

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMP Kirklevington Grange**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**15 - 19 December 2014**

**5 – 9 January 2015**

## **Glossary of terms**

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

Crown copyright 2015

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

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

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

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

Printed and published by:  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  
Victory House  
6th floor  
30–34 Kingsway  
London  
WC2B 6EX  
England

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	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	69
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	73



# Introduction

HMP Kirklevington Grange is a small category D resettlement prison in Cleveland which, at the time of this inspection, held 273 adult men. The prison prepares men, most of whom are coming to the end of long sentences for serious offences, for their re-entry back into the community. At our last inspection in May 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners were good against each of our healthy prison tests and we described the prison as performing its specialist function very well. This inspection found that the prison had maintained those high standards despite now holding a more complex population, and in some important areas had improved further.

The prison was very safe. Violent incidents and self-harm were rare and when they did happen, they were well dealt with. Prisoners responded positively to staff who expected high standards of behaviour and so the use of formal disciplinary measures was rare. Security measures were mostly effective and, with some exceptions, proportionate. Although there were some problems with the use of illegal drugs, this was less so than in comparable prisons. Prisoners told us that they were frightened of being arbitrarily returned to closed conditions and some were reluctant to use the complaints system because of this. We examined a large number of cases and checked these off against complaints data. In all the cases we examined, returns to closed conditions were made for good reasons and there was no link to complaints.

Safety and security were driven by very good relationships between staff and prisoners. Individual staff engaged positively and directly with the prisoners for whom they were responsible. There was an effective personal officer scheme and staff made excellent use of P-Nomis (Prison National Offender Management Information System) and prisoners' individual electronic files to record progress and concerns. There were good consultation arrangements. Prisoners with protected characteristics also reported positively and work on diversity and equality was good. The prison had done some particularly good work with veterans to identify their needs and link them with available specialist services. The accommodation was mostly good but some was showing its age and in need of improvement. Health services were generally good but we were concerned to find some emergency equipment was out of date; although this was dealt with as soon as we brought it to the prison's attention, it should have been picked up by its own procedures. Complaints were dealt with satisfactorily. The food was generally good and prisoners ate together. However, it was a shame that men who had often spent a long time in prison had no opportunity to learn how to cook for themselves.

Purposeful activity was very strong. Prisoners had a good amount of time out of their cells and all were engaged in work, training or education in the prison or paid and voluntary work in the community. There was an excellent and welcoming café outside the gate next to a car valeting service, and these were both run by prisoners. Local residents used the café while they had their cars cleaned and took the opportunity to purchase goods made in the prison's excellent workshops, such as the metal workshop which produced high quality work. A small team of prisoners developed and ran a sophisticated process for ensuring eligible prisoners were quickly allocated to suitable activities. Some quality improvement processes required further development, but work was in hand to progress this. A very high proportion of prisoners, more than 80%, entered employment or training on release but more could have been done to ensure this was sustainable by further embedding employability skills in the opportunities prisoners had while in prison.

Finding and keeping employment was crucial to a prisoner's chances of not reoffending after release. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) played a crucial part in this and most of the permanent jobs prisoners found on release were linked to ROTL placement. Processes of assessing prisoners' eligibility for ROTL were rightly cautious and well managed. There had been 22,000 ROTL events in the six months before the inspection and no prisoner had been unlawfully at large in this time. Offender management arrangements were excellent and among the best we have seen. The whole prison worked together with a clear focus on the prison's central resettlement task and there was

very good information exchange between different prison departments. Practical resettlement services were also very good. The 'New Direction Centre' staffed by prisoners under staff supervision was an important resource although, in a rare departure from the prison's normally common sense approach, the prisoners working there had been prevented from having access to telephones. No prisoner left the prison without accommodation arranged and other practical resettlement services were well organised. Family work was also good but the visits hall was not big enough to meet demand.

It was unhelpful that in a prison like Kirklevington Grange, whose purpose was to prepare men who have been incarcerated for long periods for entry into the modern world, that prisoners had no access in the prison to the internet. The 'virtual campus', which might have provided a limited alternative, was underused. Therefore there was too little opportunity to equip prisoners with the skills and resources they needed for the 21st century and which could, at least, have taken some of the pressure off the visits hall. It was ironic that prisoners would have this access when they left the prison on ROTL or release, but unlike every other area of resettlement, very little was done to prepare and test them for this in the supervised environment of the prison. This was something over which the prison had very little control.

Despite our overall very positive findings, some aspects of our prisoner survey were more negative. It was clear that this was largely due to the lack of information about Kirklevington Grange that prisoners were given before they arrived. Prisoners believed they would have immediate access to ROTL but rightly had to wait while a period of preparation and assessment took place. The frustration and disappointment this caused coloured the overall atmosphere in the prison and much more needed to be done to ensure prisoners had good information and realistic expectations before they arrived. Prisoners were also negative about induction arrangements. The prison had recognised this as an issue and begun to address it shortly before the inspection but it was too early to judge whether this had led to an improvement. The induction process relied heavily on prisoner peer mentors and this needed effective supervision to ensure all parts were delivered appropriately.

Kirklevington Grange has a unique and important specialist role. It performs this role very well although there is absolutely no room for complacency. It holds a more complex population than before and the risks inherent in its work will always need careful management. The prison's future role under the transforming rehabilitation agenda was not sufficiently clear at the time of this inspection but as we have said in the past, it should not be seen as an anomaly but a highly effective model from which other parts of the prison system could learn.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2015

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

Category D resettlement prison for adult men

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

Public

**Region/Department**

North East

**Number held**

273

**Certified normal accommodation**

303

**Operational capacity**

303

**Date of last full inspection**

9 - 13 May 2011

**Brief history**

Kirklevington opened as a junior detention centre in 1962, continuing in that role until it became a young offender institution in 1988. In 1992, it closed briefly and opened in October 1992 as a specialist resettlement prison.

In 2008 an additional housing block was built increasing the population to 283. In 2013 20 rooms were doubled up due to population pressures, taking the total operational capacity to 303.

**Short description of residential units**

A, B, C, G, H, J and R units – single rooms in the main building situated off the main corridors on the ground and upper floors

D and E units – 40 single rooms in two modern, prefabricated buildings

K unit – 40 single rooms in a modern, prefabricated building

L unit – 60 single rooms with en suite shower, toilet and sink. It is the newest residential unit opened in 2008.

F unit has double rooms and accommodates 40.

**Name of governor/director**

Steven Robson

**Escort contractor**

GeoAmey

**Health service provider**

Care UK

From April 2015 providers will be as follows:

GP and pharmacy services – Spectrum Healthcare

Dental services – Burgess & Hyder

Community care services – G4S  
Non-clinical substance misuse services – Lifeline  
Mental health services – TEWV  
Support services – G4S

**Learning and skills providers**

The Manchester College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Nick Flight

# About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## This 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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** *Prisoners were not given clear information before admission about what to expect in an open prison. This often led to confusion and frustration. Early days procedures were reasonably good. There was little violence, bullying or self-harm and the prison remained a safe environment. Staff expected high standards of behaviour and antisocial behaviour was not tolerated. There was a perception by some prisoners that being transferred out was used punitively, but we did not find this to be the case. Security procedures were mostly proportionate. Use of the segregation unit and use of force were limited and these interventions were only used when necessary. There was evidence that some illicit drugs were being used by prisoners, but this was managed effectively. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in May 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Kirklevington Grange were good against this healthy prison test. We made three recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved and one had not been achieved.*
- S3** Most prisoners had relatively short journeys to the prison and were admitted at a reasonable time. Too many prisoners arrived without accurate information about the prison and false expectations about how quickly they would be allowed release on temporary licence (ROTL) and this led to unnecessary confusion and frustration.
- S4** Reception remained busy with an extremely high daily throughput. This area was run efficiently, the atmosphere was relaxed and friendly and set a good tone for the rest of the prison. In our survey, most prisoners were positive about their treatment in reception, and new arrivals did not spend too long there. Prisoner feedback about induction was relatively poor. The induction arrangements had changed in December 2014, shortly before the inspection, but it was too early to assess whether improvements had been made.
- S5** There were very few incidents of violence and bullying, prisoners felt safe and reported low levels of victimisation. Interventions to deal with suspected bullying were prompt and effective and victims were supported well. Prisoners were given an unambiguous message about the standard of behaviour expected of them and most prisoners responded well to this. When poor conduct did occur, staff dealt with it appropriately.
- S6** Prisoners at risk of self-harm were looked after well. ACCT<sup>2</sup> documentation, and planning and support for the low number of ACCT cases were good. The only prisoner who had self-harmed during the six months before the inspection commented very favourably on the support he had received. Discussions at the safer custody team meeting were not sufficiently focused on learning lessons from the few incidents which did occur.
- S7** We were satisfied that staff were able to identify and provide good support to the most vulnerable adults at risk, although they were not fully aware of broader safeguarding policy and practice. This gap needed to be addressed when the prison reviewed its work in preparation for the imminent introduction of new care legislation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm

- S8 With the exception of some unnecessary routine strip-searching, security arrangements were proportionate and effective in managing the complex population. The positive relationships between staff and prisoners helped to ensure there was a good flow of intelligence. Despite prisoner perceptions, transfers back to closed conditions were only carried out when it was unavoidable. The establishment was fully aware of the challenges of reducing the supply of Subutex and Spice<sup>3</sup> and had produced a robust strategy, involving intelligence gathering, searching and testing.
- S9 Formal disciplinary measures were used infrequently and they were carried out fairly. Records of adjudications had improved since the last inspection and an effective quality assurance system was now in place. Force was not used very often, but when it did occur, use of force documentation was well completed. The segregation unit was basic and clean and was used only for short periods to accommodate prisoners returning to closed conditions.
- S10 The drug and alcohol recovery team provided a good service to a relatively small number of prisoners in recovery, but more needed to be done to engage with longer-sentenced prisoners and those who were still using drugs.

## Respect

*S11 Living conditions for all prisoners were at least reasonable and good for more than half the population. Relationships between staff and prisoners were consistently very good. Work on diversity remained positive. Prisoners' basic spiritual needs were adequately met, but the role of the chaplaincy was now more limited. Replies to formal complaints were reasonable. Prisoners were not routinely able to see their solicitors in private. Prisoners were positive about the quality of health care but processes to ensure that emergency equipment was fully functioning were not effective. Prisoners generally liked the food, but were not able to cater for themselves. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

*S12 At the last inspection in May 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Kirklevington Grange were good against this healthy prison test. We made nine recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>4</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, one had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S13 External areas of the establishment were pleasant and well maintained and prisoners had free access to them. Living conditions for most prisoners were good, although in the older accommodation some cells and communal areas required decoration and some association equipment needed replacing. Prisoners had good access to laundry facilities and could shower daily, but some showers required refurbishment. The application system was effective and prisoners had good access to telephones.
- S14 Staff-prisoner relationships were very good; in our survey, prisoners reported positively about staff across most indicators and we saw many examples of constructive engagement across the prison to support this view. Prisoners knew their personal officers and personal officer entries in P-Nomis electronic case notes were better than we usually see. Consultation arrangements were effective.

<sup>3</sup> A so-called 'legal high' or new psychoactive substance which induces effects akin to cannabis

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

- S15 Equality and diversity outcomes were good with a responsive and professional staff group. The standard of discrimination incident report form investigations was satisfactory and there was evidence of good follow-up work. Prisoners in protected groups reported an absence of discrimination and many described receiving good support. Nevertheless, consultation and engagement with community support groups needed improvement. Engaging and innovative events had been organised to celebrate diversity and some noteworthy work had been carried out involving veterans. The needs of older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities were largely met, but more attention was needed to providing activities for this group. No foreign national prisoners liable to deportation had been held in the establishment in the year before the inspection and there was no clear reason for this.
- S16 Basic spiritual support for prisoners was available for a range of faiths, but the involvement of chaplains in wider prison life was more limited than previously. Chaplains continued to be involved in family days and work with veterans and had begun to develop links with religious communities in prisoners' home areas.
- S17 Given the small scale of the establishment and the close relationships between staff and prisoners, contentious issues were frequently resolved informally. Formal complaints were generally responded to appropriately. Quality assurance had been reintroduced and this was helping to improve the standard of investigations and responses to complaints. Problems with property following transfer was the main reason for prisoners to complain, and some work had been carried out locally and with other prisons in the north east to try to resolve this. Some prisoners expressed a reluctance to make complaints for fear of being transferred out, but this concern was not borne out in the cases we examined.
- S18 Although offender supervisors and the North East Prison After Care Society (NEPACS) worker could provide support for prisoners with specific legal needs, this service was not well promoted. Prisoners were not routinely able to see their legal representatives in private.
- S19 Overall, health care services were reasonably good and prisoners we spoke to were very satisfied with the quality of health care they had received. Partnership working and some aspects of clinical governance remained good, although clinical supervision needed to be formalised. Some items in the emergency bag were out of date and the monitoring system was not robust. Once reported, these weaknesses were rectified within 24 hours.
- S20 There was an appropriate range of primary care services with very prompt access to a GP and a nurse. Hospital appointments were well managed with prisoners appropriately attending external appointments on their own or with an escort, subject to risk assessment. A full range of dental services was available with good access to prison and community dental practices. There was a clear pathway for referring and treating prisoners with mental health problems, which met the needs of the population.
- S21 The quality of the food was good and quantity was sufficient. The kitchen catered well for a range of diets and suggestions made by prisoners were responded to. There were still no self-catering facilities.

## Purposeful activity

**S22** *Although the scheduled time unlocked had reduced slightly, prisoners were still able to spend ample time out of their cells. The vast majority of prisoners were employed in good quality purposeful activity. The range of external paid employment, community service, college courses and training for prisoners was very good and had expanded significantly since the last inspection. Quality improvement and monitoring arrangements for learning, skills and work and the use of data were improving but still at an early stage of development. The quality of teaching and learning was mostly good. Pass rates for the few prisoners on English or mathematics courses were also mostly good. The number of prisoners gaining employment after release was high but their wider employability, personal and social skills were not yet being developed actively enough. Facilities in the library were adequate. The PE facilities were good but had reached the stage where they needed refurbishment.*  
**Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.**

**S23** *At the last inspection in May 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Kirklevington Grange were good against this healthy prison test. We made six recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*

**S24** There had been a slight reduction in time out of cell since the previous inspection with a mixed response to this from prisoners. All prisoners retained very good amounts of time out of their cell every day and, except for roll checks, had free movement around the prison.

**S25** An increasingly wide range of education, training and employment opportunities was provided for prisoners before release and the number of sustainable employment and training outcomes achieved was high. Working relationships with external employers, the voluntary sector and post-release support agencies were very effective. Partnership working in the prison was highly collaborative.

**S26** A very effective management information system had been developed by prisoners. This greatly assisted managers when making decisions about planning and scheduling ROTL arrangements. The allocation process to vocational training, community work and employment was efficient and well informed.

**S27** Quality improvement arrangements lacked focus and urgency; they were being devolved from the region to the prison but this was still at a very early stage. Prisoners' views were considered carefully and positive responses were made to a number of issues. The self-assessment report (SAR) was too long, descriptive and repetitive. The current quality improvement action plan was not linked closely enough to the SAR.

**S28** A very good, and growing, range of purposeful activity was available inside and outside the prison, more than enough for the number of prisoners. There was no unemployment. The number of paid external employment places for prisoners was high and had doubled since the last inspection. An expanding range of vocational activities was now offered in well-equipped workshops in the prison. Few classroom-based courses were offered but this was planned to increase.

**S29** The prison and Offenders' Learning and Skills Service provider did not promote early enough to prisoners the available pathways and the impact of the support, education, training, voluntary and employment options. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in education and vocational sessions was mostly good but a few sessions lacked sufficient challenge for prisoners.

