

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Peterborough (Men)

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

16–27 February 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

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

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

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

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	43
Section 4. Resettlement	49
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	57
Section 6. Appendices	63
Appendix I: Inspection team	63
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	65
Appendix III: Prison population profile	73
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	77

Introduction

HMP Peterborough is a category B local prison holding both male and female prisoners. The male and female parts of the prison are separated but both are on a single site and have the same senior management team, with some staff moving between the two prisons. This is unique in the England and Wales prison estate. We reported on the women's side of the prison in 2014; this inspection concentrated exclusively on the male side which held 649 men, including a small number of young adults. The male prison had opened new accommodation which, when full, would take the operational capacity to 874.

Our previous inspection in 2011 had found an improving institution which we deemed to be basically safe, respectful and purposeful, and we particularly praised some innovative work to resettle prisoners on release. This inspection describes a prison which produced very good outcomes and which had continued to improve, although there was room for more improvement in the provision of purposeful activity.

Excellent and innovative work to resettle prisoners prior to and on release was again an outstanding feature of Peterborough. Strategic management of the resettlement provision was very strong. There was a clear commitment throughout the institution to provide the conditions and support whereby men could, address their offending behaviour issues and deal with the problems that led them to offend. The Link centre within the prison was excellent in providing a range of resettlement advice and practical support; and the relatively newly opened Outside Links, based in the centre of Peterborough, was groundbreaking in continuing this support post release. Work in the resettlement pathways was strong and some excellent support was provided to assist with maintaining contact with family, friends and the outside world. Offender management arrangements were better than we normally see and a good range of offending behaviour courses were on offer. Overall, Peterborough men's prison provided a level of resettlement support that would be the envy of many other similar institutions.

Support on arrival was good and it was notable that more men in our survey than at other similar prisons reported feeling safe. Levels of violence were a challenge but were not excessive and some extremely proactive work was undertaken to tackle problematic behaviour when it occurred. This included robust action to challenge low level poor behaviour and escalating responses for more serious rule breaking and violence. This all contributed to what felt like a basically stable and well controlled prison, although some minority groups and vulnerable prisoners still felt less secure than others. Support for prisoners deemed vulnerable to self-harm was good and excellent arrangements were in place to manage those with complex needs or who required safeguarding. Despite this there had been four self-inflicted deaths since our last inspection, and while action to address the issues raised was ongoing, this merely illustrated that continued vigilance was needed to keep all prisoners safe from harm. The segregation unit was well led and provided a progressive regime where the few long stay residents were encouraged to reintegrate back to the mainstream prison. Few men on open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were held in these conditions, and then only when necessary. Use of force was well managed but somewhat high, and while most of what we saw was appropriate, ongoing vigilance was again needed to ensure proportionality and that opportunities to de-escalate were fully utilised. Substance misuse services were very good and were helping to support prisoners with these issues, and contributing to supply reduction work.

Excellent relationships between staff and prisoners underpinned much that was good about the prison and we were struck by the professionalism, commitment and decency of the vast majority of staff with whom we had contact. Living conditions were generally very good, as befitting a prison opened only 10 years ago, although some graffiti was evident. The new accommodation was excellent. Electronic kiosks provided good access to a range of information and services to prisoners, and helped to ensure that prisoners had relatively few frustrations about daily life. The provision of

cleaning materials, hygiene products and kit was good, as were consultation arrangements. Prisoners were unusually positive about the food provided and canteen arrangements were adequate. Complaints were well managed and prisoners were again more positive than in similar prisons about the timeliness and fairness of these arrangements. Equality and diversity work was good overall, with a clear commitment from managers to provide support to people from minority groups, where outcomes were either good or developing. Nevertheless, in our survey black and minority ethnic, Muslim and disabled prisoners reported less positively in some important aspects of prison life and under-identification of prisoners with disabilities meant that some needs were not being met. Health services were good overall and most services were at least in line with the community.

Purposeful activity was relatively weak compared with other areas, although we were encouraged that it was on an upward trajectory and would soon benefit from a number of improvements that were in development. Time out of cell was good overall and most prisoners had a reasonable amount of time in activities or association. However, access to outside exercise was limited and too many men were still locked up during the middle of the working day. Ofsted rated learning and skills provision as requiring improvement overall and commented on the restricted range of provision for those serving longer sentences. In particular, there was poor punctuality in education, too much teaching and learning required improvement, and outcomes in some key areas needed to be better. Nevertheless, nearly all prisoners could attend activities at least part-time, and a range of new opportunities would soon come on stream to supplement what was already offered.

Overall, Peterborough is an impressive local prison with a positive staff culture which emphasises decency and professionalism. Resettlement work is cutting edge and the prison has advanced plans to develop this further when the community rehabilitation company (CRC) is introduced in April 2015. Peterborough provides a basically safe environment where poor behaviour is robustly and appropriately challenged. All of this should assist and support the further improvements in purposeful activities that are needed. Peterborough is already better than most local prisons we have inspected in recent years, and is well placed to provide an exemplar to other similar institutions across our healthy prison tests.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

June 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A local and resettlement prison for category B prisoners with an extension for category C men sentenced to between 12 months and four years.

Prison status

Privately managed by Sodexo Justice Services

Region

East of England

Number held

678 on 17 February 2015

Certified normal accommodation

759

Operational capacity

868

Date of last full inspection

4–8 April 2011

Brief history

The prison was run by Peterborough Prison Management Ltd, which sub-contracted Sodexo Justice Services. It was established on 28 March 2005. In January 2015, it opened a resettlement unit in house block 5, providing spaces for an additional 292 men. House blocks 3 and 4 were part of the original prison and accommodated 582 men. A women's prison in separate buildings on the same site was inspected independently in 2014.

Short description of residential units

There were 12 wings, four each on three house blocks.

House block 3

W1 – first night and induction unit

X1 – integrated drug treatment system and first night centre for those requiring detoxification or stabilisation

Y1 and Z1 – remand prisoners.

House block 4

W2, X2 and Y2 – convicted prisoners

Z2 – convicted prisoners on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme.

House block 5

Burghley wing – convicted prisoners on the enhanced level, veterans, over 50s and those participating in release on temporary licence

Cavell and Nene wings – convicted category C men whom the prison aimed to progress to Burghley wing

Royce wing – safeguarding unit for vulnerable prisoners.

Name of director

Nick Leader

Escort contractors

Wincanton

Serco

Health service provider

Sodexo Justice Services (primary care)

Cimmaron UK (24-hour medical care)

Cambridge and Peterborough Foundation Trust (mental health)

Learning and skills providers

Sodexo Justice Services

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Susan Painter

About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This report

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

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

Summary

Safety

S1 *Prisoners were generally positive about escort arrangements, and support during their early days at the prison was good. Most prisoners felt safe and levels of violence had reduced, although some minority groups and those in the safeguarding unit for vulnerable prisoners felt less secure than others. Prison staff actively challenged antisocial behaviour. Support for prisoners vulnerable to self-harm or who needed safeguarding was good. Security arrangements were appropriate and drugs issues were prioritised. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was used well. Disciplinary measures were used frequently but supported safety effectively. Use of force was high but mostly proportionate. Segregation was also used frequently but the environment and regime were reasonable; care planning and relationships were very good. Substance misuse support was very good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 22 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 18 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*

S3 Prisoners were generally positive about how escort staff treated them, although some had long journeys to the prison when transferred from other establishments. Reception was busier than normal because new accommodation had been recently opened which caused some delays. Reception was bright and reasonably clean but holding rooms were poorly equipped and some graffiti was evident. Reception processes often took too long. First night interviews were conducted in private and good use was made of prisoner peer workers. The induction wing was reasonably clean. Most, but not all cells were well prepared. Induction was good. The wellbeing centre where prisoners could access a range of early days support was very good.

S4 The number of assaults and fights were lower than at the previous inspection. Prisoners consistently reported feeling safer than in comparable local prisons and in comparison with findings at the last inspection. However, black and minority ethnic, foreign national and vulnerable prisoners were more likely to say they felt unsafe or victimised. The safeguarding unit for vulnerable prisoners, which had been relocated, provided prisoners with a reasonably safe environment. The use of antisocial behaviour intervention plans had been stepped up, staff felt confident using them and they addressed poor behaviour effectively. Sanctions needed to be controlled carefully. Victims of bullying or intimidation received practical support. The safer custody department worked effectively, analysing some information; however, it did not track trends over time.

S5 There had been four self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection. Action points from official reports were being followed up in detail but a single action plan had not been developed. Processes for supporting people at risk of self-harm were implemented well. Staff managed risks confidently, their log entries were comprehensive and relevant, and management oversight was consistent. Although the number of Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) was small, more were being trained and managers and staff supported and facilitated their work well. The prison now offered a better range of support for victims of violence or intimidation and it had advanced plans for imminent changes in social care arrangements. A weekly complex needs meeting had improved multidisciplinary care for those at most risk.

- S6 Security measures were proportionate and prisoners went to activities during well supervised free-flow periods (which allow prisoners to move about the prison unescorted). Prisoners' access to activities was not restricted by security risk assessments. A reasonable amount of security information was analysed well and longer-term targets reflected the major challenges relating to drugs, mobile phones and violence. Links and communication with other departments were good and weekly briefings with residential staff ensured they were aware of current security issues. The mandatory drug testing positive rate was similar to the target for the prison. However, the prison's approach to drug supply reduction combined good intelligence gathering and analysis with effective targeted searching.
- S7 The Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) policy was used appropriately to deal with minor infringements of the rules. Prisoners transferring from other prisons did not always retain their enhanced status and reviews of entry level prisoners were sometimes late.
- S8 The prison monitored and analysed adjudications, use of force and segregation thoroughly. The number of adjudications was relatively high and had increased since our previous inspection reflecting a 'no tolerance' approach to poor behaviour. Adjudication records showed that the prison generally carried out full investigations into what had happened and punishments were proportionate.
- S9 The number of use of force incidents was high and had almost doubled since our previous inspection. Use of full restraint accounted for nearly 77% of all incidents. Incidents often arose when staff appropriately challenged prisoners about poor behaviour. The introduction of prisoner debriefs was encouraging but they were not yet carried out in sufficient depth in all cases. We were assured that force was used legitimately and that de-escalation of incidents was evident. Quality assurance was good and investigations were carried out where necessary. Special accommodation was used infrequently and the process was generally well managed.
- S10 Segregation was used frequently, although few prisoners remained segregated for long. Communal areas and cells were generally clean with very little graffiti, although exercise yards were bleak. Care and reintegration planning was good and staff knew the prisoners' individual circumstances very well. Relationships were also good. The regime was reasonably good and prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were correctly, rarely located in segregation.
- S11 Psychosocial and clinical recovery outcomes were very good; most prisoners who had received support said it had been helpful. We found a well-managed, well-integrated and effective recovery service that maximised the benefits of joint working, group work and peer support.

Respect

- S12 *The general environment and accommodation were good. Staff-prisoner relationships were strong and properly challenging. Some minority groups were less positive than others about key outcomes, but support for prisoners with protected characteristics was generally good. The chaplaincy provision was good. Complaints were managed well. Advice on accessing legal services was readily available. Health services were appropriate and outcomes generally good. Prisoners were more positive about the food than the comparator and canteen arrangements were appropriate. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

- S13 At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were good against this healthy prison test. We made 35 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved, 13 had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*
- S14 Living conditions were generally good, although some prisoners lived in overcrowded cells. New accommodation was very good. Showers had been refurbished, but lacked privacy. Arrangements for clothing, bedding, laundry and property were adequate. The kiosk electronic application system was excellent.
- S15 We observed a positive staff culture that emphasised the respectful treatment of prisoners. Poor behaviour was challenged appropriately. In our survey most prisoners said that staff treated them respectfully and there was a range of options for those who needed assistance with problems or concerns.
- S16 The diversity and equality policy was comprehensive. There was a full-time equalities team and an effective diversity and inclusion action team led by the director. The ongoing monitoring of prisoners' treatment across most protected characteristics was good, although young adults were not yet included. Diversity representatives were in place and provided prisoners with good support. Responses to discrimination incident reporting forms were good and quality assurance was effective.
- S17 Despite the prison's focus on the needs of black and minority ethnic prisoners, this group was less positive in our survey about a range of outcomes. Gypsy, Romany and Traveller prisoners were well supported. Support for foreign national prisoners was good as was prisoners' access to specialist legal advice through the voluntary organisation Hibiscus. Most prisoners with disabilities had their needs met, but there was evidence that the prison failed to identify everyone with a disability who required support. Specific provision for young adults was developing and was reasonably good for older prisoners. The chaplaincy was well integrated and delivered good provision for all faiths. A wide range of useful groups and courses was also provided.
- S18 The number of complaints was not excessive and replies were respectful and dealt with the issues raised. Complaints about staff were taken seriously. Management was good and included quality assurance and monitoring to establish trends. Advice on legal issues was readily available. Access to Justice laptops (which provide eligible prisoners with laptop facilities to progress legal proceedings) were now available. Prisoners were more negative than previously about access to legal visits, but there were no evident deficiencies.
- S19 Health services were reasonably good and governance and partnership arrangements were effective. Long-term condition management and care planning arrangements were underdeveloped. Initial screenings did not assure us that health risks were identified, although all prisoners received follow up through specialised secondary assessments. Prisoners had good access to the nurse triage clinic and GP service, but some told us they did not always receive a response to health care applications.
- S20 An appropriate range of clinics was provided and the quality of services was mainly good, but prisoners waited a long time for the optician and podiatrist. The care provided in the inpatient unit was good and the men we spoke to said they felt supported.

² This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S21 Pharmacy services were good and medicine management arrangements effective. Dentistry was good and men received an appropriate range of treatments. Waiting times were short. Mental health services were very good; response times were timely and a suitable range of interventions was provided but there were a small number of delays before men who needed hospital treatment for their condition were transferred.
- S22 Prisoners were much more positive about food at the prison than is typically reported in comparable prisons, and the food we saw was generally satisfactory, although some meals were served too early. Some newly arrived prisoners had to wait too long to receive their first order from the prison shop. Otherwise arrangements were good and queries from prisoners about their orders were dealt with promptly.

Purposeful activity

S23 *Time out of cell was generally good but access to outside exercise needed to be better. Learning and skills needed better focus to ensure outcomes were consistently good. There were sufficient activity places but attendance in education needed to be improved. The range of opportunities available was limited for those with longer sentences, particularly vocational training. Too much teaching and learning needed improvement. Achievements in many areas were good but not sufficient in some of the most important areas. The library and gym provided prisoners with some good opportunities.*
Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

S24 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 11 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S25 The regime provided some prisoners with over 10 hours out of their cell on weekdays, and nearly all had a reasonable amount of time unlocked. Relatively few prisoners were unemployed but they had the least time out of their cell. Roll checks during main work periods found that on average 29% of prisoners were locked in their cells, which was an improvement but still needed to be better. Evening association was never cancelled or curtailed but prisoners only had half an hour in the open air Monday to Thursday.
- S26 Teaching, learning and assessment were not yet consistently good. Managers' own self-assessment had identified this as an area requiring improvement. However, the range of opportunities had been increased and more places would soon be available. The prison did not analyse or use data sufficiently to develop the curriculum or monitor learning progress. A more detailed training needs analysis was required to ensure that the needs of all groups, including those serving longer sentences, were met.
- S27 There were sufficient activity places to occupy all prisoners at least part time. Good links had been developed with external partners to improve prisoners' employability. The range of education courses and accredited vocational training was adequate. However, progression opportunities for those serving longer sentences were very limited. Insufficient workshop-based support was offered to those who needed to improve their English and mathematics skills. The coordination and sequencing of activities and appointments required improvement to drive up attendance and retention rates, particularly in education.

- S28 Teachers did not always take into account learners' abilities when they planned lessons, which led to some poor outcomes. Individual coaching in vocational areas was not consistently good enough and required improvement. The management of learning resources to support English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) also needed improvement. A more coordinated approach was required to meet the additional learning support needs of some prisoners. However, the use of peer workers was effective. The management of behaviour in lessons was generally good.
- S29 Achievements in the key areas of English, mathematics and functional skills were too low but improving. Success rates for the large majority of those who participated in vocational training were good. The art programme was excellent and prisoners in workshops produced work of a very high standard. Kitchen workers demonstrated appropriate standards in food preparation and handling techniques.
- S30 The kitchen was well equipped and reflected commercial standards. Workshop resources and facilities were good but staff did not promote expected industry practice well enough. Participation in vocational training was low and not all learners were sufficiently challenged or made progress. Prisoners' personal and employability skills were not recorded and/or adequately recognised. Not all activities occupied prisoners fully, wing workers were usually well engaged, although not stretched.
- S31 The library was well used. A small number of prisoners involved in distance learning had good access to the library's computers. Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children) and the Toe by Toe mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read were offered but few other activities were available. Data about who was using the library needed to be used more effectively to improve what was offered.
- S32 Physical education provision and access were good for most, but less so for vulnerable prisoners. The prison's data revealed that just over half of prisoners used the gym regularly, which was high. Facilities were good. Some positive remedial opportunities were offered. Healthy living and lifestyles were promoted well and some excellent links with organisations outside of the prison had been developed to provide additional work opportunities. An appropriate range of accredited learning places were available and achievement rates were reasonable.

Resettlement

- S33 *The strategic management of resettlement was very good. Offender management work was good overall. The Link and Outside Links provision was excellent and provided a range of support on arrival and 'through the gate'. Prisoner mentors were used effectively to support resettlement. Support in the reducing reoffending pathways was very good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S34 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Peterborough were good against this healthy prison test. We made 18 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, five had been partially achieved, two had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S35 Prison staff had a good understanding of the resettlement needs of the population. There were regular well-attended resettlement meetings. The Link continued to provide an excellent 'one-stop-shop' where prisoners could access a wide range of resettlement support. Well-trained peer workers were used effectively to support resettlement work. Resettlement officers provided some excellent practical support to prisoners. Prisoners participated in release on temporary licence (ROTL), including to support family relationships, and processes were robust, although applications were not detailed enough.
- S36 Overall offender management work was relatively good. The offender management unit was well established; staff were knowledgeable and suitably trained. In our survey, prisoners were more likely to report they had an offender supervisor than in similar prisons, and more than the comparator said a staff member had helped them to prepare for release. Offender assessment system (OASys) documents and sentence plans were generally good and included a reasonable assessment of the risks presented by the prisoner, although some completed by external offender managers could have been improved. In some cases the OASys interim custody planning policy - NOMS policy to reduce the backlog in assessments using a shorter custody planning tool - was leading to insufficiently detailed assessments which risked missing important information. Public protection processes were robust and information was appropriately shared. Multi-agency public protection arrangements were well understood and the prison's existing systems identified and tracked cases. Categorisation arrangements were good. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners was generally appropriate.
- S37 Prisoners had a resettlement needs assessment during induction, which was reviewed prior to discharge. Everyone had a resettlement plan with objectives that were monitored. Regular multi-agency meetings promoted networking. Resettlement officers and trained prisoner peer workers provided practical support. The Outside Links facility, which provided 'through-the-gate' support, was very impressive.
- S38 New prisoners received prompt accommodation support and relatively few were released without an address. Information advice and guidance were satisfactory, but the prison had no links to the National Careers Service. There was an effective pre-release programme. Around 31% of prisoners progressed into employment while 5% went into training.
- S39 Pre-release health support was provided on discharge. The prison had effective links with local community mental health teams. Substance misuse resettlement support was good and prisoners had access to drug and alcohol support agency Adfam and charity Safeguarding of Vulnerable Adults as well as to workers from a wide range of community services. The Money Advice Service provided excellent support and prisoners received help to open bank accounts.
- S40 Provision to help prisoners maintain contact with family and friends was very good; a comprehensive range of services was offered, such as parenting and relationship courses and family visits. A wide range of individual family support was offered. The new visitors' centre was pleasant and prisoners' families and friends, particularly new visitors, received good support. Visits were easy to book and visitors were positive about their experiences. We were impressed with the provision and use of the private family room.
- S41 Offending behaviour programmes met prisoners' needs and victim awareness programmes were soon to be introduced. Prisoners were asked about issues around abuse and domestic violence on arrival and offered support if needed.

Main concern and recommendation

S42 Concern: Too much teaching, learning and use of assessments in education classes required improvement. Too many teachers did not use the results of the initial assessment sufficiently to plan lessons. As a result learners found many lessons dull, which meant they became disengaged, which slowed their progress. Teachers did not always set tasks that were appropriate to learners' needs so progress could not be monitored. Prisoners received insufficient feedback.

Recommendation: The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved.

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 journeys were short but some prisoners waited too long in court cells before being transferred to the prison. Most prisoners were positive about safety and how they were treated during escorts.*

I.2 Most prisoners' journeys were relatively short at less than two hours. However, reception staff and prisoners told us that men sometimes waited too long in court for transport to the prison and some journeys for those who were transferred from other prisons were too long. Escort staff were polite and respectful and those we spoke to were clearly focused on prisoners' safety.

I.3 Written escort records were up to date and informative, and escort and reception staff shared prisoner information verbally. Most prisoners said they had a reasonably good experience of transfers to the prison and were positive in our survey about safety and how staff treated them. Good use was made of the video link facility at the prison to reduce the number of prisoners who had to be transported to court.

Recommendation

I.4 **Prisoners should not wait for long periods at court after completing their cases.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

I.5 *Officers and peer workers provided men with good support in reception but some prisoners waited there too long. Not all first night cells were properly prepared. The induction process was very good.*

I.6 The opening of new accommodation shortly before the inspection meant that reception was busier than normal. Groups of prisoners arrived at once in the late afternoon or early evening, leading to long stays in reception often for more than three hours; however, we were reassured that this was a temporary situation while the new house block 5 was being filled.

- I.7** Reception was generally clean and bright. Although holding rooms were reasonably clean, they were poorly equipped and some had graffiti on door panels and windows. Prisoners had nothing to do.
- I.8** Reception officers were welcoming and created a relaxed and friendly atmosphere. Searching was undertaken appropriately and those arriving from other prisons were no longer strip-searched. In our survey, 72% of respondents (more than the comparator) said they were treated well in reception.
- I.9** All prisoners were interviewed in private by a reception officer. Their first night needs were identified, and staff were aware of prisoners' anxieties and the associated risks. They ensured prisoners understood how to access services during their first night. Trained prisoner peer workers also saw all new prisoners privately. All men could have a shower and make a telephone call.
- I.10** New arrivals were located on W1 wing or, if they needed detoxification or stabilisation, on X1 wings (see section on substance misuse). All were routinely observed during their first night. Wing staff and a peer supporter met prisoners, dealt with any immediate concerns, and showed them how to use the electronic wing kiosks that facilitated access to services (see paragraph 2.5).
- I.11** Living conditions on W1 were reasonably good. Communal areas were clean and well decorated but graffiti had been scratched into office and interview room door panels. Some first night cells were grubby and had graffiti.
- I.12** Induction started the day after arrival. Apart from vulnerable prisoners, all new arrivals met a range of staff in the excellent wellbeing induction centre, where they met with a range of staff, including chaplains, drugs workers, resettlement officers and prisoner peer workers. The centre was bright, welcoming, well decorated, and had features such as comfortable chairs and plants which helped create an informal atmosphere where prisoners were more likely to feel at ease and access the range of help that was offered.
- I.13** Prisoners received good induction information that officers and prisoner peer workers presented well; there was time for discussion and prisoners were encouraged to ask questions. We were assured that most prisoners received all important elements of the programme.

Recommendation

- I.14** **Holding rooms in reception should be well equipped, all first night cells should be clean and both should be free of graffiti.**

Good practice

- I.15** *The wellbeing centre offered a welcoming and informal setting for newly arrived prisoners to access a wide range of support offered by both staff and prisoners.*

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.16 *Most prisoners felt relatively safe, although those with disabilities and some other minority groups felt less so. The number of fights and assaults had declined. A system of early intervention to reduce violence had been stepped up in recent months and was having an impact. Victims of bullying or intimidation received practical support*

I.17 In our survey, 32% of prisoners said they had felt unsafe in the prison at some time, fewer than in 2011 (47%) and than the comparator (43%). Only 13% said they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection, better than 18% in 2011 and 19% in the comparator. Prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, and foreign nationals, were less likely to feel safe, and black and minority ethnic prisoners were more likely to report victimisation by both staff and other prisoners. Almost half of people with disabilities said they had been victimised by other prisoners.

I.18 Vulnerable prisoners had been moved to the safeguarding unit on Royce wing in the newly built house block 5 where it was easier for them to be separated from main location prisoners to minimise verbal intimidation. However, prisoners there still felt less safe than others: in our survey a quarter said they had felt unsafe at the time of the survey.

I.19 The number of violent incidents was not excessive and there had been an average of 14 fights each month over the previous year, fewer than at the previous inspection.

I.20 Antisocial behaviour intervention plans (ASBIPs) had been introduced since the previous inspection and had been used frequently, particularly in the past four months. This reflected a decision by managers to address more actively any early signs of problematic behaviour.

I.21 Staff felt confident using ASBIPs. Entries and case reviews were variable, but where they related to those with complex needs, they were generally good. As well as interventions (such as an anger management course), the ASBIPs provided for 'sanctions'. Although they were generally used in a measured way, the prison did not ensure any restrictions did not undermine or overlap with the discipline and incentives and earned privileges processes.

I.22 The safer custody team gave victims of bullying or intimidation practical support. A formal system for supporting victims had been devised but had not been implemented for four months up to the time of inspection owing to staffing issues.

I.23 Current issues were considered at well-attended monthly safer custody meetings, but there was no systematic analysis of statistics or trends in safer custody over time. Two prisoners had been present at each meeting.

Recommendation

I.24 **Managers should ensure there is an integrated strategic approach to behaviour management in which incentives and antisocial behaviour measures work together coherently, taking into account any patterns and trends in violence.**

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.25 *Lessons learned from four self-inflicted deaths were being applied effectively, although a more integrated approach was needed. Staff understood and used the systems for monitoring and supporting those at risk of harm very well. Listeners were effective and well supported by the establishment and local Samaritans.*

I.26 There had been four self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection in 2011. The prison had made good progress in implementing recommendations arising from investigations into the deaths in areas such as information sharing, coordinated care and incident response. However, it did not have an integrated action plan responding to the separate investigations. Night staff were familiar with processes to support those at risk of self-harm and knew the individual circumstances of those at risk on their wing.

I.27 Prisoners who were deemed at risk of suicide or self-harm were appropriately placed on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) process. These processes were implemented well and entries in logs were of a high standard. Frequent conversations with prisoners about their mood and experiences were recorded in detail. Staff, who were well supported by a committed safer custody team, were confident monitoring and supporting people at risk. Information from the safer custody team was effectively used to inform a strategic approach. A weekly meeting addressed prisoners' risk of harm to themselves and others. (See also section on health services, delivery of care (mental health).)

I.28 Multidisciplinary attendance at the monthly safer prison meetings had improved, with prisoners and Samaritans representatives attending regularly. Samaritans workers met with the small team of Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) every week.

I.29 Listeners' work was well advertised and prisoners knew about it. Listeners could move freely around the prison, were used well after incidents, and felt managers and staff supported them well. Twelve more prisoners were undergoing Listener training.

Recommendation

I.30 **A single death in custody action plan should be drawn up to monitor progress in implementing recommendations from all investigations carried out.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.³

I.31 *Preparations were in hand for the practical implications of the Care Act. Prisoners at risk were assessed and located appropriately. Informal support for victims of violence or abuse was good.*

I.32 Managers had been involved in detailed planning with the local authority, to ensure that there would be a seamless and practicable system for meeting prisoners' social care needs when the Care Act came into force. New questions had been added to the reception screening questionnaire to prepare for this.

I.33 There was an adequate safeguarding policy and a weekly complex needs meeting had improved multidisciplinary care for those most at risk. The safeguarding officer could refer those who had been victims of domestic violence or abuse to a variety of groups (see section on additional resettlement services).

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.34 *Security measures were proportionate. A reasonable amount of security information was analysed every week and longer-term targets reflected the major challenges faced. Communication with other departments was excellent. The strategic approach to drug supply reduction focused on and responded to the main threats, although the number of completed suspicion tests was too low.*

I.35 Physical security measures were proportionate and supported the prison's category B status. The prison had stopped routinely strip-searching all prisoners in reception, although the number of prisoners strip-searched after visits was high at 20%.

I.36 Prisoners were supervised well while going to activities during free-flow periods (which allow prisoners to move about the prison unescorted) and were either escorted outside these times or issued with 'movement slips', enabling them to get to appointments or activities. Vulnerable prisoners always moved around the prison separately. Security staff contributed to prisoners' risk assessments for activities, assessments were proportionate and prisoners' access to activities was not unduly restricted.

³ We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

- I.37** There had been 1729 information reports in the six months prior to our inspection, which staff from all departments had submitted. Intelligence was analysed well and the communication of intelligence to other departments was excellent. Key departments were represented at the monthly security meeting and relevant longer-term objectives were set to reflect the major challenges relating to drugs, mobile phones and violence. A daily security staff bulletin outlined the intelligence received and what further information was required. Security staff attended wing meetings regularly to ensure wing staff knew about current security issues and objectives.
- I.38** Four prisoners were subject to closed visits restrictions and nine visitors had been banned; all had been placed under the restrictions for visits-related illicit activity. The appeal process was explained to prisoners, who were informed of the outcomes of monthly reviews.
- I.39** Adequate anti-corruption procedures were in place and the prison received good support from the local police.
- I.40** The prison's approach to drug supply reduction combined good intelligence gathering and analysis with effective targeted searching. Spice and Pandora's Box (highly potent synthetic cannabinoids, potentially more harmful than cannabis, that do not show up in mandatory drug-testing (MDT)) were recognised as ongoing concerns. Since the introduction of an awareness campaign by the recovery team, which included leaflets, posters and one-to-one sessions, there had been a reduction in the number of suspected drug-related incidents.
- I.41** The prison's suspicion testing performance over the past six months had declined: of 21 tests requested, only eight (38%) were conducted; there were five (62.5%) positives. Only four officers were registered as trained to deliver tests, which was the main reason why not enough were being carried.
- I.42** The positive random mandatory drug-testing (MDT) rate for the six months to January 2015 was 10.3% against a key performance target of 10.5%. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator (28% against 34%) said it was easy to get illegal drugs, and only 3% against a comparator of 8% said they had developed a problem with drugs in the prison. As few as half the comparator (4% against 8%) said they had developed a problem with diverted medication since being in the prison. The testing suite was clean, tidy and appropriately equipped.

Recommendation

- I.43** **The establishment should ensure that the MDT programme is adequately resourced by trained testing officers so that all requested suspicion tests are undertaken.**

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

Expected outcomes:

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

I.44 *The IEP policy was used appropriately to deal with minor infringements of rules. Prisoners transferring to Peterborough from other prisons did not always retain their enhanced status and reviews of entry level prisoners were sometimes late.*

I.45 Staff used the IEP scheme to deal with minor infringements of prison rules; its aim was to promote good behaviour. Prisoners could receive negative and positive awards depending on their behaviour and those we examined were appropriately issued. Positive awards could be exchanged for additional privileges such as stationery, phone credit and additional in-possession property.

I.46 Prisoners, whether at Peterborough or elsewhere, could apply for enhanced status once they had been in prison for three months, but those who were transferred from other prisons had to spend 14 days on standard level, which was inappropriate if they had achieved enhanced level at their last prison. Reviews were well recorded but not always signed by the prisoner and targets were often not related to the prisoner's behaviour. Reviews for prisoners on the entry level of the scheme were sometimes up to two weeks late.

I.47 Prisoners on the basic level of the scheme had a review every seven days and returned to the standard regime once their behaviour improved. They received sufficient time out of cell for meals and association and could continue attending work or education. The prison had management oversight of the scheme and assurance checks were made of review boards. The system for ensuring that prisoners were not punished twice for the same infringement needed to be tightened (see section on bullying and violence reduction, paragraph I.21).

Recommendations

I.48 **Prisoners should be able to retain their enhanced status when they arrive from another prison.**

I.49 **Reviews for prisoners completing the entry level should be held on time.**

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

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

I.50 *The monitoring and analysis of adjudications, use of force and segregation were thorough. The number of adjudications was high and had increased since the previous inspection. The number of use of force incidents was also high and had almost doubled since the previous inspection. Both increases were related to a 'no tolerance' approach to poor behaviour. We were assured that force was used legitimately. Segregation was used frequently, although few remained there for long. Care and reintegration planning was good and staff knew prisoners very well. The regime was reasonably good.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.51** The monitoring and analysis of use of force, segregation and adjudications was thorough and managers were aware of trends and underlying issues and took action to resolve any concerns.
- I.52** The number of adjudications was high and had increased since our previous inspection, reflecting a 'no tolerance' approach to poor behaviour. The main charges were for assaults, disobedience and unauthorised articles. Adjudications were monitored at quarterly adjudications standardisation and segregation monitoring and review group meetings. Quality assurance of individual adjudication records at meetings was good.
- I.53** Adjudications were held in the segregation unit and the independent adjudicator attended every month to hear more serious charges. Documentation we reviewed and adjudications we observed showed that prisoners were given every chance to present their account of events and that full investigations were generally carried out. Records were generally detailed and gave a good account of the proceedings. Punishments were proportionate and in accordance with the published tariff.

The use of force

- I.54** The number of use of force incidents was high and had almost doubled since our previous full inspection. Full use of restraint accounted for 77% of all the 160 incidents that had occurred in the previous six months. As with adjudications, the number reflected the 'no tolerance' approach to poor behaviour. Managers had introduced debriefs following use of force incidents but they were not carried out in all cases. They were not sufficiently detailed to inform future practice. We were assured that force was used legitimately and that de-escalation was used appropriately.
- I.55** Managers had raised issues about individual incidents and dealt with them appropriately; quality assurance procedures for use of force were good. All planned incidents were reviewed and procedures were in place to review use of force documentation promptly to ensure its use had been proportionate. CCTV coverage was reviewed when incidents led to adjudications or when managers identified concerns. Documentation we looked at was well completed and demonstrated that force was used legitimately, although a number of records showed some staff's lack of experience in dealing with prisoners on a one-to-one basis.

- I.56** Special accommodation had been used only twice since the previous inspection and the process was used as a last resort. One incident had not been sufficiently well documented and failed to explain why the prisoner had remained in the cell overnight. When we spoke to staff involved, we were assured its use in the circumstances described was justified. The special cell only had a low wooden plinth and a stool fixed to the floor; staff told us they would not provide a mattress. There was little natural light and the light in the cell was kept on all day and night according to the documentation we examined; one prisoner had damaged the light fitting at night time because it disturbed his sleep.

Recommendations

- I.57** **Prisoner debriefs following use of force should be carried out for all prisoners and reviewed so lessons can be learned.**
- I.58** **Lighting in the special accommodation should be appropriate and prisoners should be provided with a mattress subject to security and safety considerations.**

Housekeeping point

- I.59** The use of special accommodation should be properly documented.

Segregation

- I.60** Segregation was used frequently; 305 prisoners had been segregated in the previous six months. The segregation unit was clean and there was little graffiti in cells, although the exercise yards were bare and cage-like.
- I.61** Prisoners entering the unit were searched in line with individual risk assessments. Few remained in the unit for long and the majority returned to residential units within the prison. Multidisciplinary reviews took place at prescribed intervals. All prisoners had care plans showing what support was in place. Staff in the unit knew prisoners very well and relationships were excellent.
- I.62** Six prisoners were in the unit during the inspection, four for reasons of 'good order' and discipline and two for their own safety. Those we spoke to were complimentary about their treatment. One prisoner who had been held in different segregation units for the entire 13 months of his sentence spoke highly of the support he had received since arriving at Peterborough, and indicated that it had helped him to consider returning to the normal prison location.
- I.63** The regime in the unit was reasonably good and prisoners could visit the gym and library subject to a risk assessment. Some in-cell education was available and prisoners could use the showers, telephones and kiosks every day. Those who were segregated for their own safety could have a television in their cells. Prisoners on ACCT case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm were rarely located in the segregation unit.

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.64 *The recovery team provided a comprehensive range of effective interventions and support that prisoners appreciated.*

- I.65** The psychosocial recovery team delivered a good range of group work including two accredited programmes – Building Skills for Recovery and Control of Violence for Angry Impulsive Drinkers. Additional single session groups covered harm reduction and included an awareness campaign on drugs and areas related to recovery. Tackling Drugs Through Physical Education was delivered in partnership with the gym.
- I.66** Group work was underpinned by effective one-to-one sessions and in-cell work packs. Peer support was provided by two ‘recovery champions’ who delivered inductions and one-to-one support. The peers were well trained, supervised and supported.
- I.67** These interventions, plus weekly Alcoholics Anonymous meetings, amounted to a well-balanced mix of harm reduction- and recovery-focused treatment options that were very well received by prisoners. In our survey, more than the comparator, 91% against 76%, said the support they had received had been helpful.
- I.68** Prisoners arriving at the prison with an alcohol or opiate problem spent their first night and any subsequent stabilisation period on the recovery wing (X1). Regular specially selected staff on the wing played a significant part in promoting a generally calm and therapeutic atmosphere. Prisoners told us the support from recovery champions on the recovery wing was also particularly helpful.
- I.69** A total of 111 prisoners (16.5%) were receiving opiate substitution treatment. Of those, 95 were on methadone and 16 on buprenorphine (Subutex); 87 (78.3%) prisoners were receiving maintenance doses and 24 (21.7%) were on reducing doses.
- I.70** Clinical reviews for prisoners on opiate substitution were conducted more frequently than the required minimum of 13 weeks. Prisoners told us they found this helpful and supportive. Reviews involved the specialist GP, the recovery service manager and integrated drug treatment system nurse. We had concerns about the administration of methadone (see paragraph 2.72).

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 *Living conditions were good and there was an excellent new building for almost 300 prisoners. Too many cells built for one were shared and older buildings had some graffiti. Ventilation continued to be a problem in many cells and showers lacked privacy. Prisoners could now make a wider range of requests and enquiries through the electronic kiosks, but they had less confidence in the paper applications system.*

2.2 The environment was generally good; the 10-year-old buildings were in reasonable condition and house block 5, the new accommodation for almost 300 more men, was spacious and bright. Several cells, particularly on the induction wing, were in a poorer state and had some graffiti. A total of 157 cells designed as single cells were used as doubles, most of which had bunk beds. The ventilation system was not working effectively enough. Most prisoners had courtesy keys to their cells, but a number were missing. In-cell toilets in many cases had no lids and prisoners had created improvised alternatives.

2.3 The showers in all buildings were in fair condition but were relatively open to view with no cubicle dividers, which meant they lacked privacy.

2.4 Arrangements for clothing, bedding, laundry and property were adequate. In our survey, prisoners' perceptions of their living conditions were more positive than the comparator, and responses had generally improved since the previous inspection.

2.5 All wings had electronic 'kiosks', enabling prisoners to deal effectively with most day-to-day requests and transactions. Some applications were still made on paper application forms and were not recorded or tracked and prisoners lacked confidence in the process. A number of in-cell terminals combining a TV with 'kiosk' access were being trialled in part of one wing, which would provide a better range of functions.

2.6 Four telephones were still located next to each other under privacy hoods on each landing of the older buildings. Although prisoners had limited privacy, they were happy with the arrangement, as the amount of association time they received meant they could make calls throughout the day. In-cell telephones were available in the new house block.

Recommendations

2.7 **Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared.** (Repeated recommendation 2.7)

2.8 **Ventilation in cells should be improved.** (Repeated recommendation 2.8)

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

2.9 *We observed a positive staff culture that emphasised the respectful treatment of prisoners. Poor behaviour was challenged appropriately.*

2.10 In our survey more prisoners than in comparator prisons or compared with the previous inspection said that staff treated them respectfully. They were also more likely than the comparator to say staff checked on them regularly and spoke to them during association. Our observations confirmed this and it was evident that staff had high standards when it came to interactions with prisoners. Their approach seemed to us both impressive and professional. Staff also had high expectations of prisoners and were not afraid to challenge poor behaviour. The prison evidenced a calm and respectful atmosphere, contributing to prisoners' feelings of wellbeing and safety. Some good prisoner consultation took place and there was evidence that actions were being progressed.

2.11 While prisoners in our survey were more negative than the comparator about having a personal officer, we observed that the generally positive approach adopted by the vast majority of staff meant that in reality prisoners had a range of options if they needed assistance with problems, concerns or resettlement issues.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic⁵ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

2.12 *There was a comprehensive policy and overall the management of equality and diversity was reasonably good. Responses to discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were good. Prisoners from black and minority ethnic groups received appropriate support from staff but in our survey, they were less positive than white prisoners in some areas. There was good individual support for foreign national prisoners. Evidence revealed that the prison was not identifying all prisoners with disabilities. Older prisoners on the main wings received reasonable support but specific provision for young adults required development.*

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

Strategic management

- 2.13** The diversity and equality policy was comprehensive and a full-time equality and inclusion manager was responsible for taking the lead on work for all strands apart from foreign national prisoners.
- 2.14** Strong leadership had led to a coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination. The director or deputy director chaired the well-attended monthly diversity and inclusion action team (DIAT). Minutes showed that issues raised were followed up.
- 2.15** Good use was made of monitoring data to identify prisoners' treatment across the protected characteristics. Monitoring was discussed in detail by the DIAT and had resulted in some meaningful action. However, the prison's small number of young adult prisoners was not included in monitoring processes.
- 2.16** The role of prisoner equality and diversity representatives was well advertised. Staff supported their work while prisoners appreciated it. The representatives attended all DIAT meetings and prisoner council meetings. Good staff-prisoner relationships also helped to ensure that prisoners from all protected characteristics received the help and support they needed.
- 2.17** A range of good equality impact assessments had been conducted. Actions arising from them and information from prisoner forums fed into the action plan, monitored by the DIAT.
- 2.18** In the six months prior to the inspection, 20 DIRFs had been submitted. All had been investigated thoroughly and there was evidence that one-to-one discussions took place with those involved. Responses were quality assured by the equality and inclusion manager and often the director. Equality and diversity complaints made through the prison's general complaints system were referred to the equality and inclusion manager. Complaints of discrimination made against staff were taken seriously, and there was evidence that action had been taken in appropriate cases.

Protected characteristics

- 2.19** About 20% of the population were from black and minority ethnic groups. In our survey, their responses were comparable to white prisoners in many areas but less favourable in others. For example, although 77% said most staff treated them with respect, similar to white prisoners, only 58%, compared with 75% of white prisoners, said they had a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem.
- 2.20** There were bimonthly prisoner forums for black and minority ethnic prisoners led by the equalities manager and prisoners from this group we spoke to were positive about their treatment. They said they felt staff supported them and their needs were generally being met. We found no evidence of unfair treatment and good staff-prisoner relationships also helped ensure prisoners received the help and support they needed.
- 2.21** Our survey indicated that approximately 6% of the population were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background, in contrast to less than 2% identified by the prison. Despite this group being under-identified, provision was reasonably good. Events were held twice a year to celebrate Traveller culture and two prisoners from this background acted as diversity representatives and staff and prisoners knew them.

- 2.22** About 15% of the population were foreign nationals. An up-to-date register of foreign national prisoners who had some difficulties with English was maintained. Access to telephone translation services was good and the prison had an up-to-date list of prisoners and staff willing to act as translators.
- 2.23** Two full-time managers offered foreign national men good support and were very familiar with prisoners' immigration cases. Both were trained and had been seconded to work with immigration staff at an immigration removal centre. The voluntary organisation Hibiscus helped men to instruct legal representatives and resettle in their country of origin.
- 2.24** Prisoners could make an international call to their families each month whether or not they had received visits. Consultation with foreign national prisoners was good and monthly forums were well attended. The equality and inclusion manager saw all foreign national prisoners individually at least once a month. Despite this, foreign national prisoners also reported less well in some key areas. In our survey, more foreign national prisoners than their British counterparts said they currently felt unsafe, while fewer said they had a member of staff they could turn to with a problem.
- 2.25** In our survey, 22% of prisoners considered themselves to have a disability, significantly more than 6% recorded by the prison. While good adjustments had been made for some men, we found a small number of disabled prisoners with clear needs who had not been identified. There were adapted cells on each house block and personal emergency and evacuation plans (PEEPs) were completed for all prisoners when necessary. We were told prisoners with more complex physical needs had care plans but we found little evidence that residential officers were aware of them.
- 2.26** Although most men with disabilities we spoke to said the environment was generally supportive, they were more negative than others in some key survey areas. Nearly half said they had been victimised by other prisoners and nearly a quarter (24%) said that they had felt threatened or intimidated.
- 2.27** The prison recorded that 8% of the prison population were over 50, 2% of whom were over 60. Provision for this group was reasonably good. Most were on Burghley wing in house block 5, which was generally quieter than some of the other residential units. Formal consultation with older prisoners was good. Prisoners aged 50 and over and men with disabilities could attend a regular open forum and representatives raised issues at DIAT meetings.
- 2.28** Prisoners who reached the retirement age of 65 were not required to work. These prisoners and those unable to work because of a disability were unlocked most of the working day. Efforts were made to adapt working environments if prisoners wanted to work despite their age or disability.
- 2.29** The small number of remanded young adult prisoners were identified at reception and resettlement officers saw them individually. Once convicted, they were transferred to other prisons, although with plans in the near future to develop Peterborough into a resettlement prison (for local releases) some convicted young adults are likely to be held. There were plans to develop age-specific activities such as the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme. However, there was currently little in place to identify or meet this group's needs.

Recommendations

- 2.30** The poor perceptions of minority groups should be explored and addressed.
- 2.31** The identification of disabled prisoners should be improved so that their needs can be met effectively.
- 2.32** Monitoring data about young adult prisoners should be introduced and their specific needs identified and met.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

2.33 *The chaplaincy was well integrated and delivered good faith provision. A wide range of groups and courses was available.*

- 2.34** The chaplaincy was active, visible and well integrated into prison life, delivering good faith provision for all. The team comprised a full-time managing chaplain and sessional and part-time chaplains, who catered for all main religions. The team was supported by outside speakers, ministers from various denominations, official prison visitors and volunteers from local faith communities.
- 2.35** The two multi-faith spaces – a large chapel and a smaller multi-faith room – were well maintained and suitable. There were appropriate washing facilities. Muslim Friday prayers were regularly attended and a full programme of religious festival celebrations involved prayer and social gatherings.
- 2.36** One of the team visited the segregation unit and health care department every day and attended assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management reviews for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm. Chaplains also regularly attended prison operational meetings such as those on safer custody, security and complex cases, as well as DIAT meetings.
- 2.37** The chaplaincy facilitated an excellent range of courses, groups and support sessions, such as the Alpha (Christian faith) and Living with Loss courses. There was also a full range of faith-related activities, such as Bible and Quran studies and spiritual guidance groups.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

2.38 *Prisoners understood the complaints process, responses were prompt and dealt with the issues raised and governance was good.*

2.39 Prisoners knew how to use the complaints system, and an average of 120 were made each month, which was not excessive. In our survey, 59% of respondents said it was easy to make a complaint and 42% said they were dealt with fairly, which were better than the comparator.

2.40 With a few exceptions, responses were very good, respectful and addressed the issues raised. Interim replies for more complicated cases were issued to prisoners, along with a predicted conclusion date. Most (about 90%) received a response within three working days of receipt. Complaints against staff were taken seriously – senior staff investigated them thoroughly.

2.41 Governance arrangements for recording, managing and investigating complaints were very good. The complaints clerk ensured that all complaints were logged and dispatched promptly to managers for action. Senior managers analysed the types of complaint made, and action was taken to deal with identified issues.

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.

2.42 *Prisoners had ready access to advice about legal matters.*

2.43 Prisoners could make appointments to visit the Link, where they could obtain legal advice about matters such as bail and appeals (see paragraph 4.4 and section on reintegration planning); they were satisfied with the advice they received there. They found offender supervisors helpful in directing them to sources of legal assistance.

2.44 Secure Access to Justice laptops (which provide eligible prisoners with laptop facilities to progress legal proceedings), were now available and properly controlled. Our survey showed that prisoners were less happy than previously about their access to legal visits, but there were no clear systemic flaws contributing to this perception. Legal visits facilities were reasonably good.

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.

2.45 *Health care services were reasonably good overall and effectively governed. Initial health care screening arrangements required more robust oversight. An appropriate range of services was delivered and waiting times were short except for the optician and podiatry services. Prisoners had good access to nurse triage clinics and the GP, but long-term condition management and care planning arrangements were underdeveloped. The inpatient service delivered effective clinical support. Pharmacy and dental services were reasonably good; mental health services were very good.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.46** Governance arrangements were effective and relationships between partners were sound; there was an established partnership board and health care staff attended wider prison meetings. A 2014 health needs assessment highlighted areas requiring development and action was being taken.
- 2.47** A senior nurse, supported by a number of nursing colleagues with specific responsibilities, led the health care team. There were vacancies in the team but all core functions were met. Staff's training needs were identified and group learning initiatives took place every month. Nursing staff did not routinely receive regular clinical supervision.
- 2.48** The prison had no dedicated patient forum, although health issues featured in prisoner forums. Prisoners' health care complaints, made via the prison complaint system, were forwarded to the health care team. Responses were prompt and addressed the concerns raised. Management reviews of serious incidents and monitoring of action plans stemming from them were good.
- 2.49** Health care staff contributed to the weekly multi-agency complex needs meetings. Work was undertaken to identify men with long-term conditions. However, health care plans for these prisoners were underdeveloped. Prisoners were screened at reception but we found a small number with physical disabilities whom the prison had not identified (see section on equality and diversity, protected characteristics).
- 2.50** Emergency arrangements and response times were appropriate and the prison had a suitable protocol which health and custodial staff observed. Emergency resuscitation equipment and automated defibrillators, which were checked every day, were available in the health care centre and in each of the house blocks. All nursing staff had undertaken mandatory training in emergency resuscitation. However, not all custody staff were trained to use defibrillators, or had had up-to-date basic life support skills.
- 2.51** Health care staff used policies for managing communicable diseases and information governance. Health promotion initiatives and screening programmes were being developed, but barrier protection was not well advertised. Information about available health services was reasonable and adequately displayed in house blocks. Most clinical environments were generally clean but treatment rooms in house blocks 3 and 4 had dirty air vents and stained walls, which did not comply with infection prevention standards.

Recommendations

- 2.52** Prisoners should be able to make a confidential complaint directly to health providers.
- 2.53** Prisoners should have a care plan, based on an initial review; appropriately trained and well-supervised staff should carry out subsequent periodic reviews.
- 2.54** All wing staff should receive regular first aid and resuscitation training and there should be sufficient trained staff to use emergency equipment. (Repeated recommendation 5.16)

Housekeeping points

- 2.55** All staff should have clinical supervision.
- 2.56** The prison should consider establishing a dedicated patient health forum.
- 2.57** The strategy to promote health and wellbeing among the prisoner population should include easier access to barrier protection.
- 2.58** All clinical environments and assessment/treatment rooms should comply with infection prevention standards and be subject to regular audit.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.59** Reception health screening was undertaken by both registered and unregistered nursing staff who could call on a senior nurse or GP if necessary. However, we observed gaps in practice and a lack of privacy. All men, however, were seen by the triage nurse generally within 24 hours of arriving in the prison for a more detailed secondary assessment, which we judged to be effective. The facilities used by the triage nurse in the wellbeing centre were not suitable and limited what clinical interventions could be provided.
- 2.60** Although we observed a very small number of nurses who were abrupt, most staff we saw interacted with prisoners positively.
- 2.61** In our survey, more prisoners said it was easy to see the doctor and dentist than at comparator prisons and more were also positive about the overall quality of services (48% compared to 36%), a view supported by the majority of those we spoke to. A small number were dissatisfied with the care provided, in particular they did not think they received their prescribed medication promptly enough. A number of prisoners also told us that applications for access to health services did not always receive a response.
- 2.62** Although we observed some gaps in the provision overall, the treatments offered were clinically appropriate and delivered in a timely manner. However, non-attendance rates were high for a number of clinics and were not routinely followed up. The range of primary care services was generally appropriate, but prisoners waited too long for optician and podiatry appointments.
- 2.63** The inpatient unit remained part of the prison's certified normal accommodation with six of the 12 beds occupied during the inspection, although there was no evidence that beds were being used for non-clinical reasons. All prisoners in the unit were there for clinically appropriate reasons; the majority had mental health needs that were subject to regular

multidisciplinary reviews. The service provided was good and both custody staff and health practitioners were well motivated and worked collaboratively in the best interests of prisoners, who told us they felt well supported.

Recommendations

- 2.64** The facilities used by the triage nurse in the wellbeing centre should be upgraded to allow more appropriate secondary health screening and interventions to take place.
- 2.65** The high non-attendance rate should be investigated to ensure men with genuine health needs are not disadvantaged and that services are delivered efficiently.
- 2.66** Waiting times for optician and podiatry services should be equivalent to those in the community.

Housekeeping point

- 2.67** All inpatient beds should be removed from the list of certified normal accommodation. (Repeated recommendation 5.39)

Pharmacy

- 2.68** Pharmacy services were generally good. An external pharmacy dispensed medication, which was distributed from the pharmacy room within the prison. Air conditioning within the pharmacy was available, but was not always switched on. Medicines were issued from the pharmacy or one of three wing-based treatment rooms within the prison. The pharmacist spent 32 hours a week in the prison and ran a half-day medication clinic for patients. The duty nurse had access to the pharmacy room and controlled drugs (CD) cabinet out of hours, but there was no effective audit trail to show which medications had been removed.
- 2.69** Medicines were supplied either in possession as named patient medication, or as 'see-to-take' medication (where prisoners are observed taking their medicine), which a nurse administered from stock. A number of men reported, and we observed, some delays in prisoners getting their prescribed medications.
- 2.70** Medicines in house blocks 3 and 4 were not routinely stored in treatment rooms but were transported through the prison in lockable trolleys. The trolleys were too full and it was difficult for the nurse to manage administration safely. We observed a small number of 'near misses', which could have resulted in administration errors.
- 2.71** New treatment rooms in house block 5 were clean and well presented, however storage for dispensed medication was not sufficient, which meant medicines were stacked in named baskets that were visible through the treatment hatch.
- 2.72** A risk assessment was completed for each patient when medication was provided in possession, which the doctor had access to at the time of prescribing. Discipline staff managed queues at treatment hatches; only one patient was allowed in the room at a time, ensuring privacy, although in house block 3 we observed that this was not properly enforced.

- 2.73** A number of patient group directions (PGDs) (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) were in place. PGD medicines were recorded on a separate sheet. However, we were told that PGD medications were not always transferred to patients' individual clinical records as detailed in the PGD document. We saw one patient with a possible contraindication, who was almost issued with ibuprofen before the pharmacist intervened.
- 2.74** There was no 'over the counter' remedies policy, which meant that some simple remedies were not readily available. While ibuprofen could be purchased from the canteen list, paracetamol could not.

Recommendations

- 2.75** **Access to the pharmacy and CD cabinet should be audited, as should any medicines taken from the pharmacy room out of hours; all checks should be recorded.**
- 2.76** **The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock should be used only if unavoidable.** (Repeated recommendation 5.29)
- 2.77** **A policy for prisoners reporting sick to nurses should be implemented and regularly reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied.** (Repeated recommendation 5.30)

Housekeeping points

- 2.78** The ambient temperature of the pharmacy should be monitored and appropriate steps taken to ensure it provides an appropriate environment for medicines to be stored.
- 2.79** Storage should be reviewed for dispensed medication in the house block 5 treatment rooms.
- 2.80** Officers supervising administration queues should consistently enforce the rules preventing overcrowding in the hatch areas.
- 2.81** PGD supplies should be dispensed in accordance with the policy and recorded on the patient record.

Dentistry

- 2.82** The dentist offered routine assessments and a full range of NHS treatments. Prisoners had good access. The longest waiting time we saw was four weeks. Urgent referrals were seen promptly and the primary physical health care team offered triage and pain relief. Prisoners we spoke to said they found the dental care good, which was supported by our observations. The dentist recorded all consultations and treatments on SystmOne (the electronic clinical information system) and provided duplicated written records.
- 2.83** The dental suite was suitably equipped and the environment very clean, but there was no separate area for decontaminating equipment. Dental equipment was appropriately maintained and waste materials were safely disposed of.

Housekeeping point

- 2.84** There should be a separate area for decontaminating equipment.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.85** The mental health in-reach team (MHIT) provided both primary and secondary care through an appropriate mix of psychiatry, mental health nurses and clinical psychologists. The MHIT oversaw and delivered an appropriate range of services, including self-help, counselling and interventions for prisoners with complex mental health problems.
- 2.86** The team provided the inpatient and segregation units with regular input and made effective contributions to ACCT processes. Access to the service was initiated through reception screening and supplemented by a continuing 'alert' referral system, triggered by custodial or generic health care staff, or prisoners' families when they had concerns. Applications were reviewed on a daily basis and prisoners assigned a nominated caseworker. The mental health team met regularly with primary health and substance use staff and were regarded as an integral part of the prison team. Most men referred to the service were seen within 48 hours and urgent referrals were seen on the same day. Waiting times for treatment were equivalent to community services.
- 2.87** The team's total caseload consisted of 60 prisoners, of whom 29 had enduring mental health problems and were being cared for using the care programme approach (CPA) (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness). Record keeping on SystemOne was consistently of a high standard. CPA documents and risk assessments were completed robustly and information was appropriately shared with relevant stakeholders. Very few custody staff we spoke to had undertaken mental health awareness training except as part of their initial custody officer training.
- 2.88** In the previous 12 months, 15 men had been transferred to hospital under the Mental Health Act; three transfers had been delayed for longer than three weeks after their assessment outcome.

Recommendations

- 2.89 All prison staff should attend mental health awareness training.** (Repeated recommendation 5.45)
- 2.90 The transfer of patients to hospital under the Mental Health Act should occur within Department of Health transfer target timescales.**

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.

2.91 *Prisoners were more positive about the food than the comparator. Food was varied and portion sizes adequate, although lunch and evening meals were served too early. Prisoners had insufficient hot water at night. Prisoner consultation was good.*

2.92 Prisoners were far more positive than the comparator about the food and 56% compared with 20% said it was good. Inspectors thought catering was generally satisfactory. The menu was varied and portion sizes were good. Lunch and evening meals were served too early - at weekends, the evening meal was served at 4pm which meant there was a long gap before they received breakfast the following day. Breakfast packs were issued every day on the morning they were eaten.

2.93 Only prisoners on the enhanced privileges level had a kettle in their cell; all others had only a small flask to last them up to 16 hours overnight and water did not stay hot.

2.94 The catering manager held monthly focus group meetings with prisoners to discuss catering, and wing food comments books were checked regularly. A survey of prisoners' perceptions of the food had been carried out and some menu changes adopted as a result.

2.95 The kitchen was well maintained and equipped and wing serveries were clean and well supervised, however, not all serveries workers were appropriately dressed.

Recommendation

2.96 **Prisoners should have sufficient hot water during the night.**

Housekeeping point

2.97 Prisoners should be appropriately dressed when serving food.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.98 *The prison shop had a large range of goods and problems were promptly addressed. Some newly arrived prisoners waited too long to receive their first order.*

2.99 The prison shop continued to be run in-house, and problems with orders were promptly dealt with, usually on the same day. New arrivals were advanced the cost of a reception pack

of shop items and received phone credit, repayable at 50p per week. Depending on the day of their arrival some prisoners could wait up to 11 days before they received a first shop order.

2.100 There were over 500 products, many of which had been added following regular prisoner consultation. Prisoners used catalogues for clothing, DVDs and books. There was no administration charge for catalogue orders.

2.101 Despite this, only 38% of prisoners in our survey, fewer than the comparator and than in 2011, said the shop sold a wide enough range of goods; only 20% of black or minority ethnic prisoners and 16% of Muslim prisoners said the shop sold products that met their needs. Prisoners ordered products through wing kiosks.

Recommendation

2.102 Prisoners should be able to access a full canteen order within 72 hours of arrival.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

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

3.1 *The amount of time prisoners spent out of their cells was relatively good and association periods were not curtailed or cancelled. Prisoners did not spend enough time in the open air.*

3.2 On weekdays, the majority of prisoners were out of their cells for 10 hours, and at weekends for seven hours. In our spot checks during main work periods, an average of 29% of prisoners were locked in their cells, and although this needed further improvement it was better than previously. Relatively few prisoners were locked up in both the morning and afternoon, and the amount of time that most prisoners had for activities and association was sufficient.

3.3 Prisoners appreciated the fact that evening association was never curtailed or cancelled because of staff shortages, which was reflected in our survey. Equipment and activities were provided during association at weekends.

3.4 Prisoners had access to time in the open air every day, but only for half an hour from Monday to Thursday. Our survey showed fewer prisoners than the comparator, and fewer than at the previous inspection, said they had time in the open air three or more times a week.

Recommendation

3.5 All prisoners should have the opportunity to spend one hour a day in the open air. (Repeated recommendation 6.5)

⁶ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.6 *Learning, skills and work activities and its management required improvement. The prison had sufficient learning and skills places to occupy all prisoners for at least part of the core working day. The range of learning and skills and work activities was adequate for the majority of prisoners. However, provision for those serving longer sentences was not sufficient. The quality of the provision and the achievements of prisoners required improvement. The library was satisfactory and the majority of prisoners used it regularly.*

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

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

Management of learning and skills and work

3.8 While a number of improvements had been made since the previous inspection, the quality of teaching, learning and assessment had not improved sufficiently. Despite teaching staff being appropriately qualified and experienced in the subjects they taught, achievements in key subjects were poor. Managers had increased the number of places and further increases were planned to meet the rise in the prisoner population.

3.9 Managers had a clear strategic direction for learning, skills and work, strongly supported by the prison director, but this had yet to have a significant impact on the quality of the provision. A robust internal system of observations of teaching, learning and assessment, carried out by the new well-qualified education manager, appropriately identified key areas for improvement. They were summarised accurately in the prison's self-assessment report. However, quality improvement actions had not driven swift, consistent improvement in all areas.

3.10 Managers did not analyse or use data sufficiently well to develop the curriculum or monitor the progress of all groups of learners, including those receiving additional learning support. Managers had limited information about the educational and training needs of older learners and those serving longer sentences.

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

- 3.11** The pay policy was aligned to the incentives and earned privileges scheme and did not discourage prisoners from participating in education or vocational training.

Recommendations

- 3.12** **Data should be used more effectively to monitor and evaluate the participation and outcomes of different groups of prisoners in activities.**
- 3.13** **A detailed analysis of prisoners' training needs should be undertaken to ensure the range of education and training provision meets the needs of prisoners and local employers.**

Provision of activities

- 3.14** There were sufficient activity places to occupy all prisoners for some of the core working day, and most places were used. Of the 126 unemployed prisoners three-quarters were on induction.
- 3.15** The range of education and vocational training courses was adequate for prisoners with short lengths of stay. However, for the 20% of prisoners serving longer sentences, it was limited, offering few progression opportunities (see recommendