, and the emerging problem of prisoners using new psychoactive substances, such as Spice, meant that the prison had to be vigilant in responding to these challenges. It was however, commendable that the prison had not had any self-inflicted deaths since opening, which was testament to some good work supporting those deemed vulnerable to self-harm. Substance misuse support provided on the recovery unit was excellent but needed to be extended to those requiring such assistance on other units. Use of segregation was not high and relationships on the unit were good, although the regime was somewhat limited. However, while use of force was not high, we were concerned about the management and application of some aspects of force at the prison. We found examples where de-escalation had not been used effectively, and overall arrangements did not provide reassurance that all force used was proportionate.

Relationships between staff and prisoners were strong and staff had appropriately high expectations of the behaviour they expected from the young men held. While strategic elements of diversity work were in need of development, and despite negativity in our survey from black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners, we found outcomes for the protected groups were reasonable. Health services were very good and valued by prisoners. The general environment and cleanliness was also good, but some residential areas were in a poor state of repair – many windows were broken and some cells were in a particularly poor state. Significant investment was needed to bring all the buildings up to a decent standard.

Time out of cell for most was reasonable and although too many prisoners were locked up during the core day, most had some activity. Leadership and management of learning and skills was good and some excellent work was taking place to improve the range and amount of activities available. There were now sufficient activity places for the population held and unemployment was low. The focus on vocational training was particularly strong, with some good opportunities offered, although some waiting lists were poorly managed. However, attendance and punctuality were poor and aspects of the education provision needed urgent attention, particularly the quality of some teaching and outcomes in functional English and maths. Given the age, profile and needs of the population this was surprising and was a key area for improvement.

Pre-release resettlement support was very strong and it was notable that in our survey more prisoners than the comparator said they had done something, or something had happened to them at the prison, that would make it less likely that they would offend in the future. Work to support prisoners in maintaining contact with family, friends and the outside world was particularly encouraging, and important for this age group. However, offender management arrangements were underdeveloped and many key assessments were overdue or had not even been started. While some work with higher risk prisoners was better, as was most public protection work, this was a key area for improvement to ensure everything possible was being done to reduce the risk of future reoffending.

Overall, while Deerbolt remained a decent and generally safe prison, some key challenges were evident. Action to address the supervision of force started as soon as we raised concerns with the prison management, and needed to be quickly resolved. Deficits in the key areas of functional skills teaching and achievements, and offender management, needed close management attention, but we

were confident that this would happen and that in time progress would be made. The quality of the buildings' infrastructure is more difficult for local managers to address and support is needed from the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) to resource the improvements required. This is a challenging agenda but Deerbolt remains one of the better young adult prisons we have inspected.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

May 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A closed young offender institution holding convicted young male prisoners aged 18-21.

Prison status

Public

Region

North East

Number held

2.12.14: 457

Certified normal accommodation

513

Operational capacity

513

Date of last full inspection

20-24 June 2011

Brief history

The prison opened in 1973 on the site of a former military camp and was originally a borstal. It became a youth custody centre and is currently a young offender institution.

Short description of residential units

The nine residential units include seven buildings constructed during the 1970s and early 1980s holding 60-66 young people in single cell accommodation, plus G wing, which holds 36, and J wing, with integral showers, which holds 39 young adults.

Name of governor

Gabrielle Lee

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service providers

Care UK Ltd

Tees, Esk and Wear Valley Mental Health Trust

Learning and skills provider

The Manchester College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

John Stoney

About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This report

- A8 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A9 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A10 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

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

Summary

Safety

- S1 *Most prisoners had relatively short journeys to the prison. Early days support was good. Most prisoners felt safe, and violent incidents were not excessive. Most were low level. Support for prisoners in self-harm crisis or who were vulnerable was good. Security arrangements were mainly proportionate but some aspects of the privileges system were overly punitive. The prison faced challenges in the use of illicit drugs. Adjudications were well managed. Use of force was not excessive but oversight did not demonstrate sufficient accountability, and opportunities to de-escalate incidents were being missed. The segregation environment was reasonable and staff-prisoner relationships strong, but the regime was too basic. Substance misuse support on the recovery unit was very good but underdeveloped elsewhere. **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 Deerbolt were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 23 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3 Most prisoners had relatively short journeys to reach the prison. Although few prisoners had outstanding court appearances, there was no video link facility that could have avoided unnecessary journeys. Arrivals were no longer handcuffed from escort vans into reception, and most prisoners said they were treated well by escort staff.
- S4 In our survey, almost all responses about treatment in prisoners' early days were as good as or better than the comparators. The reception environment had improved significantly. Interactions between staff and prisoners were relaxed, and processes were courteous and efficient. Reception packs were offered and there was a good supply of kit. First night cells were reasonably clean but some needed refurbishment and contained poor condition mattresses and graffiti. New arrivals got a free telephone call, the opportunity to shower and had a private first night interview. Induction arrangements were reasonable and most new prisoners were placed in activities reasonably quickly.
- S5 Despite some concerns about violent incidents, prisoners' perceptions of safety were more positive than in comparator prisons. The population was challenging and many prisoners were convicted of serious violent offences. Incidents of violence were about the same as similar prisons. Most incidents were low level, but a few were more serious. The prison had taken action to address aspects of violence, including the refurbishment of showers, supervision of exercise and movement to activities, which had been identified as hotspots. The formal anti-bullying scheme was used infrequently and most bullies were managed through adjudications and the basic regime.
- S6 There had been no self-inflicted deaths of young prisoners and levels of self-harm were similar to comparator establishments. The quality of care for those at risk of self-harm was good. Case management for those in crisis showed some consistency, with good support from the mental health team. There was a good focus on providing activities for those at risk. More Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) had been trained recently and they felt well supported. There were good efforts to ensure that prisoners in crisis and on case management were only held in the segregation unit as a last resort.

- S7 There was no local safeguarding policy but we found some good examples of practical care for prisoners at risk because of disability or ill health.
- S8 Physical and procedural security measures did not needlessly restrict access to the regime. There was a good flow of intelligence but some actions were not carried out promptly. The prison was appropriately focused on tackling an emerging problem of novel psychoactive substances, including an information campaign organised by the drug and alcohol recovery team (DART). In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator said it was easy to get drugs and that they had developed a drug problem in the prison. However, the mandatory drug testing (MDT) random positive rate for the six months to the end of October 2014 was low. The prison had an up-to-date supply reduction action plan and was generally sighted on the problem of the availability of drugs.
- S9 Differentials between the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) levels were reasonable and prisoners told us that the scheme encouraged positive behaviour. The basic regime was imposed appropriately but some aspects were too punitive, particularly closed visits.
- S10 The number of adjudications was lower than at our previous inspection and the quality of the documentation we saw was reasonable. Quality assurance arrangements were appropriate. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said that staff had physically restrained them and we found that, while use of force was not high, most use of force incidents involved full control and restraint techniques. Nearly all recent records of use of force were incomplete and poor quality, and we were not assured that all incidents were a last resort or de-escalated quickly enough, or that all uses of special accommodation were warranted.
- S11 Use of segregation was not excessive and most stays were short. It was positive that, although many segregated prisoners wanted to transfer out of the prison, most were eventually reintegrated to normal location. The unit offered a reasonable environment where staff engaged well with residents, but the regime was too basic.
- S12 Although there was a low need for clinical drug treatment, the quality of support offered was very good. Outcomes for prisoners on the drug and alcohol recovery unit were very good, but prisoners with substance misuse issues on other wings had insufficient access to one-to-one support and group work.

Respect

*S13 Living conditions were reasonable overall but some cells were poor and many windows were damaged. Staff-prisoner relationships were very good. Equality and diversity support was generally good, despite negative responses from some groups and some frailties in structures. Complaints were well managed and legal services were reasonable. Health services were very good. Prisoners were negative about the food. Prison shop arrangements were reasonable but some items were expensive. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S14 At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Deerbolt were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 31 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that nine of the recommendations had been achieved, 10 had been partially achieved, 10 had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.

S15 External areas were well kept and prisoners had reasonable access to them. Residential units looked worn out and many windows needed repair, letting in the winter cold at the time of our inspection. Most cells and communal areas were clean, although we did see some unacceptable conditions. Prisoners had good access to telephones, cleaning materials, showers and bedding. However, some wings did not have adequately screened toilets and some showers needed replacing, although a refurbishment programme was under way.

S16 Staff-prisoner interactions were respectful, and staff were very knowledgeable about those in their care. This was echoed in our survey, where significantly more prisoners than the comparator said that staff treated them with respect. It was notable that staff routinely referred to prisoners by their first name.

S17 The diversity and equality management team met regularly. There was occasionally a prisoner present but no external representation. Equality monitoring had indicated some disparities in representation in some activities and on the enhanced status but, while these had been recognised, they had not yet been fully addressed. Each diversity strand was represented by a member of the senior management team, and there was good promotion of diversity, including displays in education and monthly events. Additional strands for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners and those who had been in the armed forces had been developed. Discrimination complaint forms were freely available and generally well investigated, although there was no external quality assurance.

S18 Although black and minority ethnic prisoners raised few specific issues with us, their responses to our survey were less positive than white prisoners. Prisoner black and minority ethnic and diversity champions had recently been introduced but many were unsure of their role. There were no open forums for black and minority ethnic prisoners, but there was a forum for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners, which was positive. All foreign nationals were seen regularly by an immigration officer and the foreign nationals lead officer, who was well known to them.

S19 The prison had identified 52 prisoners as having a disability, mainly related to learning disabilities and mental health issues. In our survey, responses from prisoners who considered themselves to have a disability were considerably less positive than those without disabilities in some aspects of safety and respect. Despite this, those we met felt well supported. There had been efforts to offer support to gay prisoners but there had been no take-up. The

² 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.

chaplaincy was well integrated into the life of the prison, and faith provision was good, despite some negativity in our survey.

- S20 Complaints were mostly about relatively minor matters and responses were satisfactory, but not all were easy to read. Complaints were monitored and action taken to address identified issues. Prisoners could also raise issues with the governor and senior managers at the monthly prisoner consultation council. Offender supervisors provided reasonable legal services support.
- S21 Prisoners were very positive about the health services. Governance arrangements were good, although the complaints system was not confidential. Primary care, dentistry and mental health care were very good, with age-appropriate services. The approach to care planning for complex physical conditions required further development. Not every prisoner who arrived on medication had his in-possession risk assessment updated. Mental health services were good.
- S22 Prisoner satisfaction with the food was low and there had been no food consultation meetings for six months. Prisoners were more satisfied with the shop provision than the comparator, although black and minority prisoners were significantly less positive, and some basic items were expensive. Prisoners could shop from catalogues but were inappropriately charged a fee for this.

Purposeful activity

- S23 *Most prisoners had a reasonable amount of time out of cell. Leadership and management of learning and skills were strong and developing. Although there were enough activity places for the population, attendance and punctuality were poor and some waiting lists were too long. The quality of teaching was mixed; too much was only adequate although it was better in vocational training. Achievements were also mixed; in vocational training they were good but in functional skills they were insufficient. The use of prisoner mentors to support learning was underdeveloped in education. The library and gym provided some reasonable opportunities. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S24 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Deerbolt were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that nine of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, nine had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S25 During our roll checks we found too many prisoners locked up during the core day. However, time out of cell overall had improved since the last inspection. The majority had around nine hours a day out of their cell, but those working part time had less, and the few who were unemployed had only around two hours. Access to association was good but exercise periods were too short.
- S26 The prison and head of learning and skills and work provided a strong strategic direction that was improving prisoners' employment and resettlement opportunities. The employability strategy matched the curriculum to local and regional employment priorities and the needs of prisoners, and was starting to improve outcomes. There was a good focus on improving prisoners' functional skills in activities, but this was not yet fully effective. Partnership working was particularly good and had led to some innovative opportunities. The quality improvement group met regularly and focused on improvement strategies, but arrangements to improve the quality of teaching and learning were underdeveloped. Prisoner allocation to

activities had improved significantly and was efficient, but waiting lists for the most popular activities were too long. Prisoner pay rates were a significant disincentive to attending education.

- S27 There were now sufficient activity places for the population, with 450 full-time-equivalent spaces. However, take-up of places was insufficient, particularly in education. The range of provision was broad, but too many vocational courses were only available at level two and some learners struggled to cope with the demand as they were only operating at functional skill entry level. The learning and skills induction process was comprehensive and effective.
- S28 Not enough teaching in education was good enough, particularly in English and maths. Tutors did not plan sessions well enough to meet the differing needs of their group. Qualified prisoner mentors were used well in the English and maths 'adult support' sessions and vocational training, but in contrast were not always deployed effectively in general education classes. Learners' support needs were identified well through learner profiles in education classes, but tutors did not always differentiate activities or provide sufficient support to meet individual needs. Tutors generally managed challenging behaviour well. However, learners in English and mathematics sessions were less well behaved and their progress was slow. Learners were not getting sufficiently detailed feedback on how they could improve their English and mathematical skills. In vocational training, teaching was mostly good and most learners made good progress.
- S29 Attendance and punctuality in education, and punctuality in vocational training and work, were poor with learners arriving up to 30 minutes late. Learners produced a high standard of work in vocational training and industry workshops, and demonstrated a professional work ethic in areas such as plastering, brickwork and cleaning. In the print shop and laundry, learners produced work of a commercial standard and to commercial deadlines. However, the good employability skills developed were not formally recognised or recorded.
- S30 The library was well stocked, welcoming and effectively run. There was good use of mentors to support library services. Opening hours were limited and did not include Friday afternoon, evenings or weekends, and library visits were timetabled during education and training sessions, which disrupted learning and the working day. There was good promotion of literacy through reading initiatives.
- S31 There was a wide range of physical education facilities and access was good, but some areas and the showers were in a poor state of repair. Although a balanced programme of team and cardiovascular activities was offered, prisoners spent too much time in weight training. There were accredited courses promoting health and well-being but none linked to employability and resettlement.

Resettlement

- S32 *The strategic management of resettlement had a weak focus on offender management and the needs of the population. The overall quality of offender management work was insufficient, and there were long delays in some key assessments. Some work with higher risk prisoners was better. Public protection arrangements were good but the identification of prisoner risk was inconsistent. There was some good reintegration planning, and support in the resettlement pathways was generally very strong, although insufficient offending behaviour courses were offered. Children and families support was excellent. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

- S33 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Deerbolt were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 16 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S34 The reducing reoffending policy addressed resettlement issues, but made only scant reference to the work of offender management. The reducing reoffending meeting offered a positive forum to take developments forward. Offender management was in a period of transition and there was clear evidence that the department was struggling, with limited resources and inexperienced staff.
- S35 There was a significant backlog of initial OASys (offender assessment system) assessments and sentence plans, with some delayed for over 12 months. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparators said they had an offender supervisor or a sentence plan. Although we saw some examples of well-managed cases, too many had perfunctory assessments, limited risk assessments and little or no subsequent contact with prisoners. Work with some higher risk and indeterminate sentence prisoners was better. Interim sentence plans had been introduced to offset some of the shortfalls, but arrangements remained limited. Home detention curfew was well managed.
- S36 Public protection arrangements were good and the monthly interdepartmental risk management meeting was well managed. However, we were concerned that prisoners' multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) risk levels were not confirmed in time for effective pre-release planning.
- S37 Provision under the resettlement pathways was generally good, but integration with offender supervisors to ensure links to offender managers was weak. Housing services provided by the homelessness charity Shelter included effective use of peer workers and a good range of support, and very few prisoners were released with no fixed accommodation.
- S38 A range of employability courses focused on positive work attitudes that provided prisoners with transferable skills and prepared them well for employment opportunities on release. The National Careers Service (NCS) provided a good service to prisoners, with interviews on entry and exit and comprehensive action plans. However, offender supervisors did not consider these targets sufficiently when prioritising sentence plans. The new 'Links To' initiative provided by NCS and The Manchester College gave prisoners excellent information on pathways to specific employment opportunities and careers information, including job availability, salary and potential employers. Partnership working with outside agencies provided excellent and collective support for resettlement. The virtual campus (giving prisoners internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities) was used well.
- S39 The DART organised excellent family conferences for prisoners with substance misuse needs, but there was a lack of effective links with local and regional community substance misuse agencies. Pre-release health care planning was very good.
- S40 Children and families provision was good, and a benefit for the many families who travelled long distances to attend visits. Visitors were very positive about their experience of the prison. NEPACS (formerly the North East Prisons After Care Society) operated a welcoming visitors' centre and ran a bus service from the train station. The visits hall was large and offered a play area. NEPACS provided a comprehensive package of family support, including family days, baby bonding, parenting and relationships courses, which was some of the best we have seen in young adult prisons.

- S41 There was limited provision to address offending behaviour. The Thinking Skills Programme and some good substance misuse courses were offered, but there was no victim-focused work or anger management programme. Too many prisoners were released having done little to address their offending behaviour or underpinning attitudes.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S42 **Concern:** Governance and quality assurance of use of force was inadequate; it was not providing reassurance that all force used was proportionate and that de-escalation had been used effectively. We found examples where not all opportunities to de-escalate had been used.

Recommendation: All use of force, including the use of special accommodation, should be as a last resort, and should be de-escalated at the earliest opportunity.

- S43 **Concern:** Some cells needed refurbishment and many windows needed repair, especially given the winter weather at the time of inspection and the number of prisoners who told us their cells were cold.

Recommendation: Faulty windows should be replaced and cells in a poor state should be refurbished.

- S44 **Concern:** Too much teaching, particularly in the key areas of functional skills English and maths, was not good enough. Support for learners with identified needs needed to be better, with more feedback on performance to help learners improve. This was affecting outcomes in a key area for this age group.

Recommendation: The quality of teaching and outcomes, particularly in English and maths functional skills, should be improved.

- S45 **Concern:** Many prisoners did not have an up-to-date OASys (offender assessment system) assessment or one at all, and some prisoners were inappropriately transferred to Deerbolt without an OASys, which compounded the problems. The quality of assessments and sentence planning arrangements were too variable and some practice was poor. There was no agreed process to escalate concerns when there were delays in receiving OASys assessments that were the responsibility of the probation service outside the prison, and information sharing between offender supervisors and offender managers needed to be better.

Recommendation: All prisoners should have an up-to-date OASys assessment, including those who are the responsibility of community offender managers, and these and the associated sentence plans should be completed to a good standard.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

I.1 *Most prisoners had relatively short journeys to the prison, escort vans were clean and well equipped, and prisoners said they were treated well by escort staff.*

I.2 Most prisoners had relatively short journeys to Deerbolt, mainly from prisons in the north east and north west, and few prisoners arrived late. There was an average of 25 new receptions a week. There were relatively few movements of prisoners to courts (84 in the previous six months). The prison did not have a video link facility, which would have avoided unnecessary journeys to court and could have been used for other purposes.

I.3 Many prisoners had little knowledge about Deerbolt before they arrived and, although most knew they were to be transferred to the prison, they were not told they were going until the morning they were moved, which gave little time to alert families or visitors. Escort vans were clean with water, sanitary provisions and a first aid box, and the majority of prisoners reported that they had been treated well by escort staff. Prisoners were no longer handcuffed from escort vans into reception.

Recommendation

I.4 **The prison should install a video link to avoid prisoners making unnecessary journeys to courts, and to support their contact with legal and professional visitors.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

I.5 *Early days support was good. The reception environment had improved significantly. First night cells were reasonably clean but some needed refurbishment. Induction arrangements were reasonable and most new arrivals were placed in activities quickly. There was no specific support for new arrivals making the transition from the juvenile estate.*

- I.6** In our survey, almost all responses from prisoners about their treatment in their early days in the prison were as good as or better than the comparators. The new reception building was clean, bright and a significant improvement, and was now staffed over the lunchtime. Searching procedures were proportionate. Holding rooms displayed relevant information.
- I.7** Interactions between staff and prisoners were relaxed, and processes polite and efficient. Initial reception interviews took place at a large open counter but officers were alert to issues of confidentiality. Officers opened a first night and induction checklist document to record any identified risks. Cell sharing risk assessments were updated, although new arrivals did not share cells routinely. Prisoners were issued an identity card and reception pack, and those likely to miss the deadline to place a weekly shop order could buy larger packs. There was a good supply of kit, including clothes, sheets and towels.
- I.8** In our survey, 76% of prisoners said that they were treated well in reception, against the comparator of 59%. However, although the prison received juveniles making the transition to a young offender institution (YOI) there were no specific arrangements or planning to help them adjust in their early days at Deerbolt. Arrivals were not held long in reception before they moved to the first night centre.
- I.9** First night and induction took place on I wing. First night cells were reasonably clean and included basic toiletries, but some needed refurbishment and contained mattresses in poor condition and graffiti (see main recommendation S43). Cells had a notice board with relevant information. Prisoners were given a free telephone call and had the opportunity to shower during evening association. All new arrivals were seen for a private first night interview where they could raise any urgent matters and immediate concerns, important procedures were explained and they were helped to fill in their initial menu choice. A first night pack for new arrivals included specific information about Deerbolt and writing materials. New arrivals were also seen by a nurse on I wing. All the new arrivals we saw were relaxed without the usual anxieties associated with a first reception into prison.
- I.10** Two landings on I wing accommodated a mix of longer term prisoners and full-time workers, and three prisoners had been placed on the wing following problems with debt. We found no evidence that this mix made new arrivals feel unsafe. On I wing, new arrivals had access to Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) and prisoner information desk (PID) peer workers (who helped new arrivals to understand prison procedures).
- I.11** Induction took place over six days and for most began on the day following reception. The main elements included a prison induction talk, education and gym inductions and a presentation from the drug and alcohol recovery team (DART). The programme took place in a quiet room and was delivered by an induction officer and a PID worker. There was also opportunity for one-to-one interviews with staff, and trained peer Shelter housing advice workers saw all new arrivals. A useful booklet for foreign national prisoners translated the names of everyday items into 12 languages.
- I.12** Most new arrivals were placed into activities reasonably quickly, although some still remained on the induction wing for over two weeks. There was no process to check that all new arrivals had completed all elements of the induction programme.

Recommendation

- I.13** **There should be specific arrangements to support the transition of young people from the juvenile estate into the prison.**

Housekeeping point

- I.14** An induction checklist should be introduced to ensure that all new arrivals complete all elements of the programme.

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.15 *Most prisoners felt safe. The population was challenging and many were convicted of serious violent offences, presenting additional challenges. Most incidents were low level but a few were more serious. There had been some positive action to reduce levels of violence but individuals needed to be set meaningful challenges to address their behaviour*

- I.16** Prisoner perceptions of safety in our survey were more positive than the comparator, and this was reflected in what they told us. The population was challenging and many prisoners were convicted of serious violent offences. The level of violent incidents was about the same as similar prisons; in the previous six months, there had been an average of 10 prisoner-on-prisoner assaults and six fights a month, and an average of two assaults on staff.
- I.17** Most, but not all, incidents were low level. Of the last 50 records completed following a fight or assault, 29 recorded no injury sustained, and injuries that were recorded were mainly minor. Of the 285 violent incidents recorded between January and August 2014, 31 indicated that a 'weapon' had been used, but most were items such as food, a plate, tennis bat etc; six recorded use of a bladed weapon. In the same period, 17 incidents were recorded as serious assaults, and nine required hospital treatment. Cases were referred to the police where appropriate.
- I.18** There was a formal three-stage anti-bullying scheme, but it was used infrequently. Bullying information reports often included superficial and inconclusive investigations, as prisoners could not or would not disclose perpetrator(s). Fifteen prisoners had been monitored as perpetrators between March and October 2014.
- I.19** Most violent incidents were managed through adjudications or the violence reduction basic regime – 20 prisoners were on this at the time of the inspection (see paragraph I.41). The relevant documentation was often poorly completed, Details of the incident were often missing and there were some gaps in daily monitoring. There were few meaningful reviews of individuals to discuss targets to improve behaviour, and victim support planning was undeveloped. Although imposing sanctions and moving individuals around units provided an immediate and temporary solution, more needed to be done to explore and address the underlying issues, which often involved debt. There was no formal mediation scheme.
- I.20** There had been a prison violence reduction survey of all prisoners in June 2014, with 56 responses (11.8%). The survey had identified the showers, exercise and movement to activities as points where prisoners felt most unsafe, and there had been some action to address these hotspots. Following a serious incident on an exercise yard in May 2014, a risk assessment led to improved supervision. Refurbishment of most shower areas had included

the installation of cubicles, with subsequently some reduction in incidents occurring there. We observed good supervision during prisoner movement to activities.

- I.21** There were good links between the security department, managers of residential areas and safer custody to respond to emerging problems. A monthly safer custody meeting was well attended and relevant data analysed. The area psychology team provided support to the prison to help reduce levels of violence. A violence reduction day in November 2014 had involved 280 prisoners in violence reduction training, along with staff and contracted partners.

Recommendation

- I.22 Prisoners involved in bullying should be challenged about their behaviour and set realistic targets which should be reviewed to measure any improvements.**

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.23** *There had been no self-inflicted deaths in the prison. Levels of self-harm were similar to comparator prisons. Support for prisoners in crisis or who were vulnerable included good individual care.*

- I.24** There had been no self-inflicted deaths of young prisoners at the prison, and the level of self-harm was similar to comparator establishments. Between January and November 2014 there had been an average of 17 incidents of self-harm a month involving on average of around seven prisoners; three prisoners had accounted for 26% of these incidents. There was a good focus on the more vulnerable prisoners at the monthly safer custody meetings, which were chaired by a senior manager and well attended by a range of staff, as well as a Listener.

- I.25** On average, 16 assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were opened each month. The quality of care for those at risk of self-harm was good. ACCT documents evidenced some consistency in case management with good support through the mental health team. Assessments were completed promptly and there was a holistic approach to addressing prisoners' problems in reviews. Most documents evidenced management checks, and the duty governor attended the reviews of those at greater risk. There was a focus on providing activities, and many daily staff entries in documents showed meaningful interactions, with few observations recorded at predictable intervals. Although families were not regularly involved in ACCT procedures, we were told of examples where this had occurred. At the time of our inspection, 121 staff (67%) had received recent ACCT refresher training.

- I.26** There were good efforts to ensure that prisoners on ACCTs were only held in the segregation unit as a last resort – a decision to do so had to be authorised by the duty governor. Twelve prisoners subject to ACCT had been held there in the last six months. Few prisoners were placed on constant watch (where staff observe prisoners at all times). There was no use of strip clothing.

- I.27** There were eight Listeners, of whom five had been trained in the week before the inspection, and they were well supported by the Samaritans. A Listener suite on E wing had been used eight times in the last six months. A portable telephone with a link to the Samaritans was available for prisoners to contact the Samaritans as an alternative to asking for a Listener.

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.³

- I.28** *There was no local safeguarding policy or links with the local safeguarding adults board, but there were some good practical examples of the care of prisoners at risk.*

- I.29** There was no local safeguarding policy, partnership or protocols with the local adults safeguarding board. However, we found no cases where the needs of prisoners at risk due to mental or physical disability or ill health were not met. Such needs were identified through reception, health care, education assessment and safer custody procedures. We were informed of some good practical examples of care, for example, the escort of one young man, unable to negotiate travel independently, to his probation office on release.

Recommendation

- I.30** **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.31** *Security was underpinned by good staff-prisoner relationships across the prison. A good flow of intelligence informed relevant security objectives that were monitored appropriately. The prison was focused on the increased problem of novel psychoactive substances (NPS) through a supply reduction action plan. Security procedures did not restrict prisoner access to the regime unnecessarily but some measures, such as closed visits, were applied disproportionately.*

³ 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.32** The important elements of security were in place and were underpinned by good staff-prisoner relationships (see section on staff-prisoner relationships). The monthly security meeting was well attended by staff from across the prison, and discussion and analysis of information from intelligence reports informed relevant security objectives.
- I.33** The security team had received 1,954 intelligence reports in the previous six months from all areas of the prison. The reports were quickly analysed by a security analyst, but the redeployment of officers from security delayed some actions, including searching and drug testing. Security intelligence was well communicated through daily briefings and emails to relevant departments. The security team had good links with the substance misuse team and good external relationships with the police.
- I.34** Ten per cent of prisoners were strip searched after visits, which was disproportionate in the absence of supporting intelligence. The prison also had a disproportionate approach to visits restrictions – 28 prisoners were restricted to closed visits at the time of the inspection, of whom only five were for reasons directly related to trafficking items through visits.
- I.35** The prison operated a free-flow system to allow prisoners to attend work or education, which was supervised by staff and CCTV at strategic points. The supervision was unobtrusive and we found a relaxed atmosphere during these times, with good staff-prisoner interaction.
- I.36** In our survey, 29% of prisoners, against the comparator of 23%, said it was easy to get drugs in the prison, and 7%, against 5%, said they had developed a drug problem in the prison. The mandatory drug testing (MDT) random positive rate for the six months to the end of October 2014 was 2.6% against a target of 4%; all the positives were for cannabis. A lack of staff had reduced the suspicion drug testing programme, with only 18 suspicion tests in the six months to the end of October 2014. None had returned positive results. Data from intelligence-led searches and our discussions with prisoners indicated there was use of the NPS 'Spice' (synthetic cannabinoid) and it was relevant that these were currently undetectable by drug testing arrangements. The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) had responded with an appropriate information campaign to prisoners and staff.

Recommendations

- I.37 Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion.**
- I.38 Closed visits should only be imposed for reasons directly relating to visits.**
- I.39 Actions requested on intelligence reports should be completed within appropriate timescales. (Repeated recommendation 7.7)**

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

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.40 *Differentials between the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) levels were reasonable, although aspects of the basic regime were too punitive.*

I.41 At the time of the inspection, most prisoners were on the standard level of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, 21% were on the enhanced level and 7% on basic. The scheme offered differentials in access to private cash, visits, computer games and time out of cell, and prisoners told us it encouraged positive behaviour. However, prisoners employed in the same jobs but on different levels of the IEP scheme received different pay, which was inappropriate.

I.42 Prisoners' electronic case notes showed that they progressed or regressed on the scheme as a result of a pattern of behaviour, but could be downgraded immediately following acts of serious poor behaviour. Those on the basic regime could attend work activities and had daily access to showers and telephones. However, they were limited to two association periods a week, and prisoners on basic as a part of the violence reduction policy were subject to closed visits (see section above and recommendation I.38).

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.43 *Adjudication records were reasonable but quality assurance of minor reports was underdeveloped. Oversight of use of force was poor, nearly all recent records were incomplete and poor quality, and we were not assured that all uses were as a last resort or de-escalated quickly enough. The regime in the segregation unit remained too basic, although the environment was reasonable and staff-prisoner relationships were good.*

Disciplinary procedures

I.44 The number of adjudications and minor reports had reduced since the previous inspection and was now lower than at similar prisons. The adjudication records we examined were reasonable, and showed that hearings were conducted fairly and charges were investigated. Punishments were proportionate to the offence, and adjudicators took account of mitigation offered by prisoners. The head of residence undertook effective quality assurance of adjudication documentation, but minor reports received less oversight and their standard

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

was variable. There was no evidence that unofficial or collective punishments were used individually or systematically.

Recommendation

- I.45 Minor reports should be investigated appropriately before reaching a verdict, and they should be covered by a formal quality assurance procedure.**

The use of force

- I.46** In our survey more prisoners than the comparator said they had been physically restrained by staff. While we found the use of force overall was not high, nearly two-thirds of incidents involved the use of control and restraint techniques, which was higher than we usually see.
- I.47** Nearly all records of the use of force in the previous six months were incomplete and of a poor quality, and while quality assurance checks were carried out they were ineffective. Video recording of planned incidents did not always take place, and the recordings we viewed contained examples of poor staff communication with prisoners and missed opportunities to de-escalate the situation. As a consequence, we could not be assured that all uses of force, particularly those that involved non-compliance with staff orders, were as a last resort or de-escalated quickly enough (see main recommendation S42).
- I.48** Staff had drawn batons on five occasions and used them twice in the previous six months. The deputy governor reviewed all incidents involving batons, and the cases we looked at had been appropriate.
- I.49** The use of special accommodation was very high, at 15 times in the previous six months, although the average period was not long at 1.33 hours. The authorising documentation had been completed well, but we found one case where special accommodation had been used inappropriately for a compliant prisoner.

Recommendation

- I.50 All staff involved in a use of force incident should complete the relevant documentation, and quality assurance should be effective.**

Segregation

- I.51** The use of segregation was lower than at similar prisons, with 127 prisoners segregated in the previous six months, and most stays were not long, at an average of 5.7 days. Segregation reviews were timely but authorising documentation was too often completed poorly and targets were perfunctory. Prisoners held in the segregation unit for their own interest were recorded as being there for breaches of good order which was inaccurate. Although many prisoners wanted to transfer to another prison, staff worked with the majority to reintegrate them back to normal location at Deerbolt.
- I.52** The segregation unit contained 13 cells, two special cells and a searching cell. Living conditions were reasonable and cells and communal areas were mostly clean and graffiti free, although the shower needed replacing (see recommendation 2.9). Prisoners could have radios, reading material and access to telephone calls, showers and in-cell activities, but there was insufficient exercise in an austere exercise yard and limited access to education.

- I.53** Staff on the unit were knowledgeable about the prisoners living there and we observed respectful interactions between staff and prisoners. Staff used prisoners' first names extensively, and all residents said they were treated well.
- I.54** Prisoners arriving on to the unit were not routinely strip searched, and there was a good system to ensure that prisoners on an open ACCT were only segregated in exceptional circumstances.

Recommendation

- I.55** **The regime in the segregation unit should be improved.**

Housekeeping point

- I.56** Prisoners segregated for their own protection should be recorded as being in the unit in their own interest.

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.57** *Outcomes for prisoners on the drug and alcohol recovery unit were very good, but prisoners with substance misuse needs on other units had insufficient access to one-to-one support and groupwork. The quality of support for the few prisoners with clinical needs was very good.*

- I.58** The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) included clinical treatment provided by Care UK, psychosocial care by Lifeline and substance misuse groupwork programmes run by the North East Council on Addictions (NECA). There was a current drug and alcohol strategy document. The substance misuse strategy committee met bimonthly and each meeting reviewed and updated the strategic action plan.
- I.59** Potential outcomes for the 60 prisoners on the drug and alcohol recovery unit (A wing) were very good. The programme included regular groupwork sessions, recovery fellowship meetings (such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous) and one-to-one support. The Alcohol Recovery Programme (ARP) was also offered, and 19 prisoners had completed the programme in the three courses run in the previous six months. Other activities focused on the positive use of time and healthy lifestyles. Outcomes were also greatly improved by family conferencing opportunities (see paragraph 4.35). These interventions, coupled with good day-to-day support from the specially selected A wing discipline staff, made this unit one of the best we have seen in the young adult estate.
- I.60** Sixty per cent of the DART psychosocial caseload was made up of 89 other prisoners with drug and alcohol problems who were not located on A wing. These prisoners were less able to access one-to-one support and groupwork than those on A wing, and some who we spoke to felt that DART was less interested in those with lower intervention needs. This was reflected in our survey, where fewer prisoners than the comparator reported they had received help with drug or alcohol problems. Nevertheless, prisoners on A wing were highly satisfied with the support they had received.

- I.61** Very few prisoners at Deerbolt needed clinical treatment: at the time of the inspection only one prisoner was receiving opiate substitution therapy. The support offered was very good, and there was clear evidence of good integration of clinical and psychosocial services.

Recommendation

- I.62** **The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) should ensure that prisoners with substance misuse needs not based on A wing have prompt access to groupwork and one-to-one interventions.**

Good practice

- I.63** *The drug and alcohol recovery unit (A wing) demonstrated the potential effectiveness of intensive programmes for young adults in recovery from their drug and alcohol misuse, especially alongside family conferencing interventions.*

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1** *External areas were well kept but residential units looked worn out and many windows needed repair. Most cells and communal areas were clean, although there were some unacceptable conditions. Prisoners had good access to telephones, cleaning materials, showers and bedding. Some wings did not have adequately screened toilets and some showers needed replacing.*
- 2.2** There were nine wings, but J wing was closed during the inspection due to a reduced population. The seven older wings had spur-style landings. G wing had gallery-style landings and good accommodation. External areas were clean, free from litter and had well-kept gardens. Most residential units looked worn out and many windows needed repair – many prisoners commented that their cells were cold during the winter weather (see main recommendation S43).
- 2.3** The communal areas on the wings were clean and contained well-maintained recreational equipment. Notice boards were well laid out with relevant information. The quality of cells was more variable; most were clean and graffiti free, although we saw some unacceptable conditions, particularly on I and F wings, including cells that needed refurbishment, poor quality mattresses and graffiti. Most cells were single occupancy and the few double cells were not overcrowded. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said that cell bells were answered within five minutes, and prisoners were also more positive about access to cleaning materials, showers and bedding, which our observations supported. Although the prison had an offensive displays policy, it was not adhered to on all wings.
- 2.4** Some wings did not have adequately screened in-cell toilets. Some showers were also insufficiently private and in a poor condition, although there was a shower refurbishment programme under way.
- 2.5** Prisoners had good access to telephones during association, and those with particular needs could have additional telephone credit (see paragraph 4.38). Incoming and outgoing mail was not unduly delayed.
- 2.6** In our survey, 80% of prisoners said it was easy to make an application, but only 33% said they were answered within seven days. We found the application system worked reasonably well. Prisoner information desk (PID) workers logged applications and dealt with basic issues informally, which meant that residential staff dealt with fewer applications. The responses we saw were reasonable and addressed the issues raised, although some were unduly delayed.
- 2.7** Only prisoners on the enhanced regime could wear their own clothes, and some prison-issue clothing was poor quality and ill fitting. Access to the laundry was reasonable but most prisoners washed underwear in their sinks because of concerns it would be lost in the prison laundry. Prisoners had reasonable access to their stored property.

Recommendations

- 2.8** The prison should ensure that the offensive displays policy is adhered to by all prisoners and enforced by staff. (Repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 2.9** Communal showers should be refurbished and toilets in cells should be effectively screened.
- 2.10** Prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes.

Housekeeping point

- 2.11** Managers should ensure that applications are responded to within seven days.

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 *Staff-prisoner relationships were generally very good, most prisoners felt they were treated respectfully and staff knew them well. Wing officer comments in case history notes were regular but focused too much on institutional behaviour.*

2.13 Staff-prisoner relationships were generally positive. In our survey, 76% of prisoners, against the comparator of 64%, said that staff treated them with respect, and all prisoners in groups said they had a member of staff they could turn to for help. We saw good staff-prisoner interactions and staff were knowledgeable about prisoners, they also routinely referred to them by their first name during face-to-face interactions and in case notes. There were monthly prisoner consultation meetings where prisoners could raise issues directly with the governor and some senior managers.

2.14 Entries on P-Nomis (the Prison Service IT system) prisoner case history notes came from a variety of staff across the prison, including regular wing officer entries. However, comments from the latter varied in quality, with too much focus on institutional behaviour and limited recognition of good behaviour or identified resettlement needs. Management checks did not challenge the quality of comments.

Housekeeping point

- 2.15** Management checks of prisoner case history notes should challenge poor quality comment.

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 characteristic⁵ 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 *Equality work was developing but there was no needs analysis to inform services. Disparities in some monitoring statistics had been recognised but not yet addressed. Black and minority ethnic prisoners and those with disabilities were negative about some areas, although some good individual support was provided.*

Strategic management

- 2.17** The diversity and equality policy covered all protected characteristics but was still not based on a needs analysis so did not detail prisoner needs or how to meet them, and the action plan did not set developmental targets for all minority groups.
- 2.18** Diversity and equality provision was being developed by the equality team, led by a senior manager supported by an equality officer and a custodial manager. The diversity and equality management team (DEMT) was chaired by the governor and met regularly. The diversity prisoner orderly occasionally attended but there was no external representation. Senior manager leads for each protected characteristic provided written reports and each characteristic was discussed, with minutes evidencing progression. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners and ex-forces personnel (veterans) had been identified as additional groups for coverage, and there was good promotion of diversity, including displays in education and monthly events.
- 2.19** Local monitoring had identified an over-representation of white prisoners in some activities, and equality monitoring statistics for June and September 2014 showed an under-representation of Muslim and Asian prisoners on enhanced status, and an over-representation of Asian prisoners in segregation. Although some of these issues had been recognised several months earlier, they had yet to be fully investigated and addressed by the DEMT.
- 2.20** Eight black and minority ethnic and 12 diversity prisoner champions had been appointed. Those we met were unclear about their role, but their first formal meeting was planned for the week after the inspection.
- 2.21** Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were available on all wings and 55 had been submitted during 2014. Investigations were generally satisfactory but there was no external quality assessment. There was no identification of prisoners with current or previous racially motivated offences.

⁵ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

Recommendations

- 2.22** The diversity and equality policy and action plan should be based on a needs analysis and targets set to develop services for all groups with protected characteristics.
- 2.23** The diversity and equality management team should investigate and address disparities identified in monitoring statistics without delay.
- 2.24** Prisoners convicted of a current or previous racially aggravated offence should be identified and staff made aware of them.

Housekeeping point

- 2.25** Discrimination incident report forms should be subject to external review.

Protected characteristics

- 2.26** Around 15% of the population were black and minority ethnic and 10.3% Muslim. Prisoners we spoke to were generally positive about their experiences and made no specific complaints about unfair treatment. However, in our survey black and minority ethnic prisoners, of whom 51% identified as Muslim, were more negative than white prisoners across some safety and respect indicators. There were no open forums for this group to raise specific issues. Six per cent of prisoners identified in our survey as Gypsy, Roma and Travellers, and seven prisoners had attended the prison's first monthly forum for this group in November 2014. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller prisoners we spoke to appreciated the opportunity to meet together.
- 2.27** There were 15 foreign national prisoners (3.7%) from 12 countries, including two detainees held beyond the end of their sentence, although detainees were usually quickly moved. The foreign national policy was not based on a needs analysis and did not describe how the prison would meet the specific needs of this group. Initial identification of foreign national prisoners was good and they were seen by an offender supervisor who was also the foreign national lead, who was known to most. She had received no specific training or dedicated time for this work but liaised frequently with immigration services and met each foreign national prisoner regularly, as did a dedicated immigration officer. Independent immigration advice was available and used by prisoners. Records showed that the foreign national lead regularly used the telephone interpreting service when necessary. Foreign prisoners received a free telephone call monthly, whether or not they had had a visit. One forum had been held for this group in August 2014.
- 2.28** Initial identification of disability was by self-declaration of prisoners on arrival. The prison identified 52 young men as having a disability (11.3%), with many learning disabilities and mental health issues. Few were identified with physical disability and one fully adapted cell was available (another was on the closed wing). In our survey, 10% of prisoners reported a disability (of whom 20% identified themselves as foreign national), and 78% of those who had a disability said they had emotional and well-being or mental health issues. These respondents were less positive about some aspects of safety and respect than those who did not consider they had a disability, and there was no forum for this group to raise specific issues. However, we saw evidence of good individual support, and prisoners with disabilities told us they felt supported. A senior manager told us that one prisoner had a personal emergency evacuation plan, but wing staff were unaware of it. Some staff had undertaken

mental health awareness training and 80 staff had received autism awareness training, which was due to be rolled out to all staff.

- 2.29** No prisoners had identified themselves as gay or bisexual to the prison or in our survey. Some promotional information was displayed around the prison and the prison had attempted to introduce forums for this group without success. There was no policy for work with transgender prisoners and no identification on such need.

Recommendations

- 2.30** The prison should investigate and address the dissatisfaction reported by some minority groups in our survey.
- 2.31** Staff should be aware of personal emergency evacuation plans and their contents.

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.

2.32 *All faith needs were met and the chaplaincy was well integrated into the prison. There were still no suitable washing facilities for Muslim worshippers. There were effective and supportive community chaplaincy schemes.*

- 2.33** Day-to-day faith needs were met by Church of England, Free Church, Catholic and Muslim chaplains, supported by a variety of sessional and volunteer chaplains who met all faith needs. Only the Free Church chaplain was full-time, and some prisoners could not see a chaplain of their choice when they wanted, but all new arrivals were seen by a chaplain within 24 hours. The Muslim chaplain reported that provision for this group was appropriate, but there continued to be no washing facilities or shoe storage for Muslim prayers. The chapel was used for all services, with suitable screening for non-Christian worship. Prisoners could attend a variety of faith study groups.
- 2.34** Prisoners we met spoke positively about the faith provision but our survey responses were negative and the reasons for this unclear. In our survey of black and minority ethnic prisoners (of whom 51% were Muslim), 65%, against 43% of white prisoners, said their religious beliefs were respected (see also paragraph 2.27). It might have been relevant that prisoners had to choose between attending the chapel or gym on Sunday mornings, and some were precluded from attending Wednesday evening Mass because 50% of prisoners were locked up during evening association (see paragraph 3.3).
- 2.35** The chaplaincy was well integrated into the life of the prison and actively involved in local schools, churches and community organisations. It maintained links with several supportive community chaplaincy schemes, including 'In2Out' and 'Sowing Seeds', which provided through-the-gate services and individual mentoring support to prisoners before and after release. There was evidence of good outcomes for many of those involved.

Recommendation

2.36 Washing facilities should be provided for Muslim worshippers.

Housekeeping point

2.37 Prisoners should not be prevented from attending Wednesday evening Mass.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

2.38 *Responses to complaints were generally good although not all were legible. Senior managers took action to address identified issues.*

2.39 Information about how to submit a complaint was displayed on wings alongside information about the Independent Monitoring Board and the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator, 54% against 60%, said it was easy to make a complaint, and the full range of complaint forms were not available on all wings. However, significantly more of those who had made a complaint than the comparator felt it had been dealt with fairly.

2.40 Responses to 95% of complaints had been on time. Replies were generally satisfactory, polite and answered the complaint, but many were not legible; 10% were quality assured by a senior manager. Complaints were about relatively minor matters; the three most common topics in the year 2013-14 were property, home detention curfew and wages/regime. Two complaints about staff had been answered inappropriately by the individuals concerned. We brought this to the attention of a senior manager, who advised the manager concerned accordingly.

2.41 Complaints were monitored by number, topic, location and ethnicity, but not across all protected characteristics or by the numbers upheld or refused. The senior management team had taken action to address identified issues.

Recommendation

2.42 Complaint forms should be available on all units.

Housekeeping point

2.43 All responses to complaints should be legible.

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.

2.44 *Offender supervisors provided information and signposting for legal issues, which met need. There were insufficient private legal visits facilities, and legal visitors were dissatisfied with the provision.*

2.45 Offender supervisors advised prisoners needing legal information, using sources on the internet, and/or by signposting them to appropriate bodies, which met need. There was a range of legal reference information in the library, and information about the Criminal Case Review Commission was displayed across the prison.

2.46 Legal visits were only available one afternoon a week, at the same time as domestic visits, and facilities continued to be poor. One of the two private legal visit rooms was used to hold prisoners whose visitors had failed to turn up. Additional facilities in a room next to the visits hall, consisting of three tables and chairs separated by screens, were not sufficiently private. Legal visitors complained to us about the time taken to book legal visits, and we saw some written complaints from solicitors about this and the number of spaces available. One solicitor had been offered a slot in four weeks' time, two weeks after his client's court appearance. Although unavailable, solicitors often requested to book visits by video link (see also recommendation 1.4).

Recommendation

2.47 **Legal visits provision should meet demand and offer suitable private facilities.**

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.

2.48 *Prisoners were very positive about the health services. Governance arrangements were good although the complaints system was not confidential enough. Primary care, dentistry and mental health care were very good, but care planning for complex physical conditions was underdeveloped. In-possession risk assessments were not updated for all new arrivals on medication.*

Governance arrangements

2.49 Health care was commissioned by NHS England North East and provided by Care UK. Governance and partnership working arrangements were very good, although the health

needs assessment required updating. The service had been out to tender but this had not disrupted standards of care as staff had not been lost.

- 2.50** There were registered nurses on site from 7.30am to 8.15pm every day, but there was a reduction in availability since our last inspection as the inpatient unit had closed. Primary care nurses had completed mandatory training and clinical supervision had been introduced but lapsed since our previous visit. There was evidence of peer review and reflection, and clinical supervision was due to be reintroduced.
- 2.51** Prisoners were complimentary about the health services. In our survey, 64% said the overall quality of health services was good, against the comparator of 49% and the response of 56% in 2011. Relationships between health staff and patients were excellent, and nurses knew their patients. The first prisoner health care 'champion' had been employed in the health centre, and he encouraged prisoners to seek appropriate help. Health care staff attended the monthly prisoner consultative committee, which had a standing agenda item on health. A rolling patient satisfaction survey yielded positive results, although the questions were general and not specific to the Deerbolt population.
- 2.52** SystmOne (the electronic clinical information system) was in use. Care planning for complex conditions, other than for mental health problems, required development. There were regular audits of clinical documentation, which was good. National and professional guidance informed clinical decisions. We did not see an information-sharing protocol, although we were assured that there was one.
- 2.53** The health centre comprised several offices and a few clinical rooms, which were purpose designed. The patients' waiting area was in good repair and the door was unlocked, which characterised the good relationships between patients and staff. Free-flow prisoner movement ensured the efficient flow of patients into and out of the health centre. Some health centre windows let in too much cold and required attention. I wing had a small health centre that was of a clinical standard. The former treatment rooms on the wings were used for medicine administration only. Standards of cleanliness were very good and there were regular infection control audits with resulting action plans.
- 2.54** Emergency arrangements were appropriate with about 54% of officers trained to give first aid and/or use an automated external defibrillator (AED). Resuscitation kit in health care was regularly checked. The equipment was kept in a large bag on wheels, and we saw nurses struggling to tug this bag up the incline in the prison during two emergencies. AEDs were located in the health centre, the orderly office and the gym and were regularly checked. There were multiple sets of airway support equipment in the decommissioned treatment rooms with many out-of-date items. We were informed that this kit had been withdrawn from use but it was still on the wings.
- 2.55** A health care assistant led on health promotion and there were regular displays on themed campaigns – we saw good displays on testicular cancer and chlamydia on the wings and in the health centre. There were age-appropriate and assertive immunisation programmes for MMR (measles, mumps and rubella) and meningitis C, as well as blood-borne viruses such as hepatitis B.
- 2.56** Serious and untoward incidents were very rare. There had been few health care complaints – only five since April 2014 – and responses were courteous, prompt and focused. Patients told us they would post complaints in the general prison complaints boxes on the wings; we saw no 'medical in-confidence' envelopes for use with the forms. The boxes were opened by non-medical personnel, which breached medical confidentiality.

Recommendations

- 2.57** There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment.
- 2.58** There should be care plans for patients with complex and/or long-term conditions.
- 2.59** The health care complaints system should preserve medical confidentiality.

Housekeeping points

- 2.60** Health staff should receive regular, documented clinical supervision.
- 2.61** Withdrawn or out-of-date medical kit should be removed from clinical areas.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.62** Health care staff saw new arrivals on I wing. Reception and secondary health screening was good and contained assessments for Ebola infection and veterans' needs, which was unusual and positive. Prisoners were given an explanatory leaflet about health services, which was easy-to-read and available in several languages. Prisoners could telephone the health centre to make an appointment or ask questions about treatment. There were also pictorial health application forms available on the wings. Access to health services was very efficient.
- 2.63** Primary care services were very good. Nurses offered triage, although they lacked access to triage algorithms. Most patients were seen by nurses and urgent cases could see a GP the same day. The did-not-attend rate for the GP was carefully managed and was very low at 3% since April 2014, although it had increased in the last quarter. The GP out-of-hours cover, provided by the local community on-call service, was rarely used; custody staff could consult managers on call and nurses at other prisons in the local area.
- 2.64** Nurses led several clinics and visiting specialists ran sexual health clinics. Access to physiotherapy services had improved since our last visit. Primary care waiting times were generally short. Prisoners received age-appropriate services. Smoking cessation services were very accessible.
- 2.65** Patients benefited from telemedicine, although its use had fallen in the last year. Secondary care appointments were well managed and rarely cancelled for security reasons.

Recommendation

- 2.66** Triage algorithms should be developed and used to ensure consistency of care and treatment. (Repeated recommendation 5.22)

Pharmacy

- 2.67** There was no on-site pharmacy. Medicines were supplied by a local pharmacy promptly, but patients did not have an opportunity to attend pharmacist-led clinics. Medicines were supplied or administered by nursing staff from the health centre and medicine administration rooms on the wings three times a day. Some medicine administration rooms lacked hand-washing facilities. Medicines were administered through gates directly on to association

areas, which limited confidentiality, although we observed officers ensuring that only one patient at a time was at the gate.

- 2.68** Sixty-five per cent of patients retained their medicines in possession, but not all new arrivals on medication had their risk assessments updated on admission, which was an unnecessary risk. Nurses prescribed medications through a reasonable spread of patient group directions (authorising them to supply and administer prescription-only medicine), covering medicines usually supplied under a special sick policy. There were limited drug stocks on the wings. Although there were no records of date checks on the stocks, we saw no out-of-date medicines.
- 2.69** The medicines and therapeutics committee met regularly with appropriate clinicians attending. There were procedures to monitor prescribing costs and the prescribing of abusable medicines, the availability of which had been commendably managed down. Although there were procedures and policies in place, the pharmacy standard operating procedures (SOPs) had not been signed by staff, and not all practices followed the SOPs as some that were appropriate for Deerbolt differed from those in the SOPs (which had been designed for another prison).

Recommendations

- 2.70 Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led clinics.** (Repeated recommendation 5.30)
- 2.71 Medicines administration facilities should contain hand-washing facilities.**
- 2.72 All patients on medication should be risk assessed in accordance with the in-possession policy.**
- 2.73 Standard operating procedures (SOPs) should be appropriate for Deerbolt and should be signed by staff to show they have been read.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.74** The date checking of drug stocks on the wings should be recorded.

Dentistry

- 2.75** In our survey, 56% of prisoners, against the comparator of 43%, said that the quality of the dental service was good. There were three dental sessions a week. Those requiring urgent assessment or treatment could be seen at the next clinic, which was commendable. The average waiting time for low-priority treatment was three weeks, which was very good, and the did-not-attend rate averaged at just 3% since April 2014, which was impressive. The quality of treatment was very good, and a full range of treatments was available, equivalent to community services.
- 2.76** The dental surgery was purpose designed and required certifications were up to date. The dental chair needed regular ad hoc work to keep it in use. A separate room for decontamination facilities had been identified to attain best practice compliance.

Recommendation

2.77 The dental chair should be replaced.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.78** Mental health services were provided by Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Trust. There were four therapists on staff (nurses and assistants) and a visiting forensic psychiatrist. Each therapist had a caseload of up to 40 patients, which was sizable, although not all were in active treatment. About a third of custody officers had received recent training in mental health awareness, which was positive, and more were receiving current training to assist prisoners with autism (see paragraph 2.29)
- 2.79** Most patients had mild to moderate problems. There was an open referral system with a stepped model of care. Access was good with new referrals seen within two days. The service included evidence-based individual and group primary care, secondary care and trauma recovery therapeutic options, with access to the Trust's learning disability services as required.
- 2.80** Counselling services were offered by the mental health charity Mind but there was limited capacity. Seven clients had been waiting seven weeks to see the counsellor with the longest waiting 18 weeks, which was too long. A new more integrated primary care level service, including counselling, was planned from April 2015. The chaplaincy also offered emotional support to prisoners. Patients with serious mental health problems requiring NHS care would usually be transferred to Holme House to await transfer to the health service unit.

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.

2.81 *Most prisoners thought the food was poor and all meals had to be eaten in cell. Some prisoners could obtain a qualification in catering. Food consultation meetings were irregular.*

- 2.82** In our survey, only 21% of prisoners said the food was good, compared with 39% in 2011. All diets were catered for but it was hard for prisoners to choose five portions of fruit and vegetables daily. Prisoners appreciated the themed 'food nights' and were involved in choosing these. Breakfast packs were issued the evening before they were due to be eaten and some prisoners said they ate them that night. Prisoners continued to eat all meals in their cell, even though some in-cell toilets were insufficiently screened. There was no self-catering provision.
- 2.83** The kitchen was clean and well managed and the wing serveries were also clean. Although staff should have recorded hot food temperatures daily in a logbook, three of four wings that we inspected had no such record, and that on the fourth was only partially completed. Prisoners working in the staff bistro could gain a level 2 national vocational qualification (NVQ) in catering.

- 2.84** Although planned to run every other month, there had been no prisoner catering meetings for six months. Comments in food comments books were irregular, which suggested that they were not freely available, although we did see them.

Recommendations

- 2.85** Breakfast should be served on the morning it is to be eaten.
- 2.86** Prisoners should be able to eat together.
- 2.87** Prisoners should be regularly consulted about food, and the dissatisfaction expressed by minority ethnic prisoners and those with disabilities should be investigated and addressed.

Housekeeping point

- 2.88** Managers should ensure that food temperatures are taken and recorded.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.89** *Although most prisoners said the prison shop met their needs, black and minority ethnic prisoners were much less satisfied. Fresh fruit was unavailable, and it was inappropriate that prisoners were charged a handling fee for catalogue orders.*

- 2.90** In our survey, significantly more prisoners than the comparator, 53% against 42%, said the prison shop met their needs, but black and minority ethnic prisoners were more negative than white prisoners about this. Prisoner representatives were involved in deciding changes to the shop list every three months. Some prisoners complained about the prices, and we noted a lack of cheaper non-branded goods for some basic items. Fresh fruit was unavailable; we were told there were no suitable wing storage facilities, such as fridges.
- 2.91** Depending on their day of arrival, new prisoners could wait for up to 11 days to receive their first shop order, although those arriving with money could buy a larger reception pack. Prisoners continued to have the opportunity to shop from a small range of catalogues, although items in the one clothing catalogue were expensive. Prisoners had to pay a 50p handling charge for catalogue orders, which was inappropriate. Newspapers and magazines were available through a local newsagent.

Recommendations

- 2.92** The prison shop should offer a greater choice of cheaper non-branded items.
- 2.93** Prisoners should not be charged a handling fee for catalogue orders.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁶

3.1 *Too many prisoners were locked up during the core day, but time out of cell overall had improved since the last inspection and was now reasonable for most.*

3.2 We found about a quarter of the population locked in their cell during the working day, which was a concern given the prison's primary role as a training prison and the age group held. However, most of these prisoners were working part time, which meant they were not locked up all day, and only around 3% were unemployed, which compared favourably with 17% at the previous inspection. The majority who were fully employed could experience nine hours a day out of their cell (compared with eight hours in 2011), with five hours a day more likely for those working part time, and two hours or less for those unemployed.

3.3 The seven older wings provided association for 50% of prisoners at a time. Association was scheduled for four weekday evenings, Friday afternoons and weekends, but regime restrictions meant all prisoners had one less evening association session a week. Exercise periods were too short, at 25 minutes, and the small exercise yards had no equipment.

Recommendations

3.4 All prisoners should have access to four evening association sessions a week.
(Repeated recommendation 6.6)

3.5 Exercise periods should last for one hour, and exercise yards should contain benches or recreational equipment.

⁶ 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 *Leadership and management of learning and skills were strong and developing. Although there were enough activity places for the population, attendance and punctuality were poor and some waiting lists were too long. The quality of teaching was mixed; too much was only adequate although it was better in vocational training. Achievements also varied from good in vocational training to insufficient in functional skills. Prisoner mentors were used well to support learning. The library provided some reasonable opportunities.*

3.7 *Ofsted⁷ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: requires improvement

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: requires improvement

Quality of learning and skills and work provision: requires improvement

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: good

Management of learning and skills and work

3.8 Senior managers and cluster heads of learning and skills and work provided a clear vision and strategic direction for learning and skills. The implementation of the prison's strategic objectives and dynamic approach to partnership working were improving employment and resettlement opportunities for prisoners in custody and on release. One key objective was improving prisoners' functional skills at work and in vocational training, but this had still to be achieved fully.

3.9 The quality improvement group met regularly and focused appropriately on improvement strategies. Action planning was effective in implementing change and improvement. The self-assessment report provided a broadly accurate evaluation of provision. Quality assurance arrangements to improve the quality of teaching and learning were applied across the prison and education. The resulting records were often too descriptive and insufficiently evaluative. Little information was recorded on the learning that had taken place or learners' progress in sessions.

3.10 Allocation to activities had improved significantly since the previous inspection and was efficient, with new arrivals deployed to activities within their first two weeks. There were waiting lists for the most popular, usually best paid, activities, but these were not managed efficiently and some prisoners could wait up to 18 months for a place. Pay rates were inequitable and a disincentive to attending education.

⁷ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.11** Data were generally collected well to inform curriculum planning and improvement. However, there were inaccuracies in the success rate data in education and vocational training and so accurate improvement targets could not be set.
- 3.12** The education and vocational training provision from The Manchester College (TMC) required improvement. The quality of teaching and learning in education was too variable, but in vocational training it was good. Equality and diversity were promoted well in education through themed events, but some tutors in learning sessions struggled to promote equality and diversity in a meaningful and interesting way.

Recommendations

- 3.13** **The quality of the observation of teaching and learning observation records should be improved by observers providing clear evaluations of the impact of teaching strategies on learners and their progress.**
- 3.14** **Prisoner rates of pay for attending education should be equivalent to other work-related activities, and waiting list should be managed better to allow more prisoners to access jobs.**
- 3.15** **Education managers should provide further support to help tutors promote equality and diversity to learners in a meaningful way.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.16** Data on success rates should be recorded accurately.

Provision of activities

- 3.17** The range of provision was broad and sufficient, with approximately 450 full-time-equivalent places. However, take-up of places was insufficient in education.
- 3.18** Education offered approximately 134 places a week. English and mathematics courses were available for entry level to level 2. A few learners progressed on to A level mathematics through individual study. The most vulnerable and less confident prisoners received individual support in English and mathematics on their residential unit, and some had been successfully integrated into the mainstream education provision. The range of personal and social development courses supported employability well, and included money matters, workplace values, mentoring, business and customer service. Approximately 10 learners were on distance learning programmes.
- 3.19** A wide variety of vocational training met learners' interests well and included industrial cleaning, environmental studies, a range of construction crafts, motor mechanics and recycling. Most courses were offered at level 2 and some learners struggled to cope with the demands of this level as they had only functional skill entry level English and mathematics.
- 3.20** Work was provided in waste management, the charity workshop (where prisoners developed sewing skills), gardens, laundry, the print shop, kitchen, wing work, mentoring and a wide range of orderly positions.

Recommendation

3.21 The Manchester College should offer more provision at level 1 in vocational training for learners who struggle to meet the demands of level 2 courses.

Quality of provision

- 3.22** In education, not enough teaching was good enough, particularly in English and mathematics. Most sessions started with activities to reinforce previous learning, which were successful, but tutors did not plan the rest of the sessions well enough and did not use different learning activities sufficiently well to meet the differing needs of the group. As a result, the more able learners often became bored, and sometimes their behaviour deteriorated and they became disruptive (see main recommendation S44).
- 3.23** In the best sessions, tutors related the subjects they were teaching well to prisoners' possible future jobs and career aspirations, which helped to motivate learners. A few tutors used information learning technology (ILT) well to emphasise key points of learning. For example, in a business studies session, there was good use of interactive quizzes to consolidate learning, and in the 'virtual campus' (internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities) learners used ILT well to recognise spelling mistakes through using spell check.
- 3.24** Not enough tutors used individual learning plans to set meaningful short-term targets for learners and/or to review their progress systematically. Too many plans over-focused on qualification completion and lacked short 'bite size' targets so that learners understood what they had to do to improve and could review their progress.
- 3.25** There were insufficient arrangements to support learners with identified learning needs, and an over-reliance on tutors to implement support initiatives. Too few tutors were able to carry out the support role as part of their teaching, and learners in most need did not make the progress expected of them. The deployment of prisoner peer mentors in education sessions was underdeveloped, and in most sessions they had no impact on learners' progress. In contrast, peer mentors very worked well in the English and maths adult support class, alongside adult volunteers from outside the prison. In vocational training, peer mentor support was effective.
- 3.26** In vocational training, teaching was mostly good. Most learners made good progress and extended their knowledge, skills and understanding. Learners were enthusiastic and spoke positively about their improving skills. Standards of behaviour were mostly good and inappropriate behaviour was challenged. The quality and range of work opportunities were good and catered for a range of prisoners' abilities.
- 3.27** Tutors did not provide sufficiently detailed feedback to learners on how they could improve their English and mathematical skills (see main recommendation S44). The checking and correction of English and grammar was not routine. The low level of some learners' English and mathematic skills hindered their understanding of detailed instructions, particularly on level 2 vocational training courses.
- 3.28** The induction process was comprehensive and effective. Support workers assisted learners well during induction. Tutors were well qualified and had good vocational experience. Classrooms and workshops were well equipped. Learning resources in education were good, but resources to develop learners' English and mathematical skills in vocational training were not vocationally relevant, which diminished their impact (see main recommendation S44).

Recommendations

- 3.29** Tutors should use learning support mentors more effectively to support their peers in sessions.
- 3.30** Tutors should set short-term targets in individual learning plans so that learners fully understand what they have to do to improve their skills and can measure their progress.
- 3.31** English and mathematics learning materials used in vocational training should be vocationally relevant.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.32** Overall success rates in 2013/14 had declined from the previous year. Success rates in functional English at level 1 and mathematics at levels 1 and 2 courses were low. Success rates in personal and social development courses and in the charity workshop were good. In vocational training, success rates were high in plastering and recycling, but low in painting and decorating, and bricklaying.
- 3.33** Attendance in education was poor and had averaged at 66% in the previous six months. Punctuality in many activity areas was poor with learners arriving up to 30 minutes late.
- 3.34** In education, the work completed by learners was displayed in classrooms, but in a few cases the standard was poor. Project work in adult support sessions was of a good standard.
- 3.35** Learners produced a high standard of work in vocational training and industry workshops, and demonstrated a professional work ethic. In the print shop and laundry, learners produced work of a commercial standard and to commercial deadlines. However, the good employability skills demonstrated by learners were not formally recognised or recorded.

Recommendations

- 3.36** The prison should improve attendance in education and punctuality in vocational training and education.
- 3.37** The prison should record the employability skills prisoners develop at work to support them in gaining employment on release.

Library

- 3.38** The library service provided by Durham County Council was welcoming and effectively run. Three orderlies who were trained peer mentors provided very good support. Accommodation was appropriate and sufficient for the number of prisoners attending. It offered a range of well-displayed fiction and non-fiction, including easy readers, a small selection in foreign languages and copies of Prison Service Instructions and legal texts.
- 3.39** Induction to the library was routine for new arrivals and around three-quarters of prisoners were registered as members. Many prisoners visited the library regularly during their education class or in additional sessions. However, the time allocated for weekly visits for prisoners in education and work activities was during their core day activity, which was poor practice for a training prison. Library opening hours were limited and did not extend to

evenings or weekends, reducing the potential for prisoners to attend outside their core day activities.

- 3.40** Literacy was promoted well to prisoners through participation in ventures such as the 'six book challenge' and visits from well-known authors. Storybook Dads, where prisoners could record a story for their children, was an integral part of the library service. Useful joint initiatives with health care professionals for book and reflective reading clubs provided quiet times to help prisoners improve their physical or mental well-being (see section on children, families and contact with the outside world).

Recommendation

- 3.41** **The opening hours of the library should be extended to increase prisoner access and reduce interruptions to their core day activities.**

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.

3.42 *The physical education (PE) facilities included good quality indoor and outdoor provision. Prisoners had good access to the facilities but attendance was not monitored sufficiently well. Despite a balanced range of physical activities, too many prisoners chose weight training. There were insufficient accreditation opportunities.*

- 3.43** The range of PE facilities was good and included a large multi-functional sports hall, cardiovascular equipment and weights room. PE equipment was well maintained. A large outdoor area and all-weather synthetic sports pitch were used for team sports.
- 3.44** Prisoners in full-time work or education could use the facilities at least three times a week. Those unemployed or awaiting allocation to work could sometimes use the facilities more often. There was insufficient use of data and information to monitor, analyse and evaluate the participation of different groups of prisoners, and so staff could not identify or target specific groups not using the facilities.
- 3.45** Induction to the gym was appropriate and undertaken by all prisoners, with referrals to health care as needed to ensure that prisoners were safe to participate in exercise. The take-up of the full range of recreational PE was too low. Although the recreational PE timetable offered a balanced and wide range of physical activities, during the inspection prisoners were predominantly participating in weight training activities. This did not provide a balanced programme and was not suitable for this particular age group.
- 3.46** There were insufficient opportunities for prisoners to gain accredited sports-related qualifications to support employment on release. The range had been significantly reduced since the last inspection, and links with a local football league had stopped.
- 3.47** The promotion of health and well-being was adequate. Some health and well-being related courses were offered, mainly at level 1, in conjunction with the health care department, and were accredited by Newcastle College. Enrolments were generally low but success rates were good, at 88%.

- 3.48** Changing facilities were clean but the showers were poorly maintained. The communal showers had no privacy screen, drainage points were damaged and showers were not fully functional (see recommendation 2.9). Some storage rooms were in poor repair. Health and safety management was good. Accidents and incidents were recorded and monitored appropriately.

Recommendations

- 3.49** Data on PE attendance should be kept and analysed to ensure that any under-represented groups are encouraged to attend.
- 3.50** The use of weight training should be closely monitored and the full range of planned recreational activities should be offered to ensure that prisoners benefit from a well-balanced programme of physical fitness.
- 3.51** Industry-recognised sports-related qualifications should be provided to improve prisoners' employability on release.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *A strategic policy covered reducing reoffending but did not include offender management, and development objectives were limited. Strategic meetings also covered resettlement pathway provision but the lack of clear practice and strategic direction for offender management resulted in considerable variation in the practice of offender supervisors. There was little to address the future offender management function of the prison.*

4.2 The prison's reducing reoffending and offender management functions were managed separately. There was a comprehensive reducing reoffending policy that covered the work of the resettlement pathways, but there was nothing specific on the work of offender management, and development objectives were limited. The last resettlement needs analysis had been in July 2013 and, although based on prisoner questionnaires, did not include any information from offender assessment system (OASys) assessments. The population had changed since then, with more now serving longer sentences and convicted of more violent offences. There were limited offending behaviour programmes offered and a new needs analysis would inform service development for this area. The policy on public protection was appropriate.

4.3 An overarching action and development plan covering the period January 2013-January 2015 identified objectives and was monitored regularly against each resettlement pathway. The reducing reoffending strategy group met bimonthly and included representation from across the prison, including resettlement pathways and offender management. Pathway work was generally well managed, and in our survey more prisoners than at the last inspection, 21% against 14%, said that a member of staff had helped them prepare for release, and 52%, against 38%, said that they had done something or something had happened to them while at Deerbolt to make it less likely that they would reoffend in the future.

4.4 The offender management unit (OMU) met monthly, although the primary focus was on practical issues rather than offender supervisor practice and strategic developments. The overall lack of clear strategy and direction for offender management meant that there was considerable variation in the work of offender supervisors, compounded by a period of significant transition in the department. Many staff were now working partly as wing supervisory officers and partly as offender supervisors, but were too often redeployed from offender management to cover staffing shortfalls elsewhere. Many staff were also relatively new to offender management, yet were less than clear about their role. The prison needed to clarify the future role of offender management, and how it would be implemented and priorities determined.

Recommendation

- 4.5 The prison should develop an improved strategic approach, based on an up-to-date needs analysis, to provide a clear focus for the offender management unit and better integration with resettlement work.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.6 *There was a considerable backlog of OASys assessments especially for high risk prisoners, and the quality of those completed was very variable. Most prisoners were seen infrequently by their offender supervisor, and there was little or no casework supervision. Work with high risk cases was better. Home detention curfew was well run. Public protection arrangements were generally good but risk levels were not always identified promptly. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners was generally good.*

4.7 Eight prison officers had the hybrid role of offender supervisor and supervisory officer, and a further two worked full time as offender supervisors in the OMU, along with a full-time probation officer and probation service officer. Cases were allocated across the team with all offender supervisors having a mix of high, medium and low risk prisoners. Complex cases and any highest risk multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases were sensibly allocated to the probation officer.

4.8 An offender supervisor usually saw new arrivals within their first four days, although only 73% of prisoners in our survey said they had a named offender supervisor, against the comparator of 78%. At the time of the inspection, there was a considerable backlog of OASys assessments - which were absent from 41 cases that were the responsibility of the prison (low and medium risk) and a further 50 high and very high risk of harm cases (managed by the national probation service). Overall, 21% of the population were without an OASys or sentence plan, and an estimated half of all prisoners arriving at Deerbolt had no OASys assessment. In some cases, prisoners without an OASys assessment or sentence plan had been sentenced for over 12 months. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator or at the last inspection said they had a sentence plan. There was no agreed mechanism for staff to escalate concerns to senior staff when community probation staff did not complete assessments on time. In addition, pre-release information sharing with offender managers about progress in meeting sentence plans needed to be more consistent (see main recommendation S45).

4.9 To offset the absence of OASys assessments, the prison had introduced interim sentence plans, which listed five standard targets that could be included or excluded depending on individual needs. Although a reasonable approach in principle, in practice most of the targets were already included in wing compacts and/or learning plans. Although never designed to be an alternative to the formal sentence plan, some prisoners had no OASys completed before their release, and this was all that was in place.

- 4.10** During the inspection we were joined by colleagues from HM Inspectorate of Probation who reviewed the cases of 12 prisoners in detail, six of which were the responsibility of offender supervisors and six the responsibility of community offender managers. A further 13 cases, mainly those due to be released imminently, were reviewed but in less detail.
- 4.11** The quality of the 12 cases reviewed in detail was very variable. Although we saw some good well-managed cases, only seven had a sentence plan closely linked to key factors associated with the likelihood of reoffending and risk of harm, and only four had outcome-focused objectives to be achieved within a specific timescale. There was a current and sufficient risk management plan in only five of nine relevant cases. In none of the cases did we see evidence that prisoners were doing sufficient offending behaviour work, and only one case had evidence of any preparation for interventions or motivational work.
- 4.12** Sentence planning meetings were also variable. Although offender managers usually attended those for high risk prisoners in person or via teleconferencing, this was rare for other cases. Formal contributions from other departments across the prison were also rare.
- 4.13** Beyond OASys and sentence planning, offender supervisors saw most prisoners infrequently. We were told that high risk prisoners were seen at least quarterly, but the focus of the contact in the examples we looked was usually unclear. Low and medium risk prisoners were rarely seen except for a specific purpose, such as home detention curfew (HDC) or recategorisation review, even in the months leading up to their release. In our survey, only 28% of prisoners said that their offender supervisor was working with them to achieve their sentence planning targets. This situation was compounded by the limited programmes to address offending behaviour (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour). However, we saw some good examples of regular contact with prisoners, liaison with offender managers and support in addressing offending behaviour, usually by full-time offender supervisors, but not sufficiently often to support all prisoners consistently and effectively.
- 4.14** Despite the range of knowledge and experience held by offender supervisors, there was relatively little development of practice skills for staff. There was no regular casework supervision for any staff, and there was little consistency of practice. For example, some staff used individual workbooks with some prisoners for victim work but others did not.
- 4.15** Since April 2014 to date, 57% of prisoners considered for HDC were successfully released, an increase from 54% in 2013-14 and 45% in 2012-13. The system was well run and most prisoners, if successful, were released on or very close to their eligibility date. The failure rate had also decreased to 4%, currently its lowest rate.
- 4.16** At the time of the inspection no prisoners were released on temporary licence (ROTL). Some placements had been available but, despite regular applications, no prisoners presently met the establishment's criteria.

Recommendations

- 4.17** **The role of offender supervisors should be clearly defined to include ongoing risk and offence-related assessments and engagement, and they should be provided with regular supervision based on quality assurance of work and personal development objectives.**
- 4.18** **The use of release on temporary licence, and links with employers, should be expanded to offer as many prisoners as possible the opportunity to work outside the prison and access resettlement support before release. (Repeated recommendation 9.26)**

Public protection

- 4.19** The screening of prisoners for child protection and harassment issues was comprehensive and well managed. The monthly inter-departmental risk management meeting monitored the progression of some level 2 and level 3 MAPPAs along with other cases of current concern. While generally well attended, the meeting had no specific terms of reference other than the MAPPA guidance manual.
- 4.20** At the time of the inspection, around 60% of prisoners were subject to MAPPA with nine currently identified as level 2 (and none at level 3). While the quality of MAPPA pre-release reports was generally appropriate, there were delays in identifying the MAPPA management level for prisoners on their release. We found several prisoners due to be released within the following four weeks whose MAPPA management level had not yet been confirmed.

Recommendation

- 4.21 Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases should be monitored to ensure that the prisoner's risk level is identified six months before his release date.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.22** There should be clear terms of reference for the inter-departmental risk management team meeting.

Categorisation

- 4.23** The criteria for young adults to be recategorised for open conditions had changed earlier in 2014 and relatively few prisoners met the conditions. Of 49 prisoners who had been progressively transferred in the previous six months, 48 had been moved to adult establishments and only one had transferred to a YOI open establishment. However, the criteria were applied consistently.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.24** There were three indeterminate sentence prisoners at the time of the inspection. All were allocated to the probation officer/offender supervisor who saw them regularly and knew the cases well. A forum for this group had recently been formed.

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.

4.25 *The prison no longer had a resettlement unit but pathway providers made initial need assessments of new arrivals and saw those requiring specific support before release. Housing support and help with financial issues and benefit advice were generally good, as were employment and careers advice. Pre-release health care work was appropriate, and support for substance misusers was developing, supported by good family conferences. Work on children and families was especially good. There was limited provision to address the offending behaviour of prisoners.*

4.26 Since the last inspection, F wing was no longer a resettlement unit. The prison released around 50 prisoners a month. Pathway providers saw prisoners during induction and undertook identified work. There was no formal pre-release planning, although where there were outstanding concerns, pathway providers ensured necessary links to the community.

Accommodation

4.27 Accommodation support was provided by Shelter (the homelessness charity). One of four prisoner peer advisers saw all new arrivals during their induction and gave them information about the support available (for housing and finance, benefits and debt management). A good range of support included links with housing authorities in South and West Yorkshire, where many prisoners came from. Relatively few prisoners were released without accommodation or appropriate plans. In the previous six months, 335 prisoners had been released with only five (1.5%) released without an address – these were mostly prisoners who were not released on licence and who refused to engage.

Education, training and employment

4.28 The prison had a good employability strategy to improve prisoners' skills by matching the curriculum to their needs and local and regional priorities, and prisoner outcomes were starting to improve. Partnership working was particularly good and had led to some innovative initiatives and employment opportunities for prisoners. There was good use of labour market information, and the prison and its partners were very active in providing training opportunities directly linked to employment on release. Hartlepool College Manufacturing Academy pilot had trained prisoners nearing their release date for actual job vacancies in manufacturing. The prison was working with Nordic Training to fill some apprenticeship vacancies. Employers or their agents interviewed prisoners in custody nearing their release date for job vacancies. It was too early to assess the impact of these new initiatives.

4.29 The quality of the National Careers Service provided by CfBT was good. All new arrivals were interviewed, and action plans to develop prisoners' educational and vocational training skills in custody were comprehensive. However, offender supervisors did not consider these plans sufficiently when prioritising the sequencing of sentence plan targets. CfBT advisers provided useful group sessions to review career opportunities in specific sectors, and interviewed all prisoners before their release. Effective individual sessions encouraged hard-to-reach learners to engage in learning to develop their skills and career opportunities.

- 4.30** A range of employability courses focused on positive work attitudes while in custody, provided transferable skills and prepared prisoners well for employment opportunities on resettlement.
- 4.31** The new 'Links To' initiative, provided by the National Careers Service and The Manchester College, gave learners excellent information on career pathways to specific employment opportunities and excellent careers information, including job availability, salary and potential employers.
- 4.32** Although there was no longer a resettlement function in the prison, partnership working between the National Careers Service, Pertemps People Development Group, Pine Tree Trust and The Manchester College provided excellent collective support for prisoners nearing release. This included help with CV writing, interview skills, job search and applications, and some through-the-gate support to help find and sustain work. The virtual campus, enabling prisoners to access community education, training and employment opportunities via the internet, was used well to support employability and education courses.

Recommendation

- 4.33 Offender management unit and learning and skills staff should work together to sequence sentence plan and learning targets to benefit the prisoner.**

Health care

- 4.34** Prisoners due for release and without a GP were assisted to register with one. A discharge letter was sent to the patient's GP and take-home medication was supplied. A Macmillan care pathway was available to those requiring palliative care, which had only been required once since our last visit.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.35** Potential resettlement outcomes for prisoners with substance misuse needs were greatly improved by family conferences organised by the drug and alcohol recovery team (DART), in which the prisoner and his family looked at the impact of the problem on the family and focused on solutions. However, there was also a need to build effective links with local and regional community drug and alcohol support agencies, and facilitate pre-release contact with these agencies for relevant prisoners.

Recommendation

- 4.36 The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) should build links with local and regional community drug and alcohol support agencies to improve prisoners' resettlement outcomes.**

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37** Shelter also provided debt management advice and support. In most cases this related to outstanding fines but also included mobile phone and bank debts. Prisoners were supported in opening a bank account before their release if they wished, although the take-up of this was low at only three prisoners in the previous six months. In the same period, 110

prisoners had gone on a money management programme provided through the education department. All prisoners were offered a Jobcentre Plus interview before release to discuss their benefits needs. In our survey significantly more prisoners than the comparator, 41% against 31%, knew who to speak to about benefit advice.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.38** Provision for children and families work was very good, addressed prisoners' age and the long distances many were held from home, and was among the best we have seen in the young adults estate. In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said that someone had supported them to maintain family ties. There was a qualified family support worker employed by NEPACS (formerly North East Prisons After Care Society, a charity promoting the rehabilitation of offenders) who, as well as offering advice to prisoners, coordinated family days, father-child visits, targeted visits for new parents and parenting courses in partnership with the local authority. Additional examples of good practice across the prison included family conferences for prisoners with substance misuse problems, and additional telephone credit provided for prisoners facing special personal circumstances.
- 4.39** Prisoners and visitors we spoke to were positive about their visits experience and we found arrangements for visits were good. Visits took place on Thursday, Saturday and Sunday afternoons. There was a welcoming visitors' centre with a play area and coffee bar run by NEPACS, who also provided a dedicated bus service from Darlington train station. Visitors' centre staff and volunteers identified first-time visitors and offered information and support. The visits hall was large and well maintained, with a well-equipped play area that was open and staffed for all visits sessions.

Good practice

- 4.40** *There was very good provision to help prisoners maintain, and in some cases rebuild, family relationships and a comprehensive range of interventions provided by specialist staff, with support from residential officers to prisoners facing special personal circumstances.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.41** The prison offered relatively little to address prisoners' offending behaviour. At the time of the inspection the only nationally accredited programme was the Thinking Skills Programme, with 42 places annually; the Focus on Resettlement programme had been dropped earlier in 2014.
- 4.42** The lack of an up-to-date prisoner need analysis meant it was impossible to establish if the needs of the population were met (see recommendation 4.5). The Resolve violence reduction programme was due to be introduced in 2015, but this was unconfirmed. In principle, prisoners could transfer to HMP Holme House to undertake the programme but we were told only one prisoner had been transferred. Prisoners meeting the necessary criteria could also transfer to Swinfen Hall to complete the sex offender treatment programme, but again only a handful had done so.
- 4.43** There was little or no individual offending behaviour work, and the Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme had yet to be delivered, although this had been agreed over 12 months earlier. As a consequence, prisoners could be in custody for a considerable time but do little to address their offending behaviour, or have their attitudes about offending challenged because of infrequent contact with offender supervisors (see paragraph 4.13).

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1** All use of force, including the use of special accommodation, should be as a last resort, and should be de-escalated at the earliest opportunity. (S42)
- 5.2** Faulty windows should be replaced and cells in a poor state should be refurbished. (S43)
- 5.3** The quality of teaching and outcomes, particularly in English and maths functional skills, should be improved. (S44)
- 5.4** All prisoners should have an up-to-date OASys assessment, including those who are the responsibility of community offender managers, and these and the associated sentence plans should be completed to a good standard. (S45)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.5** The prison should install a video link to avoid prisoners making unnecessary journeys to courts, and to support their contact with legal and professional visitors. (I.4)

Early days in custody

- 5.6** There should be specific arrangements to support the transition of young people from the juvenile estate into the prison. (I.13)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.7** Prisoners involved in bullying should be challenged about their behaviour and set realistic targets which should be reviewed to measure any improvements. (I.22)

Safeguarding

- 5.8** 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. (I.30)

Security

- 5.9** Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.37)
- 5.10** Closed visits should only be imposed for reasons directly relating to visits. (1.38)
- 5.11** Actions requested on intelligence reports should be completed within appropriate timescales. (1.39, repeated recommendation 7.7)

Discipline

- 5.12** Minor reports should be investigated appropriately before reaching a verdict, and they should be covered by a formal quality assurance procedure. (1.45)
- 5.13** All staff involved in a use of force incident should complete the relevant documentation, and quality assurance should be effective. (1.50)
- 5.14** The regime in the segregation unit should be improved. (1.55)

Substance misuse

- 5.15** The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) should ensure that prisoners with substance misuse needs not based on A wing have prompt access to groupwork and one-to-one interventions. (1.62)

Residential units

- 5.16** The prison should ensure that the offensive displays policy is adhered to by all prisoners and enforced by staff. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 5.17** Communal showers should be refurbished and toilets in cells should be effectively screened. (2.9)
- 5.18** Prisoners should be able to wear their own clothes. (2.10)

Equality and diversity

- 5.19** The diversity and equality policy and action plan should be based on a needs analysis and targets set to develop services for all groups with protected characteristics. (2.22)
- 5.20** The diversity and equality management team should investigate and address disparities identified in monitoring statistics without delay. (2.23)
- 5.21** Prisoners convicted of a current or previous racially aggravated offence should be identified and staff made aware of them. (2.24)
- 5.22** The prison should investigate and address the dissatisfaction reported by some minority groups in our survey. (2.30)
- 5.23** Staff should be aware of personal emergency evacuation plans and their contents. (2.31)

Faith and religious activity

5.24 Washing facilities should be provided for Muslim worshippers. (2.36)

Complaints

5.25 Complaint forms should be available on all units. (2.42)

Legal rights

5.26 Legal visits provision should meet demand and offer suitable private facilities. (2.47)

Health services

5.27 There should be an up-to-date health needs assessment. (2.57)

5.28 There should be care plans for patients with complex and/or long-term conditions. (2.58)

5.29 The health care complaints system should preserve medical confidentiality. (2.59)

5.30 Triage algorithms should be developed and used to ensure consistency of care and treatment. (2.66, repeated recommendation 5.22)

5.31 Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led clinics. (2.70, repeated recommendation 5.30)

5.32 Medicines administration facilities should contain hand-washing facilities. (2.71)

5.33 All patients on medication should be risk assessed in accordance with the in-possession policy. (2.72)

5.34 Standard operating procedures (SOPs) should be appropriate for Deerbolt and should be signed by staff to show they have been read. (2.73)

5.35 The dental chair should be replaced. (2.77)

Catering

5.36 Breakfast should be served on the morning it is to be eaten. (2.85)

5.37 Prisoners should be able to eat together. (2.86)

5.38 Prisoners should be regularly consulted about food, and the dissatisfaction expressed by minority ethnic prisoners and those with disabilities should be investigated and addressed. (2.87)

Purchases

5.39 The prison shop should offer a greater choice of cheaper non-branded items. (2.92)

5.40 Prisoners should not be charged a handling fee for catalogue orders. (2.93)

Time out of cell

- 5.41** All prisoners should have access to four evening association sessions a week. (3.4, repeated recommendation 6.6)
- 5.42** Exercise periods should last for one hour, and exercise yards should contain benches or recreational equipment. (3.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.43** The quality of the observation of teaching and learning observation records should be improved by observers providing clear evaluations of the impact of teaching strategies on learners and their progress. (3.13)
- 5.44** Prisoner rates of pay for attending education should be equivalent to other work-related activities, and waiting list should be managed better to allow more prisoners to access jobs. (3.14)
- 5.45** Education managers should provide further support to help tutors promote equality and diversity to learners in a meaningful way. (3.15)
- 5.46** The Manchester College should offer more provision at level 1 in vocational training for learners who struggle to meet the demands of level 2 courses. (3.21)
- 5.47** Tutors should use learning support mentors more effectively to support their peers in sessions. (3.29)
- 5.48** Tutors should set short-term targets in individual learning plans so that learners fully understand what they have to do to improve their skills and can measure their progress. (3.30)
- 5.49** English and mathematics learning materials used in vocational training should be vocationally relevant. (3.31)
- 5.50** The prison should improve attendance in education and punctuality in vocational training and education. (3.36)
- 5.51** The prison should record the employability skills prisoners develop at work to support them in gaining employment on release. (3.37)
- 5.52** The opening hours of the library should be extended to increase prisoner access and reduce interruptions to their core day activities. (3.41)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.53** Data on PE attendance should be kept and analysed to ensure that any under-represented groups are encouraged to attend. (3.49)
- 5.54** The use of weight training should be closely monitored and the full range of planned recreational activities should be offered to ensure that prisoners benefit from a well-balanced programme of physical fitness. (3.50)
- 5.55** Industry-recognised sports-related qualifications should be provided to improve prisoners' employability on release. (3.51)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.56** The prison should develop an improved strategic approach, based on an up-to-date needs analysis, to provide a clear focus for the offender management unit and better integration with resettlement work. (4.5)

Offender management and planning

- 5.57** The role of offender supervisors should be clearly defined to include ongoing risk and offence-related assessments and engagement, and they should be provided with regular supervision based on quality assurance of work and personal development objectives. (4.17)
- 5.58** The use of release on temporary licence, and links with employers, should be expanded to offer as many prisoners as possible the opportunity to work outside the prison and access resettlement support before release. (4.18, repeated recommendation 9.26)
- 5.59** Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases should be monitored to ensure that the prisoner's risk level is identified six months before his release date. (4.21)

Reintegration planning

- 5.60** Offender management unit and learning and skills staff should work together to sequence sentence plan and learning targets to benefit the prisoner. (4.33)
- 5.61** The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) should build links with local and regional community drug and alcohol support agencies to improve prisoners' resettlement outcomes. (4.36)

Housekeeping points

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.62** An induction checklist should be introduced to ensure that all new arrivals complete all elements of the programme. (1.14)

Discipline

- 5.63** Prisoners segregated for their own protection should be recorded as being in the unit in their own interest. (1.56)

Residential units

- 5.64** Managers should ensure that applications are responded to within seven days. (2.11)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.65** Management checks of prisoner case history notes should challenge poor quality comment. (2.15)

Equality and diversity

5.66 Discrimination incident report forms should be subject to external review. (2.25)

Faith and religious activity

5.67 Prisoners should not be prevented from attending Wednesday evening Mass. (2.37)

Complaints

5.68 All responses to complaints should be legible. (2.43)

Health services

5.69 Health staff should receive regular, documented clinical supervision. (2.60)

5.70 Withdrawn or out-of-date medical kit should be removed from clinical areas. (2.61)

5.71 The date checking of drug stocks on the wings should be recorded. (2.74)

Catering

5.72 Managers should ensure that food temperatures are taken and recorded. (2.88)

Learning and skills and work activities

5.73 Data on success rates should be recorded accurately. (3.16)

Offender management and planning

5.74 There should be clear terms of reference for the inter-departmental risk management team meeting. (4.22)

Examples of good practice

5.75 The drug and alcohol recovery unit (A wing) demonstrated the potential effectiveness of intensive programmes for young adults in recovery from their drug and alcohol misuse, especially alongside family conferencing interventions. (1.63)

5.76 There was very good provision to help prisoners maintain, and in some cases rebuild, family relationships and a comprehensive range of interventions provided by specialist staff, with support from residential officers to prisoners facing special personal circumstances. (4.40)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Rachael Prime	Researcher
Amy Radford	Researcher
Njilan Morris-Jarra	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
Sheila Willis	Ofsted inspector
Steve Hunsley	Ofsted inspector
Daryl Jones	Ofsted inspector
Keith Humphreys	Offender management inspector
Joanna Coleshill	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2011, arriving prisoners had unreasonable delays in entering the prison but reception procedures were carried out properly and quickly, despite the limitations of the facility. First night and induction arrangements were generally satisfactory but prisoners experienced too much lock up during their induction. There was a significant level of recorded violence but the prison had an effective approach to violence reduction and anti-bullying. Prisoners reported feeling safe, although less so than when we last visited. Suicide and self-harm prevention measures evidenced good quality care. Use of formal disciplinary procedures was high. There was also a high use of force, often for minor incidents, and governance was insufficient. A significant number of prisoners had experienced segregation. The segregation unit required improvement and the regime was too limited. Illicit drug use was very low and integrated drug treatment system procedures were sound. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

There should be further work to reduce the level of violent incidents. (HP48)

Achieved

Prisoners located in the special accommodation should only be strip-searched and have their own clothing replaced with anti-tear gowns when this is supported by a risk assessment. (HP49)

Achieved

The regime in the segregation unit should be revised and improved. (HP50)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners arriving during lunch should not be left on escort vehicles and should be disembarked into the holding rooms. (1.7)

Achieved

Arriving prisoners should not be handcuffed when they are moved from escort vehicles to the reception area, and escort and prison staff should be made aware of the prison's policy on this. (1.8)

Achieved

Reception should be refurbished and made fit for purpose. (1.16)

Achieved

New arrivals should receive a thorough and meaningful risk assessment interview on the day they arrive, and a written record of this interview should be kept. (1.21)

Achieved

The induction presentation should be streamlined and the Insider facilitators supported by staff. (1.26)

Partially achieved

The induction programme should be condensed into a shorter period, and once completed, prisoners should move to their residential wings as soon as possible. (1.27)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be set individualised behaviour targets when anti-bullying monitoring documents are opened on them. (3.9)

Partially achieved

All staff should receive regular training in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT). (3.20)

Achieved

Actions requested on security information reports should be completed within appropriate timescales. (7.7)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.39)

Prisoners should only be strip-searched after visits when there is intelligence to support this. (7.8)

Not achieved

Adjudicators should ensure that all charges are appropriately investigated before reaching a verdict for adjudications and minor reports. (7.15)

Partially achieved

Mitigation offered in adjudications or minor reports should be recorded and taken into account with any finding of guilt. (7.16)

Achieved

Data collected on minor reports should be improved and a formal quality assurance procedure for minor report documentation should be introduced. (7.17)

Partially achieved

Any drawing or use of a baton should be scrutinised to give assurance that its use is appropriate and proportionate. (7.24)

Achieved

There should be protocols for the use of the two unfurnished searching/'cool off' rooms in the segregation unit, and any use of them as special accommodation should be appropriately authorised and recorded. (7.25)

No longer relevant

Governance of the use of force should be improved. (7.26)

Not achieved

The communal showers and toilets in the segregation unit should be refurbished. (7.35)

Not achieved

Staff working in the segregation unit should receive training in suicide prevention and mental health awareness as a minimum. (7.36)

Partially achieved

Data collated for the segregation monitoring and review group should be used to identify and take action on any concerns highlighted. (7.37)

Partially achieved

Suspicion drug tests should be managed and monitored more effectively to ensure they are undertaken within the required timeframe. (3.49)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2011, the quality of the internal and external environment was very good, but lack of prisoner access to showers remained unacceptable. Staff-prisoner relationships were respectful and there was a reasonable personal officer scheme. Structures to support and promote diversity were developing, and black and minority ethnic prisoners suggested their treatment and outcomes were broadly equitable. The quality of the food was good. Applications and complaints were reasonably well managed, although prisoner confidence in the systems was mixed. The prison had a well-integrated chaplaincy. The quality of health care was good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

All prisoners should have access to daily showers. (HP51)

Achieved

There should be a needs analysis to inform the development of a detailed diversity and equality strategy and priorities for the diversity and equality action plan, and specific needs analyses to inform strategy and action plans for each diversity strand. (HP52)

Not achieved

Recommendations

Toilets in cells should be effectively screened. (2.9)

Not achieved (repeated in recommendation 2.9)

The prison should ensure that the offensive displays policy is adhered to by all prisoners and enforced by staff. (2.10)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.8)

Prisoners should be allowed to wear their own clothes, and sufficient prison clothing should be available. (2.13)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be able to access their stored property within one week of making an application. (2.14)

Achieved

Communal showers should have adequate privacy screening. (2.17)

Partially achieved

Links between personal officers and the offender management unit should be developed. (2.27)

Partially achieved

Responses to applications should be tracked, monitored and quality assured. (3.28)

Partially achieved

Information about complaints should be aggregated over the year to assess themes and areas for improvement, and action taken to rectify issues. (3.29)

Achieved

The legal services officers and the foreign national coordinator should be adequately trained concerning legal issues and have time to support and signpost prisoners. (3.34)

Not achieved

Access to legal visits should be increased. (3.35)

Partially achieved

There should be washing facilities, shoe storage and a disabled-access toilet within the multi-faith area. (3.42)

Not achieved

Staff training in diversity should be completed. (4.10)

No longer relevant

Minority group prisoners should have access to formal support groups. (4.11)

Partially achieved

There should be monitoring to assess the impact of prisoners' religion, age, disability and/or foreign national status on their participation in the prison's regime. (4.12)

Partially achieved

The treatment rooms on the wings should be refurbished, kept clean and fitted with security gates. (5.6)

No longer relevant

Clinical supervision should be available to all health care professionals. (5.14)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should have access to a dedicated health care forum. (5.15)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should have access to information on health services in a range of languages. (5.21)

Achieved

Triage algorithms should be developed and used to ensure consistency of care and treatment. (5.22)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.66)

A pharmacist should visit the prison at least once a month to check the systems in operation. (5.29)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led clinics. (5.30)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.70)

There should be a policy for the issue of medicines at the special sick clinic that the medicines and therapeutics committee reviews regularly to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied. (5.31)

Partially achieved

Resuscitation kit, including oxygen, should be available in the dental suite. (5.37)

Achieved

Patients should be able to see a dentist for routine treatment within a reasonable timescale. (5.38)

Achieved

Prisoners should have access to professional counselling services. (5.43)

Achieved

Mental health awareness training should be provided for all discipline staff. (5.44)

Achieved

Prisoners should receive equal pay for the same job, whatever their privilege level. (7.44)

Not achieved

Prisoners should not be placed on report and downgraded to basic for the same single incident. (7.45)

Not achieved

Prisoners on basic level should have better access to showers and phone calls. (7.46)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2001, time unlocked was limited for many prisoners and there were needless restrictions on access to evening association. Learning and skills provision was well managed, but there were insufficient activity places and education places were underused. Too many prisoners were unemployed. The range of education and vocational training courses was good. Standards of learning and teaching, as well as success rates and achievements, were good. Prisoner time in the library was limited. There was a good range of accredited courses in PE and most prisoners had recreational access. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Prisoners should have greater access to time out of cell. (HP53)

Partially achieved

The number of activity places should be increased and the allocation process improved so that prisoners are deployed to them effectively. (HP54)

Achieved

Recommendations

There should be no regime slippage and the core day routine should be adhered to. (6.5)

Achieved

All prisoners should have access to four evening association sessions a week. (6.6)

Not achieved (repeated in recommendation 3.4)

Benches and/or recreational equipment should be provided in exercise yards. (6.7)

Not achieved (repeated in recommendation 3.5)

Quality improvement processes should be extended to all learning and skills provision. (6.13)

Achieved

The prison should endeavour to retrieve information about prisoners' achievements from the learner record service to reduce the need for them to repeat basic skills assessments carried out recently in other prisons. (6.16)

Achieved

All prisoners in work places should wear the relevant personal protective equipment. (6.22)

Achieved

Literacy and numeracy training in activities should be contextualised to make them more relevant. (6.23)

Not achieved

Vocational training provision should be increased to meet the needs of prisoners and reduce waiting times to access programmes. (6.29)

Achieved

The resources in the information and communication technology and motor vehicle workshops should be up to date and reflect current industry standards. (6.30)

Achieved

Individual learning plans should be better used to give learners clearly defined short-term targets to guide their learning and measure their progress. (6.31)

Not achieved

The take-up of education places should be increased. (6.38)

Not achieved

The progress that learners make in the literacy and numeracy workshop should be formally recorded and reviewed regularly. (6.39)

No longer relevant

Literacy and numeracy workshop and in-cell activities should be more frequent to enable learners to consolidate their learning. (6.40)

Partially achieved

The size of the library should be increased to accommodate the required library stock. (6.46)

Achieved

The library should be open on some evenings and at weekends. (6.47)

Not achieved

All prisoners should have adequate time in the library to browse and select books. (6.48)

Achieved

The library should introduce Storybook Dads and the Toe-by-Toe reading scheme. (6.49)

Achieved

There should be more showers in the PE department and they should be fitted with privacy screens. (6.57)

Not achieved

The PE department should offer higher level programmes to provide progression routes from level 1. (6.58)

Not 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, there was a reducing reoffending strategy and policy group, although the offender management and resettlement strategies needed better coordination. Needs analyses were comprehensive but many findings had yet to be adopted. Sentence planning arrangements were reasonable and OASys assessments were up to date. The collation and analysis of information on individuals and the quality of offender supervision needed to improve. Pre-release arrangements were variable and arrangements on the new resettlement unit were embryonic. Release on temporary licence was underused. Public protection arrangements were good. Provision across the seven resettlement pathways met some need although more needed to be done. Nevertheless, outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The prison should determine the function of the resettlement unit and how this should be developed, and set out a clear strategy to take these objectives forward. (HP55)

No longer relevant

The role of offender supervisors should be clearly defined to include ongoing risk and offence-related assessments and engagement. (HP56)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.19)

There should be a strategy to address the shortfall in offending behaviour provision to meet the needs of the population. (HP57)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.51)

Recommendations

The reducing reoffending policy and action plan should include developments relating to both offender management and public protection. (9.8)

Partially achieved

Information and recommendations identified from prisoner needs analyses and consultation exercises should be used to inform the strategic development of resettlement. (9.9)

Partially achieved

There should be a strategy to manage cases of prisoners where the risk of harm level is disputed with community offender managers. (9.22)

Achieved

Sentence planning and OASys (offender assessment system) assessments should be informed by contributions from all relevant departments. (9.23)

Not achieved

There should be a training plan for all offender management staff to address shortfalls in the skills required to undertake the full range of offender management work. (9.24)

Partially achieved

All offender supervisors should have regular professional supervision and casework reviews to aid personal development, and quality assurance should be extended across all offender management work. (9.25)

Not achieved

The use of release on temporary licence, and links with employers, should be expanded to offer as many prisoners as possible the opportunity to work outside the prison and access resettlement support before release. (9.26)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.18)

Offender supervisors should be more actively involved in risk management assessment and management for the prisoners for whom they are responsible. (9.30)

Achieved

The no fixed accommodation release rate for prisoners should be reduced. (9.37)

Achieved

The resettlement programme should be rationalised to reduce duplication and make better use of careers information and advice support (CIAS) and other workers to support prisoners leading up to release. (9.41)

Achieved

An accredited alcohol group work programme should be put in place without further delay. (9.53)

Achieved

The opening times of the telephone booking line should be extended, and visitors should also be able to book visits by email and text. (9.63)

Achieved

Prisoners should not have to wear bibs during visits. (9.64)

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	366	55	91.9
Recall	32	3	7.6
Detainees	2		0.4
Total	400	58	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	2		0.4
Less than six months	3	0	0.7
six months to less than 12 months	14	0	3.1
12 months to less than 2 years	78	4	17.9
2 years to less than 4 years	201	28	50
4 years to less than 10 years	95	25	26.2
10 years and over (not life)	4	0	0.9
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	2	0	0.4
Life	1	1	0.4
Total	400	58	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	400	87.3
21 years to 29 years	58	12.7
Total	458	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	386	57	96.7
Foreign nationals	14	1	3.3
Total	400	58	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category C	1		0.2
Other YOI CLOSED	399	58	99.8
Total	400	58	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	328	48	82.1
Irish	3	0	0.7
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	2	1	0.7
Other white	4	0	0.9
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	16	1	3.7
White and black African	0	1	0.2
White and Asian	1	0	0.2
Other mixed	1	1	0.4
Asian or Asian British			

Indian	2	0	0.4
Pakistani	19	4	5
Bangladeshi	1	0	0.2
Chinese	1	0	0.2
Other Asian	4	0	0.9
Black or black British			
Caribbean	8	1	2
African	5	1	1.3
Other black	1	0	0.2
Other ethnic group	3	0	0.7
Not stated	1	0	0.2
Total	400	58	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Church of England	34	13	10.3
Roman Catholic	69	8	16.8
Other Christian denominations	36	2	8.3
Muslim	42	5	10.3
Sikh	2	0	0.4
Buddhist	2	0	0.4
Other	1	0	0.2
No religion	214	30	53.3
Total	400	58	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	64	14	0	
1 month to 3 months	125	27.3	7	1.5
3 months to six months	104	22.7	20	4.4
Six months to 1 year	77	16.8	13	2.8
1 year to 2 years	28	6.1	17	3.7
2 years to 4 years			1	0.2
Total	398	86.9	58	12.7

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	2		0.4
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	201	34	51.3
Total	203	34	51.7

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	1	0.2		
1 year to 2 years	1	0.2		
Total	2	0.4		

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		52	11.74
Sexual offences		3	0.68
Burglary	3	49	11.06
Robbery	2	97	21.9
Theft and handling		1	0.23
Drugs offences		35	7.90
Other offences	1	31	7
Offence not recorded /holding warrant	6	175	39.5
Total	12	443	100.01

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Young adult prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

The young adult 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.⁸ Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis young adult population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic young adults 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 1 December 2014, the young adult population at HMYOI Deerbolt was 463. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 199 young adults.

We received a total of 175 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 88%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Six respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, thirteen questionnaires were not returned and five were returned blank.

⁸ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes a 75% response rate (65% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	24
B	20
C	21
D	24
E	19
F	26
G	13
I	24
Segregation unit	4

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMYOI Deerbolt.

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 differences⁹ are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Deerbolt in 2014 compared with responses from young adults surveyed in all other young adult trainer prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from young adult surveys carried out in six young adult trainer prisons since April 2011.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Deerbolt in 2014 compared with the responses of young adults surveyed at HMYOI Deerbolt in 2011.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of young adults who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

⁹ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.05 which means that there is only a 5% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	144 (83%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	159 (91%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	34 (20%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	61 (36%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	43 (25%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Life</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)	
	<i>Yes</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	151 (92%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	171 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	171 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	1 (1%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	131 (77%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 9 (5%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Arab</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	9 (5%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	<i>Yes</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>No</i>		157 (95%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	<i>None</i>	92 (54%)	<i>Hindu</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	25 (15%)	<i>Jewish</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	26 (15%)	<i>Muslim</i> 17 (10%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Other</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>		172 (100%)
	<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)		
	<i>Yes</i>		17 (10%)
	<i>No</i>		152 (90%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		2 (1%)
	<i>No</i>		170 (99%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	<i>Yes</i>		84 (49%)
	<i>No</i>		87 (51%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	<i>Yes</i>		42 (24%)
	<i>No</i>		130 (76%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	60 (35%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	106 (62%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (3%)

Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	60 (35%)
	Yes	83 (49%)
	No	26 (15%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	60 (35%)
	Yes	10 (6%)
	No	99 (58%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	72 (42%)
	No	90 (53%)
	Don't remember	8 (5%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	146 (85%)
	No	23 (13%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	33 (19%)
	Well	81 (47%)
	Neither	43 (25%)
	Badly	5 (3%)
	Very badly	4 (2%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that applies to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	105 (61%)
	Yes, I received written information	3 (2%)
	No, I was not told anything	57 (33%)
	Don't remember	8 (5%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	152 (88%)
	No	15 (9%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	139 (81%)
	2 hours or longer	14 (8%)
	Don't remember	18 (11%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	148 (88%)
	No	16 (9%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?		
	<i>Very well</i>		35 (21%)
	<i>Well</i>		93 (55%)
	<i>Neither</i>		28 (17%)
	<i>Badly</i>		8 (5%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		3 (2%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		2 (1%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	16 (10%)	<i>Physical health</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Mental health</i> 17 (10%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 10 (6%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	22 (13%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 20 (12%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Other</i> 5 (3%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	20 (12%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> 100 (60%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	16 (10%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	<i>Yes</i>		25 (15%)
	<i>No</i>		43 (26%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>		100 (60%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>		158 (92%)
	<i>A shower</i>		89 (52%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>		133 (78%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>		99 (58%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>		105 (61%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>		101 (59%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>		4 (2%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>		114 (68%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>		116 (69%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>		48 (29%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>		54 (32%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>		30 (18%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>		82 (49%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>		70 (42%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>		82 (49%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>		89 (53%)
	<i>Health services</i>		98 (59%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>		94 (56%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>		40 (24%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	<i>Yes</i>		145 (86%)
	<i>No</i>		17 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		6 (4%)

Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	87 (51%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	42 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	14 (8%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Yes</i>	80 (49%)
	<i>No</i>	39 (24%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	18 (11%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	39 (24%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	49 (30%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	49 (30%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	27 (16%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	24 (15%)	37 (23%)	26 (16%)	31 (20%)	22 (14%) 18 (11%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	24 (15%)	46 (29%)	24 (15%)	11 (7%)	12 (8%) 39 (25%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	15 (10%)	18 (12%)	31 (21%)	11 (7%)	17 (11%) 57 (38%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					39 (23%)
	<i>Yes</i>					64 (39%)
	<i>No</i>					63 (38%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	<i>Yes</i>					52 (32%)
	<i>No</i>					11 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					102 (62%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	86 (52%)	77 (47%)	2 (1%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	151 (92%)	14 (8%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	152 (93%)	10 (6%)	2 (1%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	91 (55%)	70 (42%)	4 (2%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	75 (46%)	73 (45%)	16 (10%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	90 (56%)	69 (43%)	1 (1%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	46 (28%)	73 (45%)	45 (27%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	<i>Very good</i>					4 (2%)
	<i>Good</i>					30 (18%)
	<i>Neither</i>					42 (26%)
	<i>Bad</i>					43 (26%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					45 (27%)

Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>	1 (1%)
	Yes	86 (53%)
	No	75 (46%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes	86 (52%)
	No	17 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	62 (38%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	76 (46%)
	No	12 (7%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	77 (47%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	90 (55%)
	No	10 (6%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>	65 (39%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	41 (25%)
	Very easy	45 (27%)
	Easy	27 (16%)
	Neither	10 (6%)
	Difficult	6 (4%)
	Very difficult	2 (1%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	33 (20%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	131 (80%)
	No	24 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (5%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (<i>If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		<i>Not made one</i> Yes No
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	21 (13%) 83 (52%) 55 (35%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	21 (14%) 42 (28%) 87 (58%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	86 (54%)
	No	31 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	43 (27%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (<i>If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		<i>Not made one</i> Yes No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	85 (53%) 31 (19%) 45 (28%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	85 (53%) 27 (17%) 49 (30%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	23 (15%)
	No	127 (85%)

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>	67 (42%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Easy</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i>	24 (15%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	16 (10%)

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>	18 (11%)
	<i>Yes</i>	73 (44%)
	<i>No</i>	57 (35%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (10%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Yes</i>	74 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	51 (32%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (11%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	37 (23%)
	<i>No</i>	125 (77%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	107 (66%)
	<i>Very well</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Well</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Badly</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	15 (9%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	126 (76%)
	<i>No</i>	40 (24%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	102 (65%)
	<i>No</i>	55 (35%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	43 (26%)
	<i>No</i>	121 (74%)

Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Never</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	35 (21%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	52 (32%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	32 (20%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	25 (15%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	59 (36%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	53 (32%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	26 (16%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	59 (37%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	33 (21%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>Neither</i>	26 (16%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	9 (6%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?			
	<i>Yes</i>	55 (33%)		
	<i>No</i>	110 (67%)		
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?			
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (13%)		
	<i>No</i>	137 (87%)		
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that applies to you.)			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	110 (69%)	<i>At meal times</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	15 (9%)	<i>At health services</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	9 (6%)	<i>Visits area</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	11 (7%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	4 (3%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	19 (12%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	18 (11%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>At work</i>	13 (8%)	<i>In your cell</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>During movement</i>	20 (13%)	<i>At religious services</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>At education</i>	13 (8%)		
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?			
	<i>Yes</i>	40 (25%)		
	<i>No</i>	123 (75%)		

Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	22 (13%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	24 (15%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	8 (5%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	36 (22%)
	No	128 (78%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that applies to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	117 (74%)
	Yes	13 (8%)
	No	29 (18%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	22 (14%)	38 (24%)	59 (37%)	16 (10%)	19 (12%)	7 (4%)
	The nurse	18 (11%)	42 (26%)	70 (44%)	13 (8%)	12 (8%)	4 (3%)
	The dentist	24 (15%)	20 (13%)	37 (24%)	14 (9%)	27 (17%)	35 (22%)
Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	26 (16%)	42 (26%)	56 (35%)	19 (12%)	14 (9%)	4 (2%)
	The nurse	17 (11%)	45 (28%)	64 (41%)	16 (10%)	10 (6%)	6 (4%)
	The dentist	43 (27%)	27 (17%)	37 (23%)	21 (13%)	12 (8%)	18 (11%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						12 (8%)
	<i>Very good</i>						21 (13%)
	<i>Good</i>						71 (46%)
	<i>Neither</i>						31 (20%)
	<i>Bad</i>						13 (8%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						8 (5%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes						27 (17%)
	No						134 (83%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?						
	<i>Not taking medication</i>						134 (84%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						12 (8%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						5 (3%)
	<i>No</i>						9 (6%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes						43 (27%)
	No						117 (73%)
Q9.7	Are your being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff.)						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>						117 (74%)
	Yes						25 (16%)
	No						16 (10%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	53 (33%)
	No	106 (67%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	33 (21%)
	No	125 (79%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	33 (21%)
	<i>Easy</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	82 (53%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	<i>Very easy</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Easy</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	95 (61%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	144 (93%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>No</i>	152 (99%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	99 (66%)
	<i>Yes</i>	27 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	24 (16%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	125 (81%)
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>No</i>	12 (8%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	119 (82%)
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	10 (7%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	16 (10%)	15 (10%)	38 (25%)	22 (14%)	40(26%)	23 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training	26 (17%)	12 (8%)	51 (34%)	30 (20%)	17(11%)	13 (9%)
	Education (including basic skills)	12 (8%)	26 (17%)	72 (48%)	18 (12%)	13 (9%)	9 (6%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	42 (28%)	11 (7%)	33 (22%)	27 (18%)	21(14%)	17 (11%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that applies to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					39 (27%)	
	Prison job					62 (42%)	
	Vocational or skills training					19 (13%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					40 (27%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					4 (3%)	

Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	36 (28%)	56 (43%)	27 (21%)	11 (8%)
	Vocational or skills training	35 (30%)	45 (39%)	21 (18%)	14 (12%)
	Education (including basic skills)	22 (18%)	58 (47%)	32 (26%)	12 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	44 (40%)	31 (28%)	23 (21%)	11 (10%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				32 (21%)
	<i>Never</i>				25 (16%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>				20 (13%)
	<i>About once a week</i>				67 (44%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>				8 (5%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				51 (34%)
	<i>Yes</i>				73 (49%)
	<i>No</i>				26 (17%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				33 (22%)
	<i>0</i>				29 (19%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				39 (26%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				44 (29%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				7 (5%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				21 (14%)
	<i>0</i>				19 (13%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				50 (33%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				27 (18%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				35 (23%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				2 (1%)
	<i>0</i>				3 (2%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				8 (5%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				32 (21%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				104 (70%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)				
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>				44 (29%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>				18 (12%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>				25 (16%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>				35 (23%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>				7 (5%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>				8 (5%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				15 (10%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	59 (42%)
	No	83 (58%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	63 (41%)
	No	89 (59%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	31 (20%)
	No	121 (80%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	16 (11%)
	<i>Easy</i>	15 (10%)
	<i>Neither</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	71 (47%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (2%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	125 (86%)
	No	21 (14%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that applies to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>No contact</i>	56 (38%)
	<i>Letter</i>	29 (20%)
	<i>Phone</i>	17 (12%)
	<i>Visit</i>	39 (27%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	109 (73%)
	No	40 (27%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	80 (54%)
	No	69 (46%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	69 (47%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Involved</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	13 (9%)

Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that applies to you.)			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			69 (49%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			41 (29%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>			20 (14%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>			18 (13%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>			13 (9%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			8 (6%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			69 (47%)
	<i>Yes</i>			42 (29%)
	<i>No</i>			17 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			18 (12%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			69 (47%)
	<i>Yes</i>			15 (10%)
	<i>No</i>			34 (23%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			29 (20%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			69 (48%)
	<i>Yes</i>			21 (15%)
	<i>No</i>			16 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			38 (26%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	<i>Yes</i>			5 (4%)
	<i>No</i>			54 (38%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			83 (58%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	<i>Yes</i>			29 (21%)
	<i>No</i>			110 (79%)
Q13.12	Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that applies to you.)			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	48 (35%)	41 (29%)	50 (36%)
	Accommodation	57 (42%)	32 (24%)	47 (35%)
	Benefits	53 (38%)	35 (25%)	50 (36%)
	Finances	59 (45%)	21 (16%)	51 (39%)
	Education	54 (41%)	30 (23%)	49 (37%)
	Drugs and alcohol	59 (45%)	33 (25%)	39 (30%)
Q13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?			
	<i>Not sentenced</i>			0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>			72 (51%)
	<i>No</i>			68 (49%)



Main comparator and comparator to last time

Prisoner survey responses HMYOI Deerbolt 2014

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

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	HMYOI Deerbolt 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		175	995	175	165
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	83%	57%	83%	91%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	9%	7%	9%	9%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	14%	15%	14%	10%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	1%	6%	1%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	12%	8%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	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.)	19%	52%	19%	10%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	4%	6%	8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	10%	27%	10%	8%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	2%	0%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	12%	10%	14%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1%	2%	1%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	49%	52%	49%	33%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	24%	24%	24%	32%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	62%	44%	62%	39%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	75%	58%	75%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	9%	9%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	42%	45%	42%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	85%	80%	85%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	60%	67%	60%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	61%	54%	61%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	18%	2%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	86%	88%	94%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	HMYOI Deerbolt 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				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	81%	61%	81%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	78%	88%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	59%	76%	63%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	40%	63%	40%	50%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	10%	21%	10%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	4%	14%	4%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	3%	1%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	13%	23%	13%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	2%	1%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	12%	16%	12%	13%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	10%	11%	10%	10%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	2%	6%	2%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	10%	9%	10%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	6%	9%	6%	8%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	12%	22%	12%	19%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	37%	30%	37%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	93%	79%	93%	95%
3.6	A shower?	52%	33%	52%	49%
3.6	A free telephone call?	78%	57%	78%	75%
3.6	Something to eat?	58%	51%	58%	69%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	61%	45%	61%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	59%	47%	59%	
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	68%	60%	68%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	70%	67%	70%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	29%	26%	29%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	32%	23%	32%	7%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	49%	45%	49%	53%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	HMYOI Deerbolt 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				
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	42%	36%	42%	61%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	49%	38%	49%	46%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	53%	36%	53%	59%
3.8	Health services?	59%	54%	59%	62%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	56%	51%	56%	62%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	86%	74%	86%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	84%	88%	84%	91%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	58%	47%	58%	58%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	76%	80%	76%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	39%	34%	39%	43%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	45%	41%	45%	47%
4.1	Get bail information?	22%	11%	22%	26%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	39%	40%	39%	36%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	32%	31%	32%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	52%	51%	52%	48%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	67%	92%	37%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	93%	56%	93%	73%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	55%	40%	55%	66%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	46%	30%	46%	65%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	56%	61%	56%	59%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	28%	30%	28%	26%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	21%	25%	21%	39%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	53%	42%	53%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	52%	37%	52%	46%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	54%	46%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	55%	61%	55%	49%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	44%	55%	44%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	75%	80%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	60%	56%	60%	66%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	HMYOI Deerbolt 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				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	33%	42%	33%	56%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	54%	60%	54%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	41%	30%	41%	23%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	36%	34%	36%	27%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	23%	15%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	25%	28%	25%	21%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44%	42%	44%	48%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	46%	48%	46%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	23%	17%	23%	20%
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?	25%	35%	25%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	64%	76%	70%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	65%	66%	65%	78%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	26%	26%	26%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	35%	18%	35%	20%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	65%	67%	65%	66%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	55%	53%	55%	55%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	39%	33%	26%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	19%	13%	11%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	25%	26%	25%	15%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	14%	13%	8%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	13%	9%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	17%	15%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	9%	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerboit 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerboit 2014	HMYOI Deerboit 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				
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	7%	5%	7%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	3%	6%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	5%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	4%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	4%	2%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	5%	7%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	8%	7%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	8%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	7%	5%	3%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	22%	36%	22%	12%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	15%	12%	7%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	7%	7%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	2%	2%	3%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	14%	6%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	7%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	5%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	4%	2%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	HMYOI Deerbolt 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	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	8%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	6%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	4%	1%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	31%	34%	31%	15%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	60%	41%	60%	47%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	70%	57%	70%	71%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	36%	15%	36%	17%
	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?	73%	55%	73%	63%
9.2	The nurse?	77%	58%	77%	70%
9.2	The dentist?	56%	43%	56%	32%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	64%	49%	64%	56%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	17%	25%	17%	27%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	65%	66%	65%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	27%	20%	27%	27%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	61%	50%	61%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	33%	23%	33%	42%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	21%	14%	21%	37%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	29%	23%	29%	27%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	10%	11%	10%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	5%	7%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	1%	4%	1%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	53%	69%	53%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	58%	76%	58%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	63%	80%	63%	80%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	HMYOI Deerbolt 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				
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	34%	28%	34%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	42%	37%	42%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	65%	57%	65%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	29%	25%	29%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	42%	36%	42%	40%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	13%	17%	13%	14%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	27%	34%	27%	35%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	3%	11%	3%	4%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	72%	72%	72%	77%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	59%	44%	59%	61%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	70%	72%	70%	76%
	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?	56%	57%	56%	67%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	82%	84%	82%	85%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	57%	59%	57%	75%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	60%	69%	60%	67%
	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?	48%	51%	48%	48%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	49%	41%	49%	53%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	49%	36%	49%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	34%	15%	34%	18%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	50%	41%	59%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	70%	40%	70%	33%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	5%	7%	5%	4%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	42%	32%	42%	44%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	41%	54%	41%	50%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	40%	20%	24%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	20%	34%	20%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	Young Adult Trainer Prisons Comparator	HMYOI Deerbolt 2014	HMYOI Deerbolt 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					
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	86%	79%	86%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	44%	39%	44%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	23%	27%	23%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	14%	17%	14%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	31%	35%	31%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	73%	78%	73%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	54%	62%	54%	72%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	54%	49%	54%	58%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	57%	52%	57%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	28%	35%	28%	
13.6	Offender manager?	25%	22%	25%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	18%	12%	18%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	11%	15%	11%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	54%	67%	54%	74%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	19%	21%	19%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	28%	26%	28%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	4%	6%	4%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	21%	17%	21%	14%
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?	45%	42%	45%	
13.12	Accommodation?	41%	39%	41%	
13.12	Benefits?	41%	31%	41%	
13.12	Finances?	29%	24%	29%	
13.12	Education?	38%	40%	38%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	46%	43%	46%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in the future?	52%	56%	52%	38%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMYOI Deerbolt 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
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		32	138
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	16%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	100%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	51%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	4%	12%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	66%	46%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	55%	70%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	63%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	90%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	81%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	51%	37%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	68%	71%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	90%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	83%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	27%	42%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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?	49%	54%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	85%	93%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25%	52%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	10%	24%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	24%	61%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	35%	57%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57%	55%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	39%	59%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	33%	48%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	39%	48%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	27%	22%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	57%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	62%	67%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	26%	37%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	65%	64%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	45%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	12%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	13%	27%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	6%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	4%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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)	0%	5%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	29%	20%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	10%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	13%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	10%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	42%	65%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	52%	75%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	17%	17%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	21%	29%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	11%	33%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	44%	42%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	20%	12%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	28%	27%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	4%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	54%	48%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	50%	30%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	36%	43%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	61%	72%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	7%	4%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	39%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	20%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMYOI Deerbolt 2014

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		17	152
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	20%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	93%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	93%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	7%	21%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	11%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	29%	51%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	41%	64%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	75%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	71%	35%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	68%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	88%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	89%	85%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	28%	40%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	40%	54%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	80%	93%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	48%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	8%	23%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	54%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	52%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	56%	56%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	69%	81%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	54%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	29%	47%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	15%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	43%	20%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	73%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	53%	67%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	29%	36%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	53%	67%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	53%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	35%	11%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	53%	21%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	33%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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)	33%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	40%	19%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	20%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	78%	58%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	78%	70%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	15%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	78%	21%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	46%	28%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	23%	45%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	14%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	31%	27%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	3%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	38%	51%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	23%	35%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	38%	41%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	54%	72%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9%	5%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	31%	43%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	23%	20%

Wing comparison



Prisoner survey responses (A wing comparator) HMYOI Deerbolt 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	A Wing	All other wings (B, C, D, E, F, G, I) excluding segregation
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		24	147
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	79%	84%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	13%	9%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	21%	13%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	5%	21%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	11%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	54%	49%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	21%	25%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	33%	34%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	13%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	39%	23%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	21%	13%

Wing comparison

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Wings (B, C, D, E, excluding F)	Wings (A, excluding F)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	18%	8%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	26%	13%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	8%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	13%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	8%	4%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	25%	21%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	7%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	0%

Wing comparison

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Wings (B, C, D, E, excluding F) comparison
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	1%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	75%	57%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	88%	67%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	44%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	8%	19%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	25%	27%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	42%	32%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	31%	19%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	44%	26%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	13%	10%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	8%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	2%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	79%	48%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	84%	50%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	86%	53%

Wing comparison



Prisoner survey responses (I wing comparator) HMYOI Deerbolt 2014

Prisoner survey responses (missing data have been excluded for each question).

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	I Wing	All other wings (A, B, C, D, E, F, G) excluding segregation
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		24	147
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	88%	83%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	21%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	19%	14%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	5%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	0%	22%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	50%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	30%	24%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	38%	33%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	8%	14%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	30%	24%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:			
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	13%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	17%	8%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	15%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	8%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	8%	7%

Wing comparison

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	5	(A, B, C, D) wing
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	13%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	17%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	6%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	17%	23%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	5%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	7%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%