- S30 Teachers in the best sessions worked productively and closely with the often very small cohorts of prisoners enrolled. Teachers used information technology well. Prisoners' behaviour in classrooms and workshops was mostly excellent. Verbal feedback to prisoners in classroom sessions on the progress they were making was good. Written feedback was not always detailed or specific enough.
- S31 The system for recognising and recording prisoners' progress and achievement in voluntary work or paid employment was not well developed. Communication and liaison with employers about how best to develop prisoners' personal or professional skills while in employment were limited. However, just over 80% of prisoners had entered employment or training on release in the past year and just over three-quarters of these men had entered employment or training directly related to their ROTL experience.
- S32 Pass rates were very high on vocational courses and in some cases had risen significantly over the past two years. Pass rates were generally high or very high for those prisoners who completed their classroom-based, education courses.
- S33 The library service was fit for purpose and popular but opening times were limited and did not include weekends. The number of registered borrowers was high (93%). The number of visits each month was also high, but the loan rate was relatively low. The range of stock was varied and adequate. A good range of activities helped promote literacy, including reading groups.
- S34 Prisoners' participation rate in PE was good. Staffing and opportunities to use the gym were also good. Gym and exercise sessions were timetabled to accommodate the needs of prisoners who were out during the day. The range of facilities was good but the gym needed refurbishment and the weights area was cramped. Outdoor facilities were well used throughout the year.

## Resettlement

**S35** *The strategic management of resettlement was reasonable, although some of the data used needed updating. Offender management was excellent, there was an effective multidisciplinary approach and prisoners felt well supported. Risk assessments relating to temporary release and public protection were rigorous and much better than we usually see. The support available for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISP) needed to be advertised better. Pathway work was generally effective and extremely good use was made of peer support to sustain this. Useful programme work was being delivered by community probation staff, although it was unclear if this would continue in the light of external changes. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

**S36** *At the last inspection in May 2011, we found that outcomes for prisoners in Kirklevington were good against this healthy prison test. We made eight recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

**S37** There was a reasonable reducing re-offending strategy, incorporating offender management and pathways work. Reducing re-offending meetings took place regularly but attendance was variable. The prisoner needs analysis was up to date, but based only on self-reported information with no OASys (offender assessment system) data. A helpful pathways action plan had been produced, although some information was out of date. The prison's future role under the transforming rehabilitation agenda was not sufficiently clear.

- S38 Offender management was very good and this finding was reinforced by positive feedback from prisoners in our survey and from most of those we spoke to. The level of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was excellent, information flow to and from the offender management unit was good and there was comprehensive use of Nomis by all departments working with prisoners.
- S39 Very good use was made of ROTL to support resettlement and maintain family ties. Risk assessment boards were well informed and decisions were timely and appropriate. Most prisoners had sentence plans, although some were not of sufficiently good quality.
- S40 Public protection procedures were very well managed. The 'whole prison' approach to understanding and implementing risk management was impressive.
- S41 The ISP forum was a promising initiative but poorly attended. Prisoners told us they did not know when meetings were being held. We were concerned to note that, due to a national backlog, 13 prisoners had passed the date of their oral parole hearing.
- S42 Prisoners' immediate needs were assessed on arrival and they were appropriately signposted to available services. The new direction centre was a good initiative and prisoners were supported to play an active and useful role. Prisoners did not have any access to the internet for resettlement opportunities and we were concerned that prisoners were not now allowed to use telephones in the centre for security reasons.
- S43 Shelter provided valued support and information to prisoners in securing accommodation, and prisoners did not leave the establishment homeless.
- S44 The National Careers Service provided by CfBT Education Trust was highly professional and thorough and available to prisoners from an early stage. Advice and guidance focused on realistic and achievable career options. Staffing was stretched to meet the high demand for this service and it was difficult for prisoners to get appointments quickly.
- S45 Joint working arrangements with partners were effective; the range of resettlement services available to prisoners was good. A very high proportion of prisoners entered employment or training on release, mostly closely related to their ROTL activity.
- S46 Pre-release planning for prisoners with physical and mental health needs was timely and effective. There was appropriate liaison with community services to ensure continuity of care.
- S47 Drug and alcohol resettlement work effectively linked some prisoners with community support on release, but the number using the service was low.
- S48 Prisoners were assisted to open bank accounts, which was particularly helpful for those in paid employment. Shelter also helped with managing debt issues.
- S49 The NEPACS family support worker provided a valued service to prisoners across a range of often quite complex family issues. The visitors' centre was a good facility and the visits hall was reasonable with a relaxed atmosphere. Some men had been unable to have a visit at the weekend because the hall was at capacity; the governor was addressing this problem. There were no parenting programmes or other initiatives such as Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children), which was a gap in provision. Consideration was being given to use of Skype for family contact, which we welcomed.

S50 Offending behaviour programmes delivered by the local Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC), mostly in the community, were accessible to prisoners. The sustainability of this was uncertain as ownership of the CRC was changing. There was little other focused work available, such as victim awareness sessions, for prisoners whose offending behaviour needs could not be met by the programmes.

### Main concern and recommendation

S51 **Concern:** Too many men arrived at Kirklevington Grange with no information about the prison or the process and timescales for release on temporary licence opportunities. In some cases they had been provided with inaccurate information by staff at sending prisons, leaving Kirklevington to manage the frustration and disappointment when prisoners' expectations could not be met.

**Recommendation:** All prisoners should be provided with accurate information about Kirklevington Grange before their transfer and, as part of their preparation for transfer to open conditions, should have the opportunity to talk to a member of staff at their sending prison who has the same information.



# 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. Too few prisoners received useful information about the prison before they arrived and this caused confusion and frustration.*

**I.2** The majority of prisoners no longer applied to move to Kirklevington Grange, and were instead allocated by the National Offender Management Service. An average of 24 men a month had arrived during the six months before the inspection. Most journeys were in cellular vans and were relatively short; the prison used its own transport to collect a few prisoners.

**I.3** In our survey, only 8% of respondents said that they had received written information about Kirklevington Grange before their arrival, compared with 14% at other open prisons. Several prisoners we spoke to said staff at their sending prisons had given them inaccurate information about what to expect at Kirklevington. They were disappointed and frustrated when they found it would be months before they would have opportunities to work outside the prison or to take home leave. Managers at Kirklevington were trying to address the problem, but needed full cooperation from sending prisons. A useful information booklet about the prison had been prepared for use by other prisons and members of the offender management unit were visiting sending prisons to talk to their opposite numbers about the Kirklevington regime.

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

**I.4** *Reception processes were organised well and staff and prisoners engaged well. Prisoners were positive in our survey about reception, but more negative about induction arrangements. Induction had been reviewed before the inspection and it was too soon to determine whether it met prisoners' needs more effectively.*

**I.5** The reception area was busy with up to 150 prisoners discharged each day on release on temporary licence (ROTL). The area was small but well organised to deal with the throughput. Staff engaged well with prisoners, including new arrivals. Usually only one prisoner was allowed in reception at a time which offered some privacy in the absence of any private interview rooms.

- I.6** In our survey, most prisoners said they were treated well in reception and few spent long periods there. New arrivals were given £1 pin phone credit and the opportunity to buy a reception pack or telephone credit.
- I.7** All new arrivals were given cells on F wing which had been properly prepared. These cells had all been approved for double occupancy and contained bunk beds and enough furniture for two people. Cell-sharing risk assessments were checked in reception before prisoners were allocated to a double cell. In practice there had been no sharing for several months.
- I.8** Fewer prisoners than at the previous inspection said they felt safe on their first night (88% compared with 98%). Prisoners did not see health care staff until the day after their arrival; this was reflected in survey results which showed that 64% of prisoners said they had access to health care when they first arrived against the comparator of 74%. Fifty per cent said they had access to a Listener (a prisoner trained by the Samaritans to provide support to prisoners in crisis) against the comparator of 38%.
- I.9** Three induction/information orderlies took the lead in preparing accommodation for new arrivals, meeting them in reception and taking them to their first night accommodation. They also made appointments for new arrivals to see health care early the next morning, and answered any questions the new arrivals had. The following day the orderlies took them on a tour of the prison and delivered an induction presentation. We were not assured that oversight to ensure all of this was delivered consistently or was adequate.
- I.10** Prisoners had an induction talk with an officer on the day of their arrival. The session that we observed covered relevant information and was conducted individually. However, we were not confident that all staff conducted the talks one to one or that all prisoners had the chance to discuss any concerns in private.
- I.11** In our survey, 64% of prisoners said that induction told them all they needed to know about the prison against the comparator of 72%. Comments on the survey included: 'There is a lot you have to find out for yourself here about RDR, ROR<sup>5</sup>, community work and courses that are run. You have to find out from word of mouth'.
- I.12** The induction programme had been reviewed shortly before the inspection and it was too early to judge if it was meeting prisoners' needs effectively. The review had included a revision of the information booklet given to prisoners and a change to the departments which prisoners visited during induction. Even so, we were not convinced that all prisoners visited all the departments identified in the induction policy. Prisoners started work in a temporary job the day after they arrived and were allocated to a permanent job at the weekly allocations board.

## Recommendation

- I.13 The management and content of the induction programme should ensure that new arrivals consistently receive all the information they need.**

## Housekeeping point

- I.14** All new prisoners should see an induction officer in private on their first night.

---

<sup>5</sup> Resettlement day release and resettlement overnight leave

## 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** *There were very few incidents of violence and bullying. Prisoners felt safe and reported very low levels of victimisation. Interventions to deal with suspected bullying were prompt and effective. The prison set high standards of behaviour and poor conduct was challenged appropriately.*
- I.16** There were very few incidents of violence and bullying. Prisoners felt safe and reported low levels of victimisation. There had only been one recorded assault on a prisoner in the six months before the inspection and no recorded fights.
- I.17** Two officers who acted as safer custody coordinators conducted most investigations into what were almost all low-level incidents. Intelligence on possible bullying came from a variety of sources and it was clear that the staff group in general was vigilant and aware of indicators of bullying. One prisoner had been placed on a support plan shortly before the inspection after concerns were raised by a staff member who had identified an injury which the prisoner could not explain satisfactorily.
- I.18** During the previous six months, eight victims had been given support plans in which actions were appropriate and follow up was well documented. Six perpetrators had been given anti-bullying plans, which were also well documented. All plans demonstrated timely, effective engagement with victims and perpetrators. Inspectors noted that officers were quick to challenge poor behaviour and prisoners were consistently given the message that high standards of behaviour were expected.
- I.19** The safer custody and violence reduction team met quarterly, chaired by the custodial manager responsible for safer custody. The meeting needed a clearer focus. While data on accident reports and issues arising from security reports were reviewed, there was no systematic collation, presentation and review of information. There was little discussion of individual cases of concern which, given the relatively low number of cases, was a missed opportunity (see section on self-harm and suicide prevention). The last annual anti-bullying survey had been conducted in December 2013.

## 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.20** *ACCT documentation<sup>6</sup> and planning and support for the low number of prisoners who needed ACCTs were good. Discussions at the safer custody team meeting were not sufficiently focused on learning lessons from incidents to help the establishment sustain good outcomes.*

**I.21** Only four prisoners had been placed on ACCTs during the six months before the inspection, much fewer than we see elsewhere. There had been only one incident of self-harm during the same period.

**I.22** The quality of ACCT documentation was good. Case history notes and care maps showed constructive identification and engagement with prisoners' needs, including, for example, proactive steps to secure support from families. Detailed notes demonstrated good ongoing engagement and support. However, there were not enough management checks and not all staff were trained in the ACCT process. The one prisoner who had self-harmed during the previous six months commented very favourably on the support he had received. This appeared to be transformative as within weeks of a serious suicide attempt, he was fully engaged in prison life.

**I.23** In our survey, 74% of prisoners said they could speak to a Listener at any time compared with 60% in similar prisons. Posters promoting the Listeners were displayed around the prison and Listeners we spoke to said that prisoners had no problem seeing a Listener when they needed to.

**I.24** The Samaritans visited monthly and attended the safer custody meetings. These meetings sometimes noted the number of prisoners who had been on ACCTs but without discussion. For example, the prisoner who had attempted suicide had not been discussed and there was a missed opportunity to learn from the case.

### Recommendation

**I.25** **The safer custody meeting should review cases involving violence, bullying or self-harm to learn lessons from them.**

---

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

## Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

### Expected outcomes:

**The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.<sup>7</sup>**

**I.26** *We were satisfied that staff identified and provided good support to the most vulnerable prisoners, but they were not sufficiently aware of broader safeguarding policy and practice.*

**I.27** The health care centre held a generic Care UK safeguarding policy and a useful local inter-agency policy and procedures for safeguarding adults at risk. However, key staff elsewhere in the prison were not aware of these documents. The public protection procedures contained a brief, underdeveloped section on the protection of adults at risk, which did not refer to the inter-agency policy.

**I.28** Staff were not sufficiently aware of broader safeguarding policy and practice and this needed to be addressed. Nevertheless, staff provided good care and support to victims of harassment and prisoners on ACCTs and we were satisfied that they would identify and support the most vulnerable prisoners at risk.

### Recommendation

**I.29** **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.30** *Good staff-prisoner relationships ensured effective dynamic security. The security team was appropriately focused on managing risk in the prison and in the community. With the exception of some routine strip-searching, security arrangements were proportionate and contributed to the effective management of a complex population. The prison was familiar with the challenges of supply reduction and was responding well.*

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

- I.31** The prison was no longer able to select prisoners from other establishments and the population had become more complex. The risks were managed effectively and very good staff-prisoner relationships ensured effective dynamic security. Staff from all areas of the prison interacted well with prisoners, recorded their progress and reported security concerns swiftly (see section on staff-prisoner relationships).
- I.32** The prison was appropriately focused on public protection and the risks associated with ROTL. Almost 22,000 ROTL events had been facilitated during the previous six months and the fact that no prisoner had been unlawfully at large during this time was a credit to the prison.
- I.33** Prisoners told us throughout the week that prisoners were returned to closed conditions inappropriately. We found this was not the case. The prison had returned 107 prisoners to closed conditions during 2014. They had worked hard to keep prisoners at Kirklevington and after reviewing all the well documented decisions to return prisoners to closed conditions in the six months before the inspection we were assured that these decisions were properly made.
- I.34** The security team had received 640 intelligence reports in the previous six months, more than at the time of the previous inspection. These were swiftly analysed by a regional analyst, enabling staff to carry out timely actions. While most security measures were proportionate to the risks posed by a category D population, the routine strip-searching in reception, after visits and in the segregation unit was inappropriate, and restrictions on peer supporters' access to phones was counter productive (see paragraph 4.32).
- I.35** The monthly security meetings were well attended and set appropriate security objectives which were monitored effectively. The prison had developed a good relationship with the police and shared information well.
- I.36** In our survey, 15% of prisoners said it was easy to get alcohol against the comparator of 23%, while results for drugs were broadly the same. Illicit buprenorphine (Subutex) was the most commonly detected drug. In our survey, 5% against the comparator of 2% said they had developed a problem with diverted medication in the prison. The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to November 2014 was low at 3.4%. Suspicion test positive rates were high at 46% from 32 tests in the same period. This indicated effective intelligence gathering and analysis in targeting prisoners who were using drugs.
- I.37** Spice<sup>8</sup>, though undetectable under the current MDT panel, had also been identified as a problem in the establishment. Some prisoners had been returned to closed conditions on the basis of strong intelligence and search evidence.
- I.38** The MDT suite was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped. However, a convex security observation mirror was located only 20cm from the toilet bowl which, in our view, was disrespectful.
- I.39** There were some more imposing physical security measures than at other open prisons, but these had no impact on access to the regime and, with the exception of roll checks, prisoners had free access to all areas of the prison.

---

<sup>8</sup> A highly potent synthetic cannabinoid that is potentially more harmful than cannabis but does not show up in MDT

## Recommendation

- I.40 All security measures should be proportionate and reflect the security status of prisoners at Kirklevington.** (Repeated recommendation I.34)

## Housekeeping point

- I.41** The convex observation mirror in the MDT suite should be located at a higher level to maintain the correct balance of security and decency.

## Incentives and earned privileges<sup>9</sup>

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.42** *An incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme had been introduced since the previous inspection and nearly all prisoners were on the enhanced regime.*

- I.43** Since our last inspection, an IEP scheme had been introduced. The scheme offered the usual differentials between the levels and 92% of prisoners were on the enhanced regime. We found that the scheme had little impact on prisoner behaviour. Prisoners' motivation to comply with the regime remained their wish to stay at Kirklevington to benefit from open conditions and community activities.

## 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.44** *Disciplinary measures were used infrequently. Adjudications were carried out fairly and records had improved. Force was used infrequently and, while the segregation unit was basic, it was only used for short periods for prisoners transferring back to closed conditions.*

## Disciplinary procedures

- I.45** There had been 92 adjudications during the previous six months, fewer than at similar prisons. Most adjudications related to unauthorised items, licence failures and positive MDTs. The adjudication records that we looked at demonstrated that hearings were fair,

<sup>9</sup> 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.

mitigating circumstances were considered and punishments were based on the evidence available.

- I.46** Effective quality assurance on all adjudication records was carried out by the deputy governor. Adjudication data were monitored and discussed at adjudication standardisation meetings. There was no evidence of any unofficial or collective punishments.

### The use of force

- I.47** At the previous inspection, there had been no use of force in the previous three years. While use of force had increased, it remained rare and was almost always used in response to prisoners refusing to transfer. There had been four incidents of use of force during 2014, including two planned incidents. In both cases the application of handcuffs was the only force used. Prison staff told us that these two planned incidents were video recorded and reviewed, but they were unable to locate the recordings for us.
- I.48** Use of force documentation was completed thoroughly and demonstrated that staff were able to deescalate all incidents swiftly. All incidents had resulted in prisoners walking to reception in preparation for transfer.

### Housekeeping point

- I.49** Recordings of planned incidents should be logged and securely stored.

### Segregation

- I.50** The segregation unit was suitable for holding prisoners awaiting transfer to closed conditions. They had daily access to exercise, showers, reading material and telephone calls. The six cells in the unit were all clean, but the in-cell toilets remained inadequately screened.
- I.51** During the previous six months, 26 prisoners had been segregated which was fewer than at the previous inspection. It was inappropriate that prisoners were routinely strip-searched on entry to the segregation unit (see section on security). All prisoners were transferred within 24 hours unless they were segregated at the weekend, when the reception at HMP Holme House was closed.
- I.52** Segregation authorisation documentation and records of prisoner observations were completed thoroughly by staff.

### Housekeeping point

- I.53** Toilets in the segregation unit should be adequately screened.

## 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.54** *The drug and alcohol recovery team provided a good service to a relatively few prisoners in recovery. More needed to be done to engage with longer-term prisoners and those who were still using illicit drugs.*

- I.55** The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) comprised clinical services, provided by Care UK, the primary health care providers, and psychosocial services provided by Phoenix Futures. A partnership manager was also in place, provided by Addaction.
- I.56** DART services were run on a regional cluster model, and some of the DART staff were shared with HMP Holme House.
- I.57** The service was delivered by one full-time worker, a part-time sessional worker and a part-time administrator, overseen by a part-time manager. The DART psychosocial case load stood at 19 prisoners actively receiving treatment, which represented 7% of the population. Compared with other open establishments, this figure was low.
- I.58** Prisoners who were on the case load told us that there was a reticence among indeterminate sentenced prisoners, lifers and younger prisoners who were not in recovery or receiving support, to admit to a drug or alcohol problem for fear of transfer to closed conditions. They also told us that group work was not popular because of a lack of trust in the confidentiality of the groups, which had again given rise to fears of transfer. Consequently, nearly all those on the case load said they preferred to receive one-to-one support.
- I.59** Interventions delivered by the DART included a drop-in support group, a weekly evening drop-in and one-to-one sessions. DART workers also attended ROTL and other risk management boards, but no peer mentors were in place. Prisoners could apply for ROTL to attend local community-based Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous meetings.
- I.60** Information about the dangerous effects of the new psychoactive substances Spice and Black Mamba had been distributed by the DART to staff and prisoners following the emergency transfer of two prisoners to the local hospital in the summer of 2014.
- I.61** An up-to-date substance use strategy was in place, but no needs analysis had been conducted for two years. However, a service user satisfaction survey was conducted twice yearly, most recently in September 2014. The results had not been released by the provider company, Phoenix Futures.
- I.62** The demand for clinical services was very low. Methadone was used as a first-line treatment. At the time of the inspection, three prisoners were receiving opiate substitution treatment, although one was taken off methadone during the inspection for failing a clinical drug test which showed he had used additional opioids as well as methadone. Prisoners we spoke to were unclear about the consequences of such behaviour: many thought it would inevitably result in transfer to closed conditions. However, we were satisfied that DART would attempt to work with the prisoner who would not be transferred unless all other alternatives had been explored.

- I.63** Buprenorphine was not routinely prescribed as it is not part of the North East Prisons protocol.
- I.64** In our survey, only 75% of prisoners who had received help for drug and alcohol problems said the support had been helpful against the comparator of 90% and 100% at the previous inspection.

### Recommendations

- I.65** The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) should develop an internal peer support scheme for prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems.
- I.66** In partnership with prison staff, the DART should develop a strategy to broaden the range and ease of access to psychosocial substance use treatment.
- I.67** Prescribing regimes for substance-dependent prisoners should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidance.

### Housekeeping point

- I.68** Clear pathways should be published to prisoners and staff, outlining the consequences of non-engagement with clinical treatment regimes.

## 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 pleasant and well maintained. Living conditions for most prisoners were good, although some cells and communal areas required decoration and some association equipment needed replacing. Access to telephones, showers and laundry facilities was good. The application system was effective.*
- 2.2** The external areas of the prison were attractive and well maintained and prisoners had very good access to them.
- 2.3** All prisoners were given keys to their cells; the quality of cellular accommodation varied but was reasonably good for nearly all prisoners. Bunk beds had been added to cells on J unit, the induction unit, although due to the low roll at the time of the inspection no prisoners were sharing a cell. Cells and communal areas on F unit required decoration and prisoners complained that they were cold at night. In contrast most prisoners lived in good conditions with en suite shower and toilets on D, E and L units. The rest of the accommodation was reasonable but some cells and communal areas required painting. Communal showers in the older part of the prison, particularly those on F unit, required replacing and the prison had applied for funding to undertake this work.
- 2.4** Association areas were available for all prisoners but much of the equipment required repair or replacement. All prisoners had access to microwaves and toasters but there were no self-catering facilities in any location.
- 2.5** In our survey, a minority of prisoners said they received clean sheets and cell cleaning materials each week. However, we found cells and communal areas throughout the prison to be clean and prisoners had good access to laundry facilities. All prisoners could wear their own clothes and access to showers, letters and telephones was good.
- 2.6** Many issues that would normally go through the application system were dealt with informally and it was positive that prisoners had access to officers on the information desk who could deal with minor issues. The application system itself worked well; applications were processed quickly and responses were reasonable.

### Recommendations

- 2.7** **Prisoners' complaints of being cold on the induction unit should be investigated and addressed.**
- 2.8** **Cells and communal areas requiring decoration should be painted and communal showers in the older units should be replaced.**

- 2.9 Association equipment that is in a poor condition should be repaired or replaced.**

## 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.**

**2.10** *Staff-prisoner relationships were very good and we saw many examples of positive engagement across the prison. Personal officer work was also good and consultation arrangements were effective.*

**2.11** Staff-prisoner relationships were very good; in our survey more prisoners than at comparable prisons said staff treated them with respect and that they had a member of staff they could turn to for help. During the inspection we saw positive, friendly and professional interaction between staff and prisoners at all times and staff and prisoners exclusively used preferred names to each other.

**2.12** Consultation arrangements were effective. The governor and senior management team attended monthly 'prisoner question time' sessions and we found examples of good informal consultation in many areas of the prison.

**2.13** In our survey, 92% of prisoners said they had a personal officer and 80% of these said their personal officer was helpful or very helpful. The use of P-Nomis case notes to record prisoner progress was exceptional and we saw detailed, informed entries by personal officers, offender supervisors and activities staff. The good relationships and detailed records supported other activities, particularly the work of security and the offender management unit (see sections on security and resettlement).

### Good practice

**2.14** *Staff across the prison used P-Nomis case notes to record prisoner progress. This created a comprehensive record of prisoner behaviour and achievements.*

## Equality and diversity

### Expected outcomes:

**The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic<sup>10</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.**

**2.15** *Equality and diversity outcomes for prisoners were good and there was a well led, responsive and professional staff group. We were satisfied that many individual problems were identified and addressed quickly, without recourse to formal processes. The quality of discrimination incident report form (DIRF) investigations and outcomes was satisfactory. Prisoners in protected groups reported an absence of discrimination and felt well supported.*

### Strategic management

- 2.16** Equality outcomes for prisoners were good. A well led, accessible and professional staff group were knowledgeable about the population and individuals with particular diversity needs. Problems were identified and addressed quickly without recourse to formal processes, such as applications and DIRFs.
- 2.17** There was a clear management structure for equality work. The deputy governor was responsible for promoting and managing equality, supported by an equality officer and management leads for each protected characteristic. Policy and action planning covered all minority groups and was purposeful and effective. There were eight prisoner equality representatives who were well known to prisoners. However, they received no training and did not meet regularly as a group.
- 2.18** The single equality and diversity action team (SEAT) meeting had recently moved to a quarterly meeting cycle, which was adequate given the good prisoner access to informal means of resolving equality issues. Prisoner representatives attended the meetings, but there was no community equality partner, despite efforts to find one. There was some evidence of matters being carried forward to subsequent meetings before they were finally resolved, but, overall, the minutes showed good engagement with equality issues.
- 2.19** The SEAT meeting considered data from the new equality monitoring tool produced by NOMS. Staff had justifiable concerns about the tool which had been introduced without guidance or training and was not readily understood by most staff and prisoners. The analysis of data was not adjusted to reflect the population of each prison: to ameliorate this, a bespoke monitoring system had been developed in the establishment which, while commendable, should not have been necessary.
- 2.20** Fifteen DIRFs had been submitted in 2014. Responses to them had been quality checked by the deputy governor, but none by an external partner. DIRF investigations that we looked at were satisfactory and there was evidence of good follow up and outcomes.

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

- 2.21 During the year before the inspection, there had been regular consultation meetings for older prisoners and two meetings for prisoners with disabilities. There was also a regular support group for veterans. There had been an ad hoc meeting with black and minority ethnic prisoners to discuss arrangements for Black History Month and one with Muslim prisoners on arrangements for Ramadan.
- 2.22 Links with community support agencies needed development for some protected groups. Nevertheless, a series of engaging and innovative events celebrating diversity had taken place with community agencies, in particular for veterans.
- 2.23 Staff training on equality and diversity was delivered through the standard Civil Service e-learning package which did not adequately address the complex issues often faced by staff.

## Recommendation

- 2.24 **NOMS should review the impact of the new equality monitoring tool to ensure that it meets the needs of all prisons. Training in its use should be provided.**

## Housekeeping points

- 2.25 Consultation should take place with protected groups to a level consistent with their needs, taking account of the potential for less formal approaches.
- 2.26 Links should be developed with community support agencies for prisoners in protected groups.

## Protected characteristics

- 2.27 During induction, each prisoner completed an equality questionnaire with his offender supervisor in a confidential setting. Data on the breakdown of the population by protected characteristic corresponded broadly to what prisoners reported in our survey.
- 2.28 In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners reported treatment broadly similar to white prisoners across a range of questions. The survey result for respect for religious beliefs was significantly more favourable than in comparable prisons. While prisoners in our black and minority ethnic group had concerns about their treatment, they did not attribute these to discrimination.
- 2.29 Older prisoners, those with disabilities and veterans felt similarly about respect and support from staff. The prisoners we spoke to felt well supported. Three prisoners with disabilities had personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs). Although PEEP documentation was cursory, we were satisfied following discussions with staff and the prisoners concerned that they would be assisted in the event of an emergency.
- 2.30 One prisoner with a disability had a practical care plan. We were impressed by detailed written staff observations which demonstrated that it was kept under regular review as the prisoner's needs changed. There was some evidence of prisoners not approaching staff about emerging needs and further use of care plans could have been considered.
- 2.31 Not enough activities were planned for older prisoners and those with disabilities, although there were plans to address this, for example, an over-50s club.

- 2.32** No foreign national prisoners liable to deportation had been transferred to the prison in the previous year, which had been the case at the previous inspection. This was attributed in part to the relatively low numbers of such prisoners in 'feeder prisons' in the north east. Kirklevington Grange no longer had control over which prisoners were transferred there, but we remained concerned about potential discrimination elsewhere in the system regarding the transfer to open conditions and rehabilitation of this group.
- 2.33** Arrangements for the support of gay and bisexual prisoners were good, although links with community support agencies for this group needed improvement.

## Recommendation

- 2.34** **The reasons for foreign national prisoners liable to deportation not being transferred to Kirklevington Grange should be investigated to ensure that prisoners in this group are being treated fairly and in accordance with policy.**

## Housekeeping point

- 2.35** Personal emergency evacuation plans should describe clearly the assistance a prisoner would require in the event of an emergency and who should provide it.

## 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.**

**2.36** *Chaplains had less involvement in prison meetings than previously. Opportunities for worship and the provision of pastoral care remained adequate for most religions. Chaplains represented a range of faiths.*

- 2.37** There was no longer a coordinating chaplain which had reduced the involvement of chaplains at some establishment meetings. A good range of chaplains covered most faiths on site apart from on Saturdays when an on-call arrangement was in place. Chaplains of other faiths attended when requested. The chaplaincy monitored the religious profile of the population to ensure that provision met the need. Services took place weekly.
- 2.38** The faith and peace centre was appropriately equipped for group worship by all faiths and for private contemplation. The centre was adequate for the number of prisoners who attended corporate worship. Events that were likely to be more popular were held in the visits hall.
- 2.39** The faith and peace centre was complemented by a world faith room in the main building. Both rooms were open for use during the day. Faith discussion and study groups took place weekly for Christians and Muslims. One-to-one support was offered to prisoners in crisis, or those who had suffered bereavement or other bad news. There was good support for veterans.
- 2.40** Arrangements for Ramadan had been good and prisoners who wished to do so were able to observe the fast.

- 2.41** Although the family support worker role was no longer taken by a chaplain, a member of the team continued to be involved in family days and the coordination of a visitors' scheme for prisoners who did not receive visits. Work was being developed to link men with local religious communities after release.

## 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.**

- 2.42** *More complaints had been submitted than at the previous inspection, despite some prisoners' concern that making complaints could lead to them being transferred out. Quality assurance had been reintroduced and was helping to improve the quality of investigation of complaints and responses to them.*

- 2.43** During the six months before the inspection, 106 complaints had been made compared with 66 in a year at the previous inspection. Loss of property was the most common cause for complaint; work had been undertaken locally and regionally to try to address the issue. Some prisoners believed that making complaints led to a transfer out and they were reluctant to use the complaints system. Our check on prisoners transferred out in 2014 against those who had made complaints did not reveal any basis for this perception.

- 2.44** Complaint forms were freely accessible. Quality assurance of responses to complaints had been reintroduced before the inspection. This had helped to improve the investigation of, and replies to, complaints.

- 2.45** Prisoners had the opportunity to resolve issues informally and we saw this happen during the inspection.

## 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.**

- 2.46** *There was no identified legal services officer, or information for prisoners about where to get help with legal matters. On-site legal visits arrangements did not offer sufficient privacy.*

- 2.47** Legal services were usually required for civil matters; few prisoners had outstanding matters relating to their conviction or sentence. There was no nominated legal services officer or information for prisoners on where to go for advice. Legal support was provided by offender supervisors and the NEPACS worker, but it was not clear if prisoners knew about this. Plans to address these gaps were developed as soon as they were pointed out to managers.

- 2.48** Prisoners who were released on temporary licence were encouraged to see their legal advisers outside the establishment. Legal visits took place in the main visits hall during weekday social visits. Attempts were made to ensure that legal visits were separated from social visits but this did not provide adequate confidentiality.

## Recommendation

- 2.49** Legal visits at the establishment should take place in private.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.50** Sources of legal support should be advertised around the prison.

## 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.**

- 2.51** *Health care services were reasonably good and prisoners we spoke to were very satisfied with the quality of health care. Partnership working and many aspects of clinical governance were effective, although formal clinical supervision was needed. Most items in the emergency bag were out of date and the monitoring system was not robust. There was an appropriate range of primary care services with very prompt access to a GP and a nurse. The health centre met infection control standards. Medicines management was good although some areas required review. Hospital appointments were well managed. A full range of dental services was available. There was a clear pathway for referring and treating prisoners with mental health problems which met the need of the population.*

## Governance arrangements

- 2.52** Health services were commissioned by NHS England and provided by Care UK.
- 2.53** The health needs assessment was out of date and a new assessment was in hand. Health services had recently been retendered and several contracts had been agreed to start from April 2015. This had caused some anxiety among staff but had not affected the delivery of care. Working relationships between commissioners, the prison and provider were good. Well attended clinical governance and partnership board meetings covered all essential areas. Service user feedback was very positive and audits were shared with health staff and informed service delivery. An accessible confidential health care complaints system was in place and there had been one complaint since July 2013. Several letters and cards had been received from prisoners complimenting health care staff on the care and kindness they had received.

- 2.54** The health care centre operated like a small community health centre. It delivered a part-time service from 8am to 1pm every weekday with an early evening clinic on Thursday for prisoners who worked. Additional time was available in the afternoon for staff to carry out administration and attend meetings. One hour was allocated on Saturday and Sunday mornings to administer methadone if required. The service was not suitable for prisoners requiring 24-hour nursing care.
- 2.55** There was a core team of experienced nurses and an administration manager and additional support, including an inpatient facility, was provided by HMP Holme House if required. Mandatory training was well managed and staff had access to other clinical training. Staff said that informal management and clinical supervision took place. However, this was not always recorded and it was unclear if the needs of the individual or the establishment were being met.
- 2.56** Staff used relevant reference material and there was an appropriate range of policies including safeguarding, information sharing and palliative care.
- 2.57** Emergency resuscitation equipment held in the health centre included an automated external defibrillator (AED). We found that most items in the emergency bag were past their expiry date and there was no effective monitoring system. This was rectified within 24 hours once it was brought to the attention of the head of health care.
- 2.58** AEDs were located in the control room, gymnasium and on K unit. All the AED pads<sup>11</sup> were out of date. Signs were still in place indicating that there was an AED on L unit although it had been relocated to K unit in 2013. First aid training had been completed by 24% of custody staff and 8% had been trained in the use of AEDs. Further training was planned so that appropriately trained staff were present on each shift.
- 2.59** There was a health care lead for older prisoners and occupational therapy equipment was available for prisoners requiring mobility and health aids. Age-appropriate screening programmes were available, including bowel cancer screening.
- 2.60** Health promotion was delivered during clinics. Some health promotion material was available in the health centre, but very little health and wellbeing promotion information was displayed on the units.
- 2.61** Waiting times for smoking cessation services were very short and access to immunisations and screening for blood-borne viruses was good. Condoms were readily available at reception and from the health centre.

## Recommendations

- 2.62 Health care staff should have regular access to individual management and clinical supervision and this should be recorded.**
- 2.63 The emergency resuscitation equipment should be in good order with an effective monitoring system in place. Sufficient discipline staff should be trained in the use of automated external defibrillators.**

---

<sup>11</sup> Pads with electrode sensors to enhance conductivity of the electric shock

## Housekeeping points

- 2.64** The defibrillator signs should accurately reflect the locations in which they are placed.
- 2.65** Health promotion material, including mental health and wellbeing information, should be displayed on the notice boards on the units.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.66** In our survey, 82% of prisoners were satisfied with the overall quality of health services against the comparator of 61%.
- 2.67** Health care staff participated in the pre-admission assessment of prisoners to ensure that continuity of care could be provided. The initial health screening for new arrivals was undertaken by a registered nurse and a screening tool was used to identify immediate health needs, including mental health and learning disability. If the prisoner arrived after the health centre had closed in the afternoon, this was undertaken the following day and any urgent needs discussed with the health team at HMP Holme House. Anyone on medication or needing to see a GP was seen within 48 hours and more urgently if required. An in-depth health assessment followed within five days.
- 2.68** The range of clinics included nurse-led drop-in clinics, primary care clinics each weekday morning and a fortnightly sexual health clinic. A GP attended three days a week and a nurse prescriber took clinics on the remaining week days, including one evening clinic for workers. There was a well managed appointment system with short waiting times and effective triage. Community podiatry, physiotherapy and optician services were available to prisoners.
- 2.69** There was a systematic approach to the management of long-term conditions, including asthma and diabetes, and these were treated and monitored individually. There was a long-term conditions register. Most prisoners attended their appointments and were encouraged to make informed health choices.
- 2.70** An electronic clinical record (SystemOne) was used and entries in patient records were of a good standard and audited every six months. Staff used assessment templates which reflected national clinical guidance, although the care planning function on SystemOne needed further development.
- 2.71** External hospital appointments were well managed with prompt referrals. Prisoners attended hospital appointments on their own or with an escort subject to risk assessment.

## Housekeeping point

- 2.72** The care planning templates on SystemOne should be used more.

## Pharmacy

- 2.73** Medicines were supplied and dispensed each weekday by the pharmacy at Holme House in a timely manner. Medicine was collected from the health care centre and the prisoner and nurse signed a printed script to verify receipt. All newly arrived prisoners on medication saw a GP for a medication review within 48 hours. Prisoners were responsible for re-ordering their own prescriptions to prepare them for release. Medicines were supplied appropriately

with patient information leaflets. Discontinued and out-of-date medication was recorded and sent back to the pharmacy.

- 2.74** There was an appropriate range of policies and procedures, but the in-possession policy did not reflect practice and not all standard operational procedures had been signed by staff. The bimonthly medicines and therapeutics committee had appropriate representatives who reviewed medication related incidents and the prescribing of tradable medicines. Drug alerts were implemented and there was a prescribing formulary. A limited range of medications was supplied through patient group directives (PGDs)<sup>12</sup>, although this was being extended.
- 2.75** A pharmacist visited the prison monthly to oversee medicines management arrangements. There was no pharmacy clinic. All medicines were stored in a refrigerator because the temperature of the clinical room could not be controlled adequately to ensure their integrity and suitability for use. Medication which had to be kept at between 2 and 8 degrees was stored in a separate refrigerator, but records showed the temperature had regularly gone below 2 degrees.
- 2.76** Pre-dispensed doses of methadone were supplied against a prescription on a named patient basis and administered by a single nurse. This was not within best practice guidelines which recommended a second person to check. Three clinical incidents had been reported during the previous six months: two related to incorrect doses of methadone and the other was a controlled drug recording issue. Tramadol was still supplied in possession contrary to recent legal changes of classification to a Schedule 3 controlled drug, although this was under review.
- 2.77** Medication stored in the emergency cupboard had been over labelled and some had been pre-packed by Holme House which did not have an appropriate licence for this.
- 2.78** There was appropriate provision of medication for prisoners being discharged or transferred.

## Recommendations

- 2.79** A local in-possession policy should be introduced by the medicines and therapeutics committee.
- 2.80** The ambient temperature of the medication room should be monitored to ensure that it provides an appropriate environment for medicines to be stored.
- 2.81** The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the administration of methadone by a single nurse which contravenes best practice and the guidance for handling Tramadol should be followed.
- 2.82** Over-labelled stock should be supplied by a company with an appropriate licence.

## Housekeeping points

- 2.83** Staff should read and sign all the medication procedures and policies.

---

<sup>12</sup> Enable the supply and administration of prescription-only medicine by persons other than a doctor or pharmacist, usually a nurse

- 2.84** Corrective action should be taken when records show that heat-sensitive items stored in drug refrigerators are outside the 2–8°C range; this should be routinely monitored.

## Dentistry

- 2.85** In our survey, 73% of prisoners were satisfied with the quality of dental services against the comparator of 51%. Weymouth Dental Services took a weekly dental clinic in a well equipped dental facility on site. A full range of treatments was provided and there were no waiting lists. Most prisoners used a local community dental surgery, which provided an out-of-hours service.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.86** Mental health services were provided by Tees, Esk and Wear Valley NHS Foundation Trust. The mental health team based at Holme House provided a responsive service and were available as required. There was a clear pathway for referring and treating prisoners with mental health problems which met the needs of the population. Referrals were made by members of the health care team and prison staff.
- 2.87** Following referral, an initial mental health assessment was carried out within two working days and more urgent assessments could be made if required, including weekends and evenings. An appropriate range of support was available, including self help and guidance, cognitive behavioural therapy and access to a psychiatrist. There was a physical care pathway clinic to ensure physical health checks were carried out for this vulnerable client group. The current caseload for the team was 11 and these included prisoners on antipsychotic medication and individuals with anxiety disorders.
- 2.88** Mind, a third sector organisation, delivered counselling services, although waiting times had increased to up to 24 weeks while a new counsellor was recruited. A replacement had been appointed and was awaiting security clearance.
- 2.89** There were no prisoners with serious and enduring mental health problems at the time of our inspection but there was a suitable protocol for referral in conjunction with Holme House. This had been used effectively in July 2014 to provide appropriate 24-hour care and treatment.

## 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.**

- 2.90** *While the number of prisoners who were positive about the food had reduced, it remained higher than at similar prisons. The quality and quantity of the food was good, the kitchen catered for a range of diets and was responsive to prisoners' suggestions.*

- 2.91** In our survey, 56% of prisoners said that the food was good or very good compared with 79% at the previous inspection. This was still higher than the comparator of 37%. The budget for food had reduced to £1.96 per prisoner per day and the prison was unable to use local suppliers. Despite this, we found that the food remained good. The menu operated on a four-week cycle and catered for a range of religious and medical diets. Prisoners selected meals three days in advance and new prisoners were given a choice of meals as soon as they arrived. With the exception of breakfast which prisoners took back to their cells, prisoners ate in a large dining hall using ceramic plates and metal cutlery.
- 2.92** The kitchen was well managed, prisoners working there were appropriately trained and could achieve vocational qualifications. A late evening meal was provided in the dining hall for prisoners working outside the prison. This was commendable and we were concerned about plans to stop it.
- 2.93** Formal consultation arrangements were not well used, but we were confident that the kitchen was responsive to prisoners' suggestions. Prisoners remained unable to cook for themselves on any of the units, which was a missed opportunity in an open prison with such a strong resettlement focus.

## Recommendation

- 2.94** **Prisoners should have additional facilities to cook for themselves.** (Repeated recommendation 2.103)

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.95** *Arrangements to buy items from the shop and catalogues were efficient. The range of items and catalogues broadly met prisoners' needs.*

- 2.96** Prisoners had weekly access to the shop. Orders were distributed on Wednesday evenings. Prisoners who were working out could collect their items from staff when they returned to the prison.
- 2.97** In our survey, 67% against the comparator of 48% said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. There were regular opportunities to change items on the shop list through consultation with prisoners and it was clear that items were being changed in response to feedback.
- 2.98** Prisoners could no longer routinely arrange to bring back items from home leave or town visits. Instead, they had access to a range of catalogues for ordering items. They could also order magazines and newspapers.

## 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.<sup>13</sup>**

**3.1** *Prisoners continued to spend most of their time out of their cells. They had free movement around most areas of the prison apart from daily roll checks.*

**3.2** Prisoners were able to spend most of their time out of their cells. The core day started at 7.30am with a roll check and prisoners were not required to return to their cells until 10.30pm. Previously, prisoners had not had to be in their cells until midnight at weekends and the change to 10.30pm prompted mixed views from prisoners we spoke to. A small number of prisoners who returned from work after this time were not able to access communal areas to heat up their meals. Prisoners were able to work outside the prison provided they were on site between midnight and 5am.

**3.3** Prisoners had free movement around the prison with roll checks in their cells at set times between 6.30am and 8pm. All prisoners were in some form of employment. The range of recreational facilities in the evenings and at weekends was adequate, although some were in need of refurbishment.

### 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.**

**3.4** *The prison's strategy of providing effective resettlement options for prisoners before release was successful. The range of paid employment, community service, college courses and training options available to prisoners was very good and had expanded significantly since the last inspection. Quality improvement and performance management arrangements for learning and skills activities were reasonably effective at a strategic level but at an early stage of development. The quality of teaching and learning was good. Prisoners' pass rates on educational and vocational courses were good. The number entering employment after release was high but the quality of prisoners' individual employability, personal and social skills was not being developed actively enough. The library facilities were adequate. The PE facilities were good but needed refurbishment.*

**3.5** *Ofsted<sup>14</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

<sup>13</sup> Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

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

## Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.6** Prison managers and staff focused resolutely and successfully on the strategy of providing effective resettlement pathways for prisoners before release and maximising the number of sustainable employment and training outcomes for prisoners after release. The prison could no longer select which prisoners joined the prison but had managed very well the consequent change to a sometimes less cooperative prisoner profile without detriment to the achievement of the strategy. Funding streams were sourced and managed effectively and the impact of budget cuts had been mitigated well.
- 3.7** The initiatives of prison managers and productive partnerships had developed and expanded the range of paid employment, community service, college courses and training options available to prisoners before and after release. Collaborative working in the prison was generally effective and was being developed further. The education and vocational training provision by The Manchester College (TMC) was good.
- 3.8** A prisoner-led team had developed an accurate, comprehensive and regularly updated range of data on prisoners' activity, skills and availability; this formed the heart of the release on temporary licence system (ROTL). The team produced accurate daily activity and allocation reports which prison managers relied on heavily for making decisions about administrative, scheduling and planning issues.
- 3.9** The allocations process for vocational training, community work and employment was efficient and well informed. Prisoners' applications and waiting lists for vocational and educational options were managed fairly but not all prisoners knew how to apply for the options available to them. Many were concerned that risk assessments for paid employment they had arranged themselves took too long to be completed.
- 3.10** Quality improvement arrangements for learning, skills and employment were largely managed in a number of external regional strategic forums, including a quality improvement group. This approach lacked urgency and focus. The formal quality improvement group focused too much on operational matters; the operation and remit of the group were under review.
- 3.11** Performance management, monitoring and quality improvement activities were being devolved rapidly to senior managers in the prison but the new arrangements were at a very early stage. The range of detailed data to inform these activities had not been determined by prison managers and partners. The exact meanings of terms and methodologies used by TMC relating to data on prisoners' pass and retention rates needed to be clarified and agreed between TMC and prison managers.

<sup>14</sup> Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.12** Actions by prison and TMC managers to improve the attendance of prisoners at classroom-based sessions had been successful but required further effort. The attendance rates of prisoners allocated to vocational activities, community work and paid employment could not be determined precisely enough using available prison data.
- 3.13** Prisoners' views were considered carefully to help improve aspects of the provision. The most recent prisoner survey had focused only on the views of prisoners in the early stages of the Kirklevington resettlement pathway. The prison had responded appropriately to a number of the issues identified by these prisoners. The views of the significant number of prisoners in paid employment were excluded from the survey for logistical reasons and the survey had not been re-run to gather their views. Too many of the survey question and answer options were not worded precisely enough to allow for quantifiable conclusions.
- 3.14** The overall prison self-assessment report (SAR) was too long, highly descriptive and repetitive. While most of the key strengths and areas for improvement had been identified correctly, some had not. Managers successfully rationalised and refined the SAR during the inspection. The quality improvement action plan was not linked closely enough to the SAR. A few of the key improvement actions identified at a multi-partner curriculum review meeting held in early summer 2014 had not been prioritised for urgent action.
- 3.15** The prison and the learning and skills provider did not promote the available skills development pathways thoroughly or vigorously enough to prisoners in the early stages of their time at Kirklevington, nor the impact of the support, education, training, voluntary and employment options. Prisoners often resorted to asking other prisoners for such information and the responses were frequently misleading.

## Recommendations

- 3.16** The review of the effectiveness of the quality improvement group process should be completed as a matter of priority. In whatever form the group is then constituted it should focus very tightly on quality improvement action planning and monitoring rather than operational matters.
- 3.17** Thorough performance management and monitoring arrangements should be established quickly, informed by a wide range of detailed data, including attendance at all activities.
- 3.18** The precise meanings of terms and methodologies used by the education provider in connection with prisoners' pass rates should be clarified so they are widely understood by all prison managers.
- 3.19** The recently refined self-assessment report process should be used to produce a linked quality improvement action plan which is at the heart of continuous improvement practice.
- 3.20** The prison and learning and skills provider should promote the various resettlement pathways and the impact of the support, education, training, voluntary and employment options earlier, more thoroughly and more vigorously to prisoners to ensure they have a clear understanding of what is available and how it can benefit them.

## Good practice

- 3.21** *The car valeting unit, the café and the goods produced in the workshops were all of a very high quality. These services had been thoughtfully combined to maximise opportunities for prisoner involvement. This was entrepreneurial and represented a clear example of good practice.*

## Provision of activities

- 3.22** The range of purposeful activity offered inside and outside the prison was very good and more than met the needs of the whole population. No prisoners were unemployed and their attitude to work was positive.
- 3.23** The number of paid employment places for prisoners was now high and had doubled since the last inspection. The number of voluntary sector options had also increased substantially. The range of commercially-orientated vocational activities in the prison was adequate and expanding. Classroom-based provision was limited, but plans were well advanced to increase it from early 2015 through a new focus on the achievement of level 2 functional English and mathematics skills.
- 3.24** About 70 prisoners were involved daily in full-time paid employment and a further 34 in a community work placement. Six prisoners were attending external college courses following a range of subjects, including plastering and plumbing, and 15 were attending education courses in the prison. Sixty places were available in external activities including the prison shop and cafeteria, car valeting, driving and work with the Forestry Commission. A further 48 places were available internally in the farm and gardens, coffee shop, welding, recycling and portable appliance testing workshops. Orderly, cleaner and kitchen work roles accounted for about 40 places.
- 3.25** The four Open University and distance learning learners were supported well by the prison and TMC.

## Quality of provision

- 3.26** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment in education and vocational sessions was generally good but none was outstanding. Prisoners' behaviour in classrooms and workshops was almost uniformly excellent.
- 3.27** Teachers in the best sessions worked productively and closely with the often very small cohorts of prisoners enrolled, most of whom had different starting points and levels of learning. Prisoners enjoyed their learning. The teachers were well qualified and had high expectations of prisoners. They planned the lessons well to provide appropriate challenge, interest and activity for each prisoner. Information technology was frequently used thoughtfully to enrich teaching and promote learning. A few education sessions required improvement because they lacked sufficient challenge for prisoners.
- 3.28** Prisoners' English and mathematics skills were developed well in classroom sessions using practical tasks such as writing letters to employers and preparing job applications. Verbal feedback to prisoners in classroom sessions on the progress they were making was good, but written feedback in individual learning plans and assessment reviews was not always detailed or specific enough to help prisoners understand how to improve. There were errors in some teachers' spelling in handouts and written feedback, which did not set a good example for prisoners with low literacy skills.

- 3.29** In workshops prisoners were coached well by their tutors and assessors, most of whom were well qualified and had many years' experience in industry. Prisoners worked effectively on their own and in small teams. They benefited from access to industry standard workshops, which prepared them for progression to higher level courses in local colleges.
- 3.30** The education induction and initial assessment process was individual and moderately effective. For the most part, the effectiveness of the process was hampered by the adviser's lack of detailed information on the prisoner's prior learning and skills. The outcome of a basic-level assessment of prisoners' English and mathematics skills was used to assign prisoners to a functional skills course if their skills were below level 1. Prisoners received a more accurate diagnostic assessment when starting their course and some were consequently assigned to a different course level.
- 3.31** Support for prisoners with additional learning needs had improved since the last inspection. The gap in achievement between prisoners with additional needs and those without had been closed. Support was now integrated more effectively into classroom teaching by teachers who had received specialist training.
- 3.32** The system for recognising and recording prisoners' progress and achievement (RARPA) in their community work was not well developed and required a much more managed and structured approach to prisoners' personal and professional development. There was no RARPA system for prisoners in paid employment, although plans were well developed to introduce one. Communication and liaison with employers about the personal or professional development needs of employed prisoners were minimal.

## Recommendations

- 3.33** Prisoners should be given specific and detailed written targets in their individual learning plans to help them understand what they need to do and when they need to do it to improve further.
- 3.34** Teachers should ensure that spelling and grammar in all handouts and written feedback to prisoners are correct.
- 3.35** The processes and management of the system for RARPA on community work and in employment should be improved to ensure the system accurately records individuals' achievements.
- 3.36** The prison should engage employers in reviewing prisoners' progress and achievements as part of its assessment of the impact of ROTL.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.37** A very high proportion of prisoners, slightly above 80%, had entered employment or training on release in the past year, the majority into employment. Just over three-quarters of these entered employment or training directly related to their ROTL experience, principally construction, warehousing and service industry roles. Data from probation reports indicated that much of the employment during the first year was sustained but the veracity of the data could not be confirmed.
- 3.38** Pass rates were very high on vocational courses and in some cases had risen significantly over the past two years. Pass rates were high or very high for prisoners who completed their classroom-based education courses but the completion rate was variable. TMC data

showed that 10% of the 305 prisoners who had started a functional skills class in 2013 to 2014 did not complete it because they were transferred to a different activity or a new course.

- 3.39** A good standard of work was evident in workshops and prisoners developed good technical skills. The standard of prisoners' work in classroom sessions was at the expected level for the qualification.
- 3.40** Attendance at education sessions averaged 82%. The rate had improved but still required further improvement. Inspectors saw no evidence during the inspection of poor attendance at any of the scheduled activities inside or outside the prison. However, there were no data to corroborate this.

## Library

- 3.41** The library service was fit for purpose and popular. The number of registered borrowers was very high, at just over 90%. The number of prisoners visiting the library each month was also high relative to the population, although the loan rate was comparatively low. Prisoners tended to use the facility for recreational reading, of newspapers for example, rather more than for loans. If staff were available, the library was open during most of the week, including evenings, but it was closed at weekends.
- 3.42** The range of stock was adequate and varied, including fiction and non-fiction appropriate for advanced and less confident readers, Prison Service Orders, CD-ROMs and DVDs. Stock loss was particularly low.
- 3.43** There was a good range of activities to promote literacy which included reading groups and reading challenges. A chess club used the library for weekly meetings. The Toe-by-Toe scheme<sup>15</sup> co-ordinated by the Shannon Trust was not in operation, although trained staff were in place.

## Recommendation

- 3.44** **The library service should promote the library more actively so that visits and the loan rate in particular increase.**

## 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.**

- 3.45** *A high proportion of prisoners used the gym. Timetabling and access times were flexible and well considered. The range of indoor and outdoor facilities was good and used well, but the gymnasium and facilities were in need of refurbishment and some equipment needed repair. The PE department worked well with other departments to promote health and wellbeing. Two fitness-related accredited qualifications were offered, and most of the small number of prisoners taking them passed.*

<sup>15</sup> Peer mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read

- 3.46** The physical education department was resourced adequately, with two experienced and well qualified members of staff. Prisoners' participation rates in PE were high; 67% of prisoners used the facilities regularly.
- 3.47** Outdoor facilities, including a full-size football pitch and astroturf pitch, were used well throughout the year. There was a good range of facilities in the gym including free weights, resistance and cardiovascular (CV) equipment. These were supplemented by CV equipment in a separate fitness suite, and exercise bikes and running machines on the wings. The décor and layout of the gym was dated and the weights area was too cramped. Some equipment in the fitness suite was broken and awaiting repair.
- 3.48** The PE department worked well with other departments to promote health and wellbeing. The department took referrals from the health care unit for prisoners needing rehabilitation through physiotherapy and massage, and designed specific exercise regimes for prisoners referred by the drug and alcohol team.
- 3.49** The timetabling of gym and exercise sessions was designed to accommodate the varying needs of prisoners who were away on courses, working in the community, or employed inside or outside the prison during the working day. For example, sessions were timed for early mornings and late evenings for shift workers, together with sessions at the weekend.
- 3.50** Two fitness-related qualifications were offered, and the small number taking them generally passed. Prisoners' opportunities for progression to sports courses in nearby colleges were good but attempts to find employment opportunities for prisoners in the leisure industry had not been successful.

## Recommendation

- 3.51** **The physical fabric of the gym should be upgraded and the weights area redesigned to make best use of the available space.**



## Section 4. Resettlement

### Strategic management of resettlement

#### Expected outcomes:

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

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

**Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.**

**4.1** *The standard of the reducing re-offending strategy was reasonable. Attendance at reducing re-offending meetings was variable. The prisoner needs analysis lacked offender assessment system (OASys) data and the pathways action plan was not up to date. The prison's future role under the transforming rehabilitation agenda was not sufficiently clear.*

**4.2** There was a reasonable reducing re-offending strategy which encompassed offender management and resettlement pathways. A helpful pathways action plan was used to monitor delivery of resettlement services, although it was not up to date. There was an up-to-date needs analysis but it was based on prisoner surveys. It did not contain any OASys data, and therefore did not adequately identify the offending behaviour needs of the population.

**4.3** There were quarterly reducing re-offending meetings, which the offender management unit (OMU) and pathway providers attended. Attendance by other relevant departments was variable, but action was being taken to address this by changing the time of meetings.

**4.4** The prison's future role under the transforming rehabilitation agenda was not sufficiently clear, which made long-term strategic planning difficult.

#### Recommendation

**4.5** **There should be an up-to-date prisoner needs analysis which draws on an appropriate range of information, including OASys data.**

#### Housekeeping points

**4.6** The pathways action plan should be kept up to date.

**4.7** All relevant departments should regularly attend the reducing re-offending meetings.

## Offender management and planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

**4.8** *Offender management was very good. Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was excellent, information flow to and from the OMU was good and there was comprehensive use of NOMIS. Most prisoners had an up-to-date OASys. Sentence plans were in place but quality was variable. Very good use was made of ROTL to support resettlement and maintain family ties. Home detention curfew (HDC) assessments were informed and decisions were timely. Public protection was well managed. Lifer forums were not well advertised. New arrivals said they had been given little and/or inaccurate information by their sending prison, especially regarding ROTL opportunities.*

**4.9** Offender management was very good. In our survey, 98% of prisoners said they had a named offender supervisor in the prison, against an 81% comparator; 86% said they had a sentence plan. Most prisoners we spoke to were positive about the OMU.

**4.10** There were 10 prison offender supervisors in the OMU, most of whom had undertaken relevant training and were experienced in the role. There were also three probation offender supervisors and a part-time senior probation officer. The level and quality of contact between prisoners and offender supervisors were excellent.

**4.11** Offender management was very well integrated with the rest of the prison. We saw many detailed records of good quality interaction from a range of staff encouraging prisoners to comply with their sentence plans, particularly relating to finding and maintaining employment, and holding prisoners to account for any negative behaviour. Offender supervisors received relevant information from all prison departments to inform their work and use of NOMIS across the whole prison was excellent.

**4.12** We were particularly pleased to see that most OASys were reviewed shortly after prisoners arrived. Only about 20 OASys were out of date, primarily because prisoners had not arrived with them. Some risk of serious harm assessments did not analyse information such as suspected gang membership or previous domestic abuse, but risk management plans were generally strong. Most prisoners had sentence plans but some lacked objectives to address outstanding offending behaviour needs (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).

**4.13** The prison made ROTL a priority and very good use was made of it to support resettlement and maintain family ties. During the six months before the inspection, there had been 21,034 ROTL events for 285 prisoners. Risk assessment boards were well informed and decisions were timely and appropriate.

**4.14** During the previous six months, 47 applications had been considered for release on HDC, of which 35 had been successful, 10 were in progress and two had been refused. All HDC assessments were informed and decisions were timely.

### Recommendation

**4.15** **Sentence plans should include all appropriate objectives, including addressing offending behaviour needs.**

## Housekeeping point

- 4.16** Risk of serious harm assessments should incorporate an analysis of all pertinent information.

## Good practice

- 4.17** *There was a 'whole prison' approach to offender management; all staff understood, recorded and shared information about prisoners, which was comprehensively and effectively used to manage risk and inform decision making.*

## Public protection

- 4.18** Public protection procedures were well managed on arrival and throughout a prisoner's sentence. Risk management procedures were rigorous; formal procedures were sound and we observed a whole prison approach to understanding and implementing risk management.
- 4.19** The night orderly officer undertook an initial screening of the daily reception list to identify public protection cases, and these were sent to the OMU. The prison was holding 27 MAPPAs level 1 prisoners (multi-agency public protection arrangements), 91 MAPPAs nominals<sup>16</sup>, six prisoners subject to harassment procedures and four subject to child protection procedures. Thirty-five prisoners were listed on ViSOR (violent and sexual offenders register), which was accessible to and used by relevant staff. There were 122 restricted prisoners<sup>17</sup> and the prison was required to make telephone and on-site checks regularly when these prisoners were out on ROTL.
- 4.20** All prisoners were discussed at one of three different levels of risk management board. The meetings were well attended and a wide range of information was shared to support ROTL decisions. A particular strength was the contribution from the psychology team, identifying detailed factors in prisoners' behaviour which could indicate an increase or reduction in risk. Actions were followed up robustly. Additional detailed conditions were identified for ROTL licences and those we saw were necessary and proportionate.
- 4.21** MAPPAs nominals were clearly identified, but recording of the MAPPAs level was not always clear.

## Housekeeping point

- 4.22** A MAPPAs level should be set for all MAPPAs eligible cases and this should be recorded on NOMIS no less than six months before release.

## Categorisation

- 4.23** All prisoners at the establishment were category D (suitable for open conditions).
- 4.24** A number of prisoners we spoke to said that their sending prison had given them little and/or inaccurate information about Kirklevington. In particular, not all were aware that they would not be allowed to go out on ROTL for at least the first 12 weeks after they arrived, which caused frustration (see section on early days in custody and main recommendation

<sup>16</sup> Prisoners who are eligible for MAPPAs but whose level has not yet been set

<sup>17</sup> Prisoners restricted under the ROTL policy, ie indeterminate sentenced prisoners, MAPPAs and high-risk cases

S51). However, this period enabled the prison to more accurately assess the impact on a prisoner of their transfer to open conditions, and their readiness to be safely released on temporary licence, and was a key part of the prison's approach to risk management

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.25** At the time of the inspection there were 45 indeterminate sentence prisoners (ISP), of whom 26 were serving life sentences and 19 indeterminate sentences for public protection. Those we spoke to were positive about the OMU and the support they received from offender supervisors.
- 4.26** An ISP consultation forum was a promising initiative but it was very poorly attended. Some prisoners told us they did not know when meetings were being held.
- 4.27** We were concerned that 13 prisoners had passed the date for their oral parole hearing because of a national backlog.

## Recommendation

- 4.28 Oral parole hearings should be timely.**

## Housekeeping point

- 4.29** The ISP consultation forum should be better advertised well in advance of the meetings.

## 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.**

**4.30** *Prisoners' immediate needs were assessed on arrival. The new direction centre was a good initiative, but prisoners could not use the telephone or the internet there for resettlement opportunities. Good support was provided for finance, accommodation and family issues, but there were not enough visit sessions to meet demand. Some prisoners did not undertake appropriate work to address outstanding offending behaviour needs.*

- 4.31** Prisoners' immediate needs were assessed on arrival by offender supervisors who signposted prisoners to appropriate services. Pathway services were based in the new direction centre, this was a 'one stop shop' which enabled prisoners to readily access co-ordinated support, advice and services to meet their resettlement needs, and was a good initiative. Prisoner orderlies carried out much of the administrative work and played an active and useful role in the centre.
- 4.32** Prisoners were not able to use the internet for resettlement opportunities and we were concerned that, to meet security requirements, prisoners were not even allowed to use telephones in the new direction centre despite the fact they would have free access to

phones on ROTL (see paragraph I.34). This hampered the good work that service providers were doing with prisoners.

- 4.33** In our survey, 60% of prisoners said they had done something at the prison to make them less likely to offend in the future compared with 77% at the previous inspection.

## Recommendation

- 4.34 Risk assessed prisoners should have supervised access to telephones and the internet in the new direction centre to assist with resettlement needs.**

## Accommodation

- 4.35** The charity Shelter was based in the prison one day a week to provide useful support with accommodation issues, such as access to rented accommodation, mortgage issues and referrals to supported providers. Men did not leave the prison homeless. Shelter also signposted some prisoners to through-the-gate services where available.

## Education, training and employment

- 4.36** The quality of the National Careers Service (NCS) subcontracted to CfBT Education Trust was good. The staff resource of one full and one part-time adviser was stretched to meet the high demand for the service, although advisers regularly provided a level of service beyond the contract specification.
- 4.37** The CfBT advisers were very thorough. Individual prisoners received well-informed advice and guidance at an early stage on realistic and achievable career options and appreciated advisers' guidance on how the options might be achieved. However, some prisoners became demotivated while awaiting a second appointment. Most prisoners were highly complimentary about the quality of the service but were concerned at the difficulty of getting appointments quickly.
- 4.38** Joint working arrangements between CfBT and partners providing complementary resettlement services in and outside the prison, such as Pinetree and Pertemps People Development Group, were very good.
- 4.39** A very high proportion of prisoners entered employment or training on release, in most cases closely related to their ROTL activity.
- 4.40** Prisoners' use of the virtual campus<sup>18</sup> for job search was limited to employability sessions. The campus was not being used to its full capacity as a semi-live job search resource or to augment and expand learning.

## Recommendations

- 4.41 Ways of augmenting the CfBT staffing resource should be considered, for example by training prisoners to take on an intermediary role or to act as a conduit to CfBT staff.**

---

<sup>18</sup> Enables prisoners to have internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities

**4.42 The virtual campus should be fully commissioned and used to maximum capacity.**

### Health care

**4.43** Pre-release planning for prisoners with physical and mental health needs was timely and effective. There was appropriate liaison with community services to ensure continuity of care. Support for patients with palliative care needs was in place if required.

### Drugs and alcohol

**4.44** Prisoners nearing their release date were given relevant information on the dangers of drug and alcohol use in the community.

**4.45** The drug and alcohol recovery team linked some prisoners effectively with community support on release. However, the number of prisoners using the service was low and more needed to be done to engage with prisoners not on the caseload (see section on substance use).

### Finance, benefit and debt

**4.46** Shelter provided information and support to prisoners on finance issues such as tenancy arrears, credit card and mobile phone debt. They helped prisoners to set up repayment plans and liaised with creditors to have interest frozen on debts. Prisoners were able to attend a course in education on budget management skills.

**4.47** Prisoners were assisted to open bank accounts, which was particularly important for those in paid employment.

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

**4.48** A North East Prison After Care Society (NEPACS) family support worker was based in the prison, a service which was much valued by prisoners. Support was provided for a range of complex issues such as mediation with former partners, contact with children and initiating court action if required. A family day was held during every school holiday, organised by NEPACS, with capacity for 16 prisoners. Demand was high, so prisoners were appropriately prioritised for places. No parenting programmes or other initiatives such as Storybook Dads<sup>19</sup> were delivered, which was a gap in provision. We welcomed the consideration that was being given to the use of Skype for family contact.

**4.49** Domestic visits took place on Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday afternoons from 1.45 to 3.45pm. Prisoners were only allowed an hour for a visit to meet rising demand since the national directive to decrease home visits on ROTL. Despite this, prisoners told us they could not always have a weekend visit as all places were booked. Action was being taken to address this by increasing the number of tables and chairs in the visits hall.

---

<sup>19</sup> In which prisoners record stories for their children

- 4.50** Visitors booked in at the prisoner run coffee shop outside. The shop also acted as the visitor centre and provided a welcoming environment where visitors could buy a range of refreshments at reasonable prices. Entry into the visits hall was swift, and visits started on time. The visits hall had a relaxed atmosphere and a tea bar operated by NEPACS.
- 4.51** An annual visits survey was undertaken, most recently in March 2014. An action plan indicated that responses were made to the issues raised.

## Recommendations

- 4.52** Prisoners should have supervised access to Skype for family contact to ease pressure on limited visits capacity.
- 4.53** Interventions, such as a parenting programme and Storybook Dads, should be provided to meet identified need.
- 4.54** Sufficient social visits should be provided to meet demand.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.55** Strong interventions were delivered to address resettlement issues and reduce the risk of reoffending. However, some prisoners needed more focused work linked to their offending. No victim work was delivered, or one-to-one work for prisoners who did not meet the criteria for programmes dealing with specific offences, such as causing death by dangerous driving or child cruelty.
- 4.56** Some prisoners took accredited offending behaviour programmes delivered by the local Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC). The CRC also ran the Resolve programme in the evenings to allow working prisoners to attend. The sustainability of this initiative was uncertain as ownership of the CRC was about to change. Since April 2014, two prisoners had completed Building Better Relationships (a designated domestic violence course), four had completed Resolve and four had completed the thinking skills programme.

## Recommendation

- 4.57** Focused interventions to address unmet offending behaviour needs should be developed and implemented.



## Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

### Main recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.1** All prisoners should be provided with accurate information about Kirklevington Grange before their transfer and, as part of their preparation for transfer to open conditions, should have the opportunity to talk to a member of staff at their sending prison who has the same information. (S51)

### Recommendations

To NOMS

#### Equality and diversity

- 5.2** NOMS should review the impact of the new equality monitoring tool to ensure that it meets the needs of all prisons. Training in its use should be provided. (2.24)
- 5.3** The reasons for foreign national prisoners liable to deportation not being transferred to Kirklevington Grange should be investigated to ensure that prisoners in this group are being treated fairly and in accordance with policy. (2.34)

#### Offender management and planning

- 5.4** Oral parole hearings should be timely. (4.28)

### Recommendations

To the governor

#### Early days in custody

- 5.5** The management and content of the induction programme should ensure that new arrivals consistently receive all the information they need. (1.13)

#### Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.6** The safer custody meeting should review cases involving violence, bullying or self-harm to learn lessons from them. (1.25)

#### Safeguarding

- 5.7** The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.29)

## Security

- 5.8** All security measures should be proportionate and reflect the security status of prisoners at Kirklevington. (1.40)

## Substance misuse

- 5.9** The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) should develop an internal peer support scheme for prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems. (1.65)
- 5.10** In partnership with prison staff, the DART should develop a strategy to broaden the range and ease of access to psychosocial substance use treatment. (1.66)
- 5.11** Prescribing regimes for substance-dependent prisoners should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidance. (1.67)

## Residential units

- 5.12** Prisoners' complaints of being cold on the induction unit should be investigated and addressed. (2.7)
- 5.13** Cells and communal areas requiring decoration should be painted and communal showers in the older units should be replaced. (2.8)
- 5.14** Association equipment that is in a poor condition should be repaired or replaced. (2.9)

## Legal rights

- 5.15** Legal visits at the establishment should take place in private. (2.49)

## Health services

- 5.16** Health care staff should have regular access to individual management and clinical supervision and this should be recorded. (2.62)
- 5.17** The emergency resuscitation equipment should be in good order with an effective monitoring system in place. Sufficient discipline staff should be trained in the use of automated external defibrillators. (2.63)
- 5.18** A local in-possession policy should be introduced by the medicines and therapeutics committee. (2.79)
- 5.19** The ambient temperature of the medication room should be monitored to ensure that it provides an appropriate environment for medicines to be stored. (2.80)
- 5.20** The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the administration of methadone by a single nurse which contravenes best practice and the guidance for handling Tramadol should be followed. (2.81)
- 5.21** Over-labelled stock should be supplied by a company with an appropriate licence. (2.82)

## Catering

- 5.22** Prisoners should have additional facilities to cook for themselves. (2.94)

## Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.23** The review of the effectiveness of the quality improvement group process should be completed as a matter of priority. In whatever form the group is then constituted it should focus very tightly on quality improvement action planning and monitoring rather than operational matters. (3.16)
- 5.24** Thorough performance management and monitoring arrangements should be established quickly, informed by a wide range of detailed data, including attendance at all activities. (3.17)
- 5.25** The precise meanings of terms and methodologies used by the education provider in connection with prisoners' pass rates should be clarified so they are widely understood by all prison managers. (3.18)
- 5.26** The recently refined self-assessment report process should be used to produce a linked quality improvement action plan which is at the heart of continuous improvement practice. (3.19)
- 5.27** The prison and learning and skills provider should promote the various resettlement pathways and the impact of the support, education, training, voluntary and employment options earlier, more thoroughly and more vigorously to prisoners to ensure they have a clear understanding of what is available and how it can benefit them. (3.20)
- 5.28** Prisoners should be given specific and detailed written targets in their individual learning plans to help them understand what they need to do and when they need to do it to improve further. (3.33)
- 5.29** Teachers should ensure that spelling and grammar in all handouts and written feedback to prisoners are correct. (3.34)
- 5.30** The processes and management of the system for RARPA on community work and in employment should be improved to ensure the system accurately records individuals' achievements. (3.35)
- 5.31** The prison should engage employers in reviewing prisoners' progress and achievements as part of its assessment of the impact of ROTL. (3.36)
- 5.32** The library service should promote the library more actively so that visits and the loan rate in particular increase. (3.44)

## Physical education and healthy living

- 5.33** The physical fabric of the gym should be upgraded and the weights area redesigned to make best use of the available space. (3.51)

### Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.34** There should be an up-to-date prisoner needs analysis which draws on an appropriate range of information, including OASys data. (4.5)

### Offender management and planning

- 5.35** Sentence plans should include all appropriate objectives, including addressing offending behaviour needs. (4.15)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.36** Risk assessed prisoners should have supervised access to telephones and the internet in the new direction centre to assist with resettlement needs. (4.34)
- 5.37** Ways of augmenting the CfBT staffing resource should be considered, for example by training prisoners to take on an intermediary role or to act as a conduit to CfBT staff. (4.41)
- 5.38** The virtual campus should be fully commissioned and used to maximum capacity. (4.42)
- 5.39** Prisoners should have supervised access to Skype for family contact to ease pressure on limited visits capacity(4.52)
- 5.40** Interventions, such as a parenting programme and Storybook Dads, should be provided to meet identified need. (4.53)
- 5.41** Sufficient social visits should be provided to meet demand. (4.54)
- 5.42** Focused interventions to address unmet offending behaviour needs should be developed and implemented. (4.57)

## Housekeeping points

### Early days in custody

- 5.43** All new prisoners should see an induction officer in private on their first night. (1.14)

### Security

- 5.44** The convex observation mirror in the MDT suite should be located at a higher level to maintain the correct balance of security and decency. (1.41)

### Discipline

- 5.45** Recordings of planned incidents should be logged and securely stored. (1.49)
- 5.46** Toilets in the segregation unit should be adequately screened. (1.53)

### Substance misuse

- 5.47** Clear pathways should be published to prisoners and staff, outlining the consequences of non-engagement with clinical treatment regimes. (1.68)

### Equality and diversity

- 5.48** Consultation should take place with protected groups to a level consistent with their needs, taking account of the potential for less formal approaches. (2.25)
- 5.49** Links should be developed with community support agencies for prisoners in protected groups. (2.26)
- 5.50** Personal emergency evacuation plans should describe clearly the assistance a prisoner would require in the event of an emergency and who should provide it. (2.35)

### Legal rights

- 5.51** Sources of legal support should be advertised around the prison. (2.50)

### Health services

- 5.52** The defibrillator signs should accurately reflect the locations in which they are placed. (2.64)
- 5.53** Health promotion material, including mental health and wellbeing information, should be displayed on the notice boards on the units. (2.65)
- 5.54** The care planning templates on SystemOne should be used more. (2.72)
- 5.55** Staff should read and sign all the medication procedures and policies. (2.83)
- 5.56** Corrective action should be taken when records show that heat-sensitive items stored in drug refrigerators are outside the 2–8°C range; this should be routinely monitored. (2.84)

### Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.57** The pathways action plan should be kept up to date. (4.6)
- 5.58** All relevant departments should regularly attend the reducing re-offending meetings. (4.7)

### Offender management and planning

- 5.59** Risk of serious harm assessments should incorporate an analysis of all pertinent information. (4.16)
- 5.60** A MAPPA level should be set for all MAPPA eligible cases and this should be recorded on NOMIS no less than six months before release. (4.22)
- 5.61** The ISP consultation forum should be better advertised well in advance of the meetings. (4.29)

## Examples of good practice

- 5.62** Staff across the prison used P-Nomis case notes to record prisoner progress. This created a comprehensive record of prisoner behaviour and achievements. (2.14)
- 5.63** The car valeting unit, the café and the goods produced in the workshops were all of a very high quality. These services had been thoughtfully combined to maximise opportunities for prisoner involvement. This was entrepreneurial and represented a clear example of good practice. (3.21)
- 5.64** There was a 'whole prison' approach to offender management; all staff understood, recorded and shared information about prisoners, which was comprehensively and effectively used to manage risk and inform decision making. (4.17)

## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Ian Macfadyen	Team leader
Bev Alden	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Michelle Bellham	Researcher
Colette Daoud	Researcher
Jessica Kelly	Researcher
Rachel Prime	Researcher

#### **Specialist inspectors**

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
Jan Fooks-Bale	CQC inspector
Catherine Raycraft	CQC inspector
Nick Crombie	Ofsted inspector
Charles Searle	Ofsted inspector
Liz Smith	Offender management inspector
Nicola McCloskey	Offender management inspector
Nigel Scarff	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, men had an appropriate introduction to the different conditions at Kirklevington. The prison was very safe with almost no bullying or self-harm. High standards of behaviour were expected and enforced. Prisoners were usually only segregated for a short time before transfers, and there was no use of force. There was a detailed supply reduction action plan but positive mandatory drug test results were a little over target. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

#### Recommendations

Decisions to return prisoners to closed conditions should be fully evidenced in records. (1.33)

**Achieved**

All security measures should be proportionate to reflect the security status of prisoners at Kirklevington (1.34)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 1.40)

All disciplinary charges should be fully investigated with clear reasons given for the decisions reached. (1.41)

**Achieved**

### Respect

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

*At the last inspection, in 2011, the standard of accommodation was mostly satisfactory. Prisoner-staff relationships were very good. Personal officers were mostly helpful but entries in prisoner records were sparse. Diversity work was positive. Chaplains played an active role in the prison. The food was good. Health services were excellent and replicated community standards. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

Ongoing problems with the water pressure, shower temperature and the toilets on K wing should be rectified. (2.9)

**Achieved**

Personal officers should make regular entries in prisoners' files commenting on progress in meeting resettlement objectives, family issues and other relevant matters. (2.15)

**Achieved**

The prison should take action, in consultation with regional staff and the UK Border Agency, to encourage applications from foreign national prisoners likely to be released in the UK. (2.35)

**No longer relevant**

Muslim prisoners and staff should be consulted to identify and address reasons for Muslim prisoners' poor perception of their treatment by staff. (2.36)

**Achieved**

Managers should ensure that prisoners are confident that using the complaint system will not result in repercussions. (2.53)

**Partially achieved**

Policies and procedures, which should include an information-sharing protocol, should be relevant, within review date, pertinent to the local health and social care environment, and with local contact details as appropriate. (2.71)

**Achieved**

Triage algorithms should be used to assist nurses to make informed clinical decisions. (2.81)

**Achieved**

The pharmacist should visit the prison periodically to check systems and provide clinical audit and medication reviews. (2.87)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should have additional facilities to cook for themselves. (2.103)

**Not achieved** (Recommendation repeated, 2.93)

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection in 2011, prisoners were able to spend most of the time out of their cells. There were sufficient good quality activity places to keep men occupied in the prison and very effective use of training, education and employment opportunities in the community. A commendably high number of men were engaged in external paid employment and it was very positive that community work had a clear focus on restorative justice principles. The library provision was satisfactory. PE facilities were good. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.*

## Recommendations

The prison should further develop the use of learning and skills data to evaluate fully the impact of initiatives. (3.6)

**Partially achieved**

The prison should work with employers to improve their involvement in target setting. (3.22)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners attending external courses should receive timely access to computers needed for course work. (3.23)

**Achieved**

The prison should fully implement and monitor the strategy for improving pass rates in numeracy at level 2. (3.26)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners and library staff should have appropriate access to the internet. (3.28)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should have access to PE facilities, including when regular PE staff are absent. (3.37)

**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, a good whole-prison approach to resettlement was underpinned by an effective strategy, with an excellent focus on engaging prisoners in education, training and employment. Sentence plans were well focused on reducing reoffending, and reintegration services were satisfactory. Prisoners with previous drug and alcohol problems received good help. Family links were well supported, particularly through use of release on temporary licence (ROTL). Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

## Recommendations

All resettlement pathways and services should be monitored to demonstrate the effectiveness of action taken by the prison in helping successful resettlement outcomes. (4.6)

**Not achieved**

Offender assessment system (OASys) assessment reviews should be completed on all prisoners within eight weeks of their arrival. (4.21)

**Partially achieved**

Events for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners and their families should inform them about the process of preparation for release, and the operation of post-custody supervision and leave conditions. (4.35)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners should be fully aware of how to access resettlement services in the prison. (4.41)

**Achieved**

Accommodation services should keep records of prisoner contact and monitor outcomes to ensure that prisoners obtain suitable and sustainable accommodation for release. (4.44)

**Achieved**

The counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service should further encourage and improve service user involvement and consultation, and develop an internal peer support scheme for prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems. (4.55)

**Partially achieved**

The new finance and advice service should ensure that prisoners have the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills required to manage their finances adequately in prison and on release. (4.60)

**Partially achieved**

Visitors should be allowed into the prison in time for visits to begin at the published time and better shelter should be provided for those waiting to do so. (4.70)

**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		266	99.6%
Recall		1	0.04%
Convicted unsentenced		0	
Remand		0	
Civil prisoners		0	
Detainees		0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>267</b>	<b>100%</b>

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		0	
Less than six months		0	
six months to less than 12 months		0	
12 months to less than 2 years		5	1.9%
2 years to less than 3 years		9	3.4%
3 years to less than 4 years		21	7.9%
4 years to less than 10 years		171	64%
10 years and over (not life)		16	6%
Life – Non ISPP		26	16.9%
Life - ISPP		19	7.1%
<b>Total</b>		<b>267</b>	<b>100%</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:22		
Under 21 years	0	
21 years to 29 years	67	25.1%
30 years to 39 years	89	33.3%
40 years to 49 years	72	27%
50 years to 59 years	26	9.7%
60 years to 69 years	12	4.5%
70 plus years	1	0.4%
Please state maximum age here 78		
<b>Total</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>100%</b>

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	0	265	99.3%
Foreign nationals	0	2	0.7%
<b>Total</b>		<b>267</b>	<b>100%</b>

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B			
Category C			
Category D		267	100%

Other			
<b>Total</b>			

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
White			
British		233	87.3%
Irish		1	0.4%
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		3	1.1%
Other white		3	1.1%
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean		1	0.4%
White and black African		0	
White and Asian		3	1.1%
Other mixed		2	0.7%
Asian or Asian British			
Indian		3	1.1%
Pakistani		7	2.6%
Bangladeshi		1	0.4%
Chinese		1	0.4%
Other Asian		5	1.9%
Black or black British			
Caribbean		2	0.7%
African		0	
Other black		2	0.7%
Other ethnic group			
Arab		0	
Other ethnic group		0	
Not stated		0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>267</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Religion</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist		0	
Church of England		77	28.8%
Roman Catholic		44	16.5%
Other Christian denominations		26	9.7%
Muslim		20	7.5%
Sikh		2	0.7%
Hindu		0	
Buddhist		5	1.9%
Jewish		0	
Other		0	
No religion		93	34.8%
<b>Total</b>		<b>267</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

**Sentenced prisoners only**

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			18	6.7%
1 month to 3 months			48	18%
3 months to six months			52	19.5%
six months to 1 year			70	26.2%
1 year to 2 years			74	27.7%
2 years to 4 years			5	1.9%
4 years or more			0	
<b>Total</b>			<b>267</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry		0	
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).		122	45.7%
<b>Total</b>		<b>122</b>	<b>45.7</b>

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		96	35.5%
Sexual offences		0	
Burglary		17	6.4%
Robbery		24	8.9%
Theft and handling		11	4%
Fraud and forgery		15	5.6%
Drugs offences		97	35.9%
Other offences		10 ( Arson, Perverting justice etc)	3.7%
Civil offences		0	
Offence not recorded /holding warrant		0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>270</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

### Prisoner survey methodology

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

### Sampling

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

### Distributing and collecting questionnaires

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

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

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

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

### Survey response

At the time of the survey on 15 December 2014 the prisoner population at HMP Kirklevington Grange was 267. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 185 prisoners.

We received a total of 137 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 74%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Seventeen respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 14 questionnaires were not returned and 17 were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	5
B	7
C	8
D	25
E	17
F	4
G	8
H	8
J	2
K	16
L	30
R	7

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Kirklevington Grange.

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

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

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Kirklevington Grange in 2014 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other open prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since April 2011.
- The current survey responses from HMP Kirklevington Grange in 2014 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Kirklevington Grange in 2011.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2014 survey between responses of prisoners who considered themselves to be a veteran and those who did not.

## Survey summary

### Section I: About You

<b>Q1.1</b>	<b>What wing or houseblock are you currently living on?</b> See shortened methodology			
<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>			
	Under 21 .....	0	(0%)	
	21 - 29.....	35	(26%)	
	30 - 39.....	47	(35%)	
	40 - 49.....	30	(22%)	
	50 - 59.....	15	(11%)	
	60 - 69.....	7	(5%)	
	70 and over .....	0	(0%)	
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you on recall?</b>			
	Yes .....	4	(3%)	
	No .....	125	(97%)	
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>			
	Less than 6 months .....	1	(1%)	
	6 months to less than 1 year .....	0	(0%)	
	1 year to less than 2 years .....	7	(5%)	
	2 years to less than 4 years .....	20	(15%)	
	4 years to less than 10 years .....	78	(58%)	
	10 years or more .....	9	(7%)	
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection) .....	8	(6%)	
	Life .....	12	(9%)	
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)</b>			
	Yes .....	1	(1%)	
	No.....	133	(99%)	
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>			
	Yes .....	135	(100%)	
	No.....	0	(0%)	
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>			
	Yes .....	134	(99%)	
	No.....	1	(1%)	
<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>			
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish) .....	115 (84%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese .....	0 (0%)
	White - Irish .....	1 (1%)	Asian or Asian British - other .....	2 (1%)
	White - other.....	4 (3%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean..	3 (2%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	2 (1%)	Mixed race - white and black African .....	0 (0%)
	Black or black British - African .....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - white and Asian .....	1 (1%)
	Black or black British - other .....	1 (1%)	Mixed race - other.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian .....	1 (1%)	Arab.....	0 (0%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	5 (4%)	Other ethnic group .....	2 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)		

<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?</b>		
	Yes .....		2 (2%)
	No.....		130 (98%)
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>		
	None.....	48 (35%)	Hindu .....
	Church of England .....	48 (35%)	Jewish .....
	Catholic .....	23 (17%)	Muslim .....
	Protestant.....	1 (1%)	Sikh.....
	Other Christian denomination .....	2 (1%)	Other.....
	Buddhist.....	1 (1%)	
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>		
	Heterosexual/ Straight .....		133 (98%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		1 (1%)
	Bisexual.....		2 (1%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)</b>		
	Yes .....		20 (15%)
	No.....		117 (85%)
<b>Q1.13</b>	<b>Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?</b>		
	Yes .....		16 (12%)
	No.....		121 (88%)
<b>Q1.14</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>		
	Yes .....		73 (54%)
	No.....		63 (46%)
<b>Q1.15</b>	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>		
	Yes .....		75 (55%)
	No.....		61 (45%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>		
	Less than 2 hours .....		72 (53%)
	2 hours or longer .....		65 (47%)
	Don't remember .....		0 (0%)
<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>		
	My journey was less than two hours .....		72 (53%)
	Yes .....		49 (36%)
	No.....		14 (10%)
	Don't remember .....		0 (0%)
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>		
	My journey was less than two hours .....		72 (53%)
	Yes .....		5 (4%)
	No.....		59 (43%)
	Don't remember .....		1 (1%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>		
	Yes .....		95 (70%)
	No.....		36 (26%)
	Don't remember .....		5 (4%)

<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	118 (86%)
	No.....	17 (12%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	Very well.....	46 (34%)
	Well.....	53 (39%)
	Neither .....	34 (25%)
	Badly.....	3 (2%)
	Very badly .....	0 (0%)
	Don't remember .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Yes, someone told me .....	116 (85%)
	Yes, I received written information.....	10 (7%)
	No, I was not told anything .....	14 (10%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes .....	126 (93%)
	No.....	10 (7%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)

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

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	127 (93%)
	2 hours or longer .....	5 (4%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (3%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes .....	115 (84%)
	No .....	17 (12%)
	Don't remember .....	5 (4%)
<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	48 (35%)
	Well.....	60 (44%)
	Neither .....	19 (14%)
	Badly.....	7 (5%)
	Very badly .....	3 (2%)
	Don't remember .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Loss of property .....	12 (9%)
	Housing problems.....	6 (5%)
	Contacting employers .....	1 (1%)
	Physical health .....	10 (8%)
	Mental health.....	6 (5%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners .....	1 (1%)
	Contacting family .....	19 (14%)
	Childcare .....	0 (0%)
	Money worries.....	23 (17%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	2 (2%)
	Getting phone numbers .....	15 (11%)
	Other.....	4 (3%)
	Did not have any problems .....	62 (47%)

<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (23%)
	No.....	36 (28%)
	Did not have any problems .....	62 (48%)
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Tobacco.....	74 (56%)
	A shower .....	48 (36%)
	A free telephone call.....	88 (66%)
	Something to eat.....	58 (44%)
	PIN phone credit.....	80 (60%)
	Toiletries/ basic items .....	38 (29%)
	Did not receive anything .....	13 (10%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Chaplain .....	72 (58%)
	Someone from health services.....	80 (64%)
	A Listener/Samaritans .....	63 (50%)
	Prison shop/ canteen .....	34 (27%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	35 (28%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	What was going to happen to you .....	85 (64%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	59 (44%)
	How to make routine requests (applications) .....	77 (58%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	78 (59%)
	Health services .....	70 (53%)
	Chaplaincy .....	56 (42%)
	Not offered any information.....	25 (19%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	Yes .....	119 (88%)
	No.....	13 (10%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	Have not been on an induction course .....	11 (8%)
	Within the first week.....	118 (87%)
	More than a week.....	4 (3%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	Have not been on an induction course .....	11 (8%)
	Yes .....	79 (59%)
	No.....	39 (29%)
	Don't remember .....	5 (4%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	Did not receive an assessment.....	31 (24%)
	Within the first week.....	35 (27%)
	More than a week .....	47 (36%)
	Don't remember .....	18 (14%)

### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to...</b>						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	27 (21%)	33 (26%)	21 (16%)	19 (15%)	3 (2%)	26 (20%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	15 (13%)	25 (21%)	18 (15%)	16 (13%)	7 (6%)	39 (33%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters.....</i>						50 (38%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>						43 (33%)
	<i>No.....</i>						39 (30%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						57 (43%)
	<i>No.....</i>						4 (3%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>						73 (54%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	132 (99%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	48 (38%)	67 (53%)	12 (9%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	35 (27%)	91 (69%)	6 (5%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	107 (81%)	25 (19%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	39 (30%)	56 (43%)	35 (27%)			
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>						
	<i>Very good.....</i>						20 (15%)
	<i>Good.....</i>						55 (41%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>						26 (19%)
	<i>Bad.....</i>						30 (22%)
	<i>Very bad.....</i>						3 (2%)
<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know.....</i>						1 (1%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>						89 (67%)
	<i>No.....</i>						42 (32%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						98 (74%)
	<i>No.....</i>						5 (4%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>						30 (23%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						56 (43%)
	<i>No.....</i>						9 (7%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A.....</i>						66 (50%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>						
	<i>Yes.....</i>						85 (64%)
	<i>No.....</i>						3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A.....</i>						45 (34%)

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

<i>I don't want to attend</i> .....	41 (31%)
<i>Very easy</i> .....	39 (30%)
<i>Easy</i> .....	21 (16%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	3 (2%)
<i>Difficult</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Very difficult</i> .....	1 (1%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	25 (19%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	115 (87%)
<i>No</i> .....	12 (9%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (4%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are applications dealt with fairly?</i>	15 (12%)	77 (62%)	33 (26%)
<i>Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	15 (12%)	77 (61%)	35 (28%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	67 (50%)
<i>No</i> .....	21 (16%)
<i>Don't know</i> .....	45 (34%)

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

	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Are complaints dealt with fairly?</i>	85 (65%)	17 (13%)	29 (22%)
<i>Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?</i>	85 (66%)	24 (19%)	20 (16%)

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

<i>Yes</i> .....	23 (19%)
<i>No</i> .....	101 (81%)

**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> .....	39 (31%)
<i>Very easy</i> .....	25 (20%)
<i>Easy</i> .....	27 (21%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	24 (19%)
<i>Difficult</i> .....	11 (9%)
<i>Very difficult</i> .....	1 (1%)

**Section 6: Relationships with staff****Q6.1 Do most staff treat you with respect?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	105 (82%)
<i>No</i> .....	23 (18%)

**Q6.2 Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?**

<i>Yes</i> .....	108 (82%)
<i>No</i> .....	23 (18%)

<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes .....	57 (43%)
	No.....	77 (57%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	13 (10%)
	Never.....	24 (18%)
	Rarely .....	22 (17%)
	Some of the time .....	34 (26%)
	Most of the time .....	19 (15%)
	All of the time.....	18 (14%)
<b>Q6.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	10 (7%)
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	63 (47%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	55 (41%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	7 (5%)
<b>Q6.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i> .....	10 (7%)
	Very helpful.....	54 (40%)
	Helpful .....	45 (34%)
	Neither .....	11 (8%)
	Not very helpful .....	6 (4%)
	Not at all helpful.....	8 (6%)

### Section 7: Safety

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	Yes .....	21 (16%)
	No.....	113 (84%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	Yes .....	9 (7%)
	No.....	125 (93%)
<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....	113 (90%)
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>At work</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>During movement</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>At education</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>At meal times</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>At health services</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Visits area</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>In your cell</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>At religious services</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>	
	Yes .....	18 (14%)
	No.....	115 (86%)

<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (23%)
	No .....	103 (77%)
<b>Q7.7</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> .....	9 (7%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	2 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i> .....	6 (5%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q7.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	Not been victimised .....	97 (76%)
	Yes .....	4 (3%)
	No .....	27 (21%)

### Section 8: Health services

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	8 (6%)	50 (38%)	57 (43%)	9 (7%)	6 (5%)	2 (2%)
	The nurse	3 (2%)	68 (52%)	54 (41%)	6 (5%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
	The dentist	17 (13%)	26 (20%)	46 (35%)	16 (12%)	17 (13%)	8 (6%)

<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?</b>						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	12 (9%)	34 (26%)	49 (37%)	22 (17%)	9 (7%)	5 (4%)
	The nurse	3 (2%)	60 (47%)	53 (41%)	9 (7%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
	The dentist	25 (20%)	22 (17%)	53 (41%)	17 (13%)	8 (6%)	3 (2%)
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>						
	<i>Not been</i> .....						3 (2%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....						43 (33%)
	<i>Good</i> .....						62 (47%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....						19 (15%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....						3 (2%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....						1 (1%)
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>						
	Yes .....						61 (46%)
	No .....						73 (54%)
<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?</b>						
	<i>Not taking medication</i> .....						73 (55%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i> .....						56 (42%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....						3 (2%)
	<i>No</i> .....						1 (1%)
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>						
	Yes .....						18 (13%)
	No .....						116 (87%)
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)</b>						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....						116 (88%)
	Yes .....						10 (8%)
	No .....						6 (5%)

### Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>		
	Yes .....		15 (11%)
	No .....		119 (89%)
<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>		
	Yes .....		9 (7%)
	No .....		125 (93%)
<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>		
	<i>Very easy</i> .....		36 (27%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....		10 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		5 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....		2 (2%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....		2 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		78 (59%)

**Q9.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?**

Very easy.....	8 (6%)
Easy.....	12 (9%)
Neither.....	10 (7%)
Difficult.....	4 (3%)
Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
Don't know.....	95 (70%)

**Q9.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?**

Yes.....	5 (4%)
No.....	130 (96%)

**Q9.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?**

Yes.....	7 (5%)
No.....	128 (95%)

**Q9.7 Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?**

Did not / do not have a drug problem.....	115 (88%)
Yes.....	11 (8%)
No.....	4 (3%)

**Q9.8 Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?**

Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....	125 (95%)
Yes.....	6 (5%)
No.....	1 (1%)

**Q9.9 Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?**

Did not have a problem/ did not receive help.....	117 (91%)
Yes.....	9 (7%)
No.....	3 (2%)

**Section 10: Activities****Q10.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?**

	Don't know	Very Easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
Prison job	5 (4%)	69 (51%)	50 (37%)	8 (6%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)
Vocational or skills training	16 (13%)	45 (35%)	39 (31%)	8 (6%)	17 (13%)	2 (2%)
Education (including basic skills)	11 (9%)	49 (39%)	52 (42%)	8 (6%)	4 (3%)	1 (1%)
Offending behaviour programmes	60 (47%)	26 (20%)	23 (18%)	14 (11%)	6 (5%)	0 (0%)

**Q10.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**

Not involved in any of these.....	21 (17%)
Prison job.....	93 (75%)
Vocational or skills training.....	19 (15%)
Education (including basic skills).....	23 (19%)
Offending behaviour programmes.....	10 (8%)

**Q10.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?**

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	3 (3%)	54 (45%)	54 (45%)	8 (7%)
Vocational or skills training	15 (15%)	56 (54%)	26 (25%)	6 (6%)
Education (including basic skills)	16 (16%)	56 (55%)	24 (24%)	5 (5%)
Offending behaviour programmes	26 (30%)	25 (29%)	23 (27%)	12 (14%)

<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	16 (12%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	13 (10%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....	42 (32%)
	<i>About once a week</i> .....	39 (29%)
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....	23 (17%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>	
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....	28 (21%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	64 (48%)
	<i>No</i> .....	40 (30%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	20 (15%)
	<i>0</i> .....	22 (17%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	21 (16%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	37 (28%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	32 (24%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	16 (12%)
	<i>0</i> .....	14 (11%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	19 (15%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	25 (19%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	57 (44%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	9 (7%)
	<i>0</i> .....	13 (11%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	6 (5%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	91 (74%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....	10 (8%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....	21 (16%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....	78 (60%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	8 (6%)

### Section 11: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	81 (61%)
	<i>No</i> .....	51 (39%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	30 (23%)
	<i>No</i> .....	103 (77%)

<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (16%)
	No.....	112 (84%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	18 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	22 (17%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	34 (26%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	13 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	30 (23%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	15 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	1 (1%)

### Section 12: Preparation for release

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	Yes .....	131 (98%)
	No.....	3 (2%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/ NA</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	15 (12%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	49 (38%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	51 (40%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	72 (56%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	130 (98%)
	No.....	3 (2%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	Yes .....	112 (85%)
	No.....	19 (15%)
<b>Q12.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	19 (15%)
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	44 (34%)
	<i>Involved</i> .....	32 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	13 (10%)
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	8 (6%)
<b>Q12.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	19 (15%)
	<i>Nobody</i> .....	29 (23%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i> .....	71 (56%)
	<i>Offender manager</i> .....	53 (42%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i> .....	37 (29%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i> .....	20 (16%)
<b>Q12.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	19 (15%)
	Yes .....	89 (69%)
	No.....	12 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	9 (7%)

<b>Q12.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	19	(15%)	
	Yes .....	10	(8%)	
	No.....	82	(65%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	16	(13%)	
<b>Q12.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i> .....	19	(15%)	
	Yes .....	62	(48%)	
	No.....	30	(23%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	19	(15%)	
<b>Q12.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>			
	Yes .....	4	(3%)	
	No.....	57	(44%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	70	(53%)	
<b>Q12.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>			
	Yes .....	61	(47%)	
	No.....	69	(53%)	
<b>Q12.12</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that to you.)</b>			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
	Employment	37 (30%)	54 (44%)	33 (27%)
	Accommodation	49 (43%)	38 (33%)	28 (24%)
	Benefits	51 (44%)	36 (31%)	30 (26%)
	Finances	48 (41%)	36 (31%)	33 (28%)
	Education	48 (42%)	41 (36%)	26 (23%)
	Drugs and alcohol	63 (55%)	30 (26%)	21 (18%)
<b>Q12.13</b>	<b>Have you been provided with information on the following? (please tick all that to you.)</b>			
			Yes	No
	Resettlement day release		96 (72%)	37 (28%)
	Resettlement overnight release		92 (70%)	39 (30%)
<b>Q12.14</b>	<b>Have you had access to the following? (please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
			Yes	No
	Resettlement day release		89 (68%)	41 (32%)
	Resettlement overnight release		75 (60%)	51 (40%)
	Special purpose leave		31 (30%)	74 (70%)
<b>Q12.15</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release?</b>			
			Yes	No
	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here		35 (27%)	95 (73%)
	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom e.t.c.)		43 (33%)	87 (67%)
	Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions		95 (74%)	33 (26%)
	Have you been on a preparation for release course		17 (13%)	110 (87%)
	Is this prison near your home area or intended release address		72 (57%)	54 (43%)
	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future		71 (60%)	48 (40%)

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Kirklevington Grange 2014

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

#### Key to tables

		HMP Kirklevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirklevington Grange 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>137</b>	<b>1892</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	3%	3%	3%	2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	1%	4%	1%	0%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	11%	6%	12%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	1%	3%	1%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	99%	99%	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.)	12%	29%	12%	19%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	4%	2%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	13%	8%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	3%	2%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	12%	15%	7%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	12%	7%	12%	12%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	54%	53%	54%	50%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	55%	53%	55%	53%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	48%	48%	48%	36%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	78%	80%	78%	78%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	8%	10%	8%	8%
2.4	Was the van clean?	70%	67%	70%	70%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	86%	83%	86%	86%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72%	77%	72%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	85%	81%	85%	85%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	8%	14%	8%	8%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 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				
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	93%	92%	93%	96%
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	93%	70%	93%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	86%	84%	94%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79%	79%	79%	84%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	53%	42%	53%	36%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	9%	9%	9%	5%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	5%	8%	5%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	2%	1%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	14%	11%	14%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	17%	11%	17%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	2%	4%	2%	2%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	8%	8%	8%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	5%	5%	5%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	2%	1%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	11%	10%	11%	8%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	46%	44%	46%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	56%	59%	56%	85%
3.6	A shower?	36%	38%	36%	77%
3.6	A free telephone call?	66%	44%	66%	66%
3.6	Something to eat?	44%	52%	44%	78%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	60%	57%	60%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	29%	40%	29%	
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	58%	57%	58%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	64%	74%	64%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	50%	38%	50%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	27%	28%	27%	10%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 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				
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	64%	65%	64%	73%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	44%	45%	44%	53%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	58%	55%	58%	73%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	59%	56%	59%	75%
3.8	Health services?	53%	64%	53%	72%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	42%	56%	42%	64%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	88%	89%	88%	98%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	95%	92%	98%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	64%	72%	64%	82%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	77%	85%	77%	
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	46%	64%	46%	79%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	33%	51%	33%	68%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	27%	33%	22%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	43%	49%	43%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	98%	99%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	38%	74%	38%	68%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	27%	66%	27%	66%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	81%	78%	81%	80%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	30%	43%	30%	76%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	56%	37%	56%	79%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	67%	48%	67%	64%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	74%	60%	74%	82%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	55%	43%	55%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	64%	66%	64%	65%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	46%	55%	46%	
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	86%	87%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	70%	72%	70%	87%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 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)?	69%	62%	69%	83%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	53%	50%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	37%	43%	37%	40%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	55%	46%	55%	42%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	19%	17%	19%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	41%	35%	41%	52%
<b>SECTION 6: Relationships with staff</b>					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	74%	82%	88%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	82%	74%	82%	87%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	43%	29%	43%	
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	29%	17%	29%	36%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	92%	69%	92%	98%
	For those with a personal officer:				
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	80%	68%	80%	79%
<b>SECTION 7: Safety</b>					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	16%	20%	16%	6%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	8%	7%	2%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	14%	15%	14%	4%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	6%	6%	6%	2%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	9%	6%	
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	1%	3%	
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	2%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	2%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 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				
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	2%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	1%	3%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	0%
<b>SECTION 7: Safety continued</b>					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	23%	22%	23%	12%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	8%	7%	6%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	10%	9%	
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	2%	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	1%	2%	
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	1%	2%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	0%	2%	
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%	2%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	3%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	3%	5%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	13%	24%	13%	12%
<b>SECTION 8: Health services</b>					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	81%	49%	81%	97%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	92%	70%	92%	99%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	55%	24%	55%	79%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
8.2	The doctor?	70%	65%	70%	96%
8.2	The nurse?	91%	73%	91%	98%
8.2	The dentist?	73%	51%	73%	91%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	82%	61%	82%	99%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	46%	45%	46%	44%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	98%	98%	98%	
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	13%	13%	13%	11%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	63%	54%	63%	
<b>SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	11%	11%	11%	8%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	7%	11%	7%	6%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	36%	35%	30%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	15%	23%	15%	
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	2%	4%	1%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	2%	5%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	72%	75%	72%	
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	86%	82%	86%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	75%	90%	75%	100%
<b>SECTION 10: Activities</b>					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
10.1	A prison job?	89%	77%	89%	
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	66%	57%	66%	
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	81%	72%	81%	
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	38%	33%	38%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.2	A prison job?	75%	72%	75%	75%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	15%	17%	15%	35%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	19%	22%	19%	38%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	8%	4%	8%	9%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	97%	93%	97%	98%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	47%	45%	47%	60%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	86%	80%	86%	90%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	64%	63%	64%	82%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	84%	84%	84%	95%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	66%	63%	66%	79%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	70%	70%	70%	82%
	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?	42%	48%	42%	54%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	47%	55%	47%	53%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	48%	63%	48%	
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	52%	53%	52%	68%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	63%	76%	63%	83%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	74%	78%	74%	93%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	60%	54%	60%	65%
<b>SECTION 11: Friends and family</b>					
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	62%	52%	62%	79%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	23%	22%	23%	13%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	13%	17%	15%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	42%	37%	42%	
<b>SECTION 12: Preparation for release</b>					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	98%	93%	98%	
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	12%	16%	12%	
12.2	Contact by letter?	39%	41%	39%	
12.2	Contact by phone?	41%	58%	41%	
12.2	Contact by visit?	58%	40%	58%	
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	98%	81%	98%	
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	86%	76%	86%	84%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	70%	71%	70%	87%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	Open prisons comparator	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 2014	HMP Kirkclevington Grange 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					
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
12.6	nobody?	27%	32%	27%	
12.6	Offender supervisor?	66%	50%	66%	
12.6	Offender manager?	50%	39%	50%	
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	34%	19%	34%	
12.6	Staff from other departments?	19%	21%	19%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	81%	74%	81%	90%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	10%	13%	10%	
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	56%	47%	56%	
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	3%	7%	3%	
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	47%	30%	47%	54%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
12.12	Employment?	62%	55%	62%	
12.12	Accommodation?	57%	52%	57%	
12.12	Benefits?	54%	51%	54%	
12.12	Finances?	52%	44%	52%	
12.12	Education?	61%	55%	61%	
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	59%	59%	59%	
Have you been provided with information on the following:					
12.13	Resettlement day release?	72%	76%	72%	
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	70%	74%	70%	
Have you had access to the following:					
12.14	Resettlement day release?	69%	64%	69%	
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	60%	57%	60%	
12.14	Special purpose leave?	29%	34%	29%	
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	27%	25%	27%	40%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	33%	28%	33%	34%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	74%	79%	74%	95%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	13%	19%	13%	28%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	57%	45%	57%	59%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	60%	60%	60%	77%

## Diversity analysis



### Key Question Responses (ethnicity and veterans) HMP Kirklevington Grange 2014

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

#### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>121</b>
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	0%	0%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			13%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	2%	7%	1%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	64%	0%	13%	8%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	18%	14%	26%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	12%	12%		
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	53%	54%	74%	51%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	88%	70%	50%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	82%	85%	74%	86%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	83%	94%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	82%	78%	74%	79%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	44%	54%	57%	53%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	63%	64%	58%	65%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	89%	93%	88%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	91%	93%	92%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	47%	46%	50%	46%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%	93%	99%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	64%	55%	47%	57%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	70%	67%	60%	68%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	75%	67%	75%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	74%	38%	47%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	76%	62%	72%	63%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	82%	88%	86%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	51%	53%	50%
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	82%	82%	85%	82%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	87%	82%	92%	81%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	26%	29%	22%	29%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	94%	92%	86%	93%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	13%	16%	15%	16%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	7%	7%	7%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	12%	14%	7%	14%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	6%	6%	7%	6%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	1%	7%	0%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	18%	23%	29%	22%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	12%	9%	7%	9%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	1%	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%	15%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	87%	80%	60%	84%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	94%	92%	93%	92%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	36%	47%	60%	44%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	6%	15%	14%	13%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	18%	37%	53%	32%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	79%	74%	69%	76%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	14%	16%	8%	16%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	14%	19%	23%	18%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Consider themselves to be a veteran	Do not consider themselves to be a veteran
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	9%	8%	8%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	36%	48%	47%	47%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	44%	54%	36%	54%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	38%	66%	43%	65%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	79%	73%	91%	73%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	50%	61%	58%	60%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	7%	25%	22%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	18%	14%	17%
Have you been provided with information on the following:					
12.12	Resettlement day release?	87%	70%	71%	72%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	87%	68%	64%	71%
Have you had access to the following:					
12.13	Resettlement day release?	68%	69%	64%	69%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	60%	59%	64%	59%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	31%	29%	36%	29%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	40%	25%	7%	29%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	26%	34%	36%	33%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	79%	73%	71%	74%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	15%	13%	7%	14%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	47%	59%	78%	55%

## Diversity analysis



### Key Question Responses (disability, age 50 and over) HMP Kirklevington Grange 2014

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

#### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>112</b>
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	1%	0%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	95%	100%	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.)	15%	12%	5%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	2%	0%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	10%	8%	0%	10%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			37%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	21%	10%	28%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	47%	55%	76%	49%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64%	74%	81%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	85%	85%	77%	86%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	84%	81%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	79%	77%	80%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	68%	51%	56%	52%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	40%	67%	43%	69%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	78%	90%	95%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	80%	94%	86%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	44%	47%	51%	47%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%	100%	98%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	54%	56%	44%	60%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	62%	68%	56%	70%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	74%	73%	81%	72%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	39%	44%	43%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	80%	61%	50%	68%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	89%	87%	91%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	41%	52%	33%	55%
6.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	74%	83%	85%	82%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	78%	83%	86%	84%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	26%	29%	24%	30%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	90%	93%	86%	94%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	27%	14%	14%	17%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	0%	8%	5%	8%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	26%	11%	14%	14%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	10%	5%	0%	8%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	0%	0%	1%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	0%	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	5%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	0%	0%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	43%	19%	29%	20%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	22%	7%	10%	8%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	1%	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	2%	0%	2%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	1%	5%	1%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	16%	0%	5%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	89%	80%	86%	81%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	95%	92%	100%	92%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	95%	38%	86%	38%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	38%	9%	14%	14%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	57%	31%	33%	33%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	89%	73%	81%	76%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	11%	16%	14%	15%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	34%	16%	19%	19%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	23%	6%	0%	9%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	41%	48%	50%	46%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	32%	56%	19%	59%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	53%	64%	54%	64%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	78%	73%	51%	79%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	47%	62%	44%	63%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	27%	22%	9%	25%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	10%	18%	5%	17%
Have you been provided with information on the following:					
12.12	Resettlement day release?	57%	74%	63%	73%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	50%	73%	66%	71%
Have you had access to the following:					
12.13	Resettlement day release?	57%	70%	66%	68%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	50%	61%	68%	58%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	29%	30%	36%	30%
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	29%	27%	9%	31%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	11%	37%	34%	34%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	71%	74%	76%	74%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	17%	13%	20%	12%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	40%	60%	59%	57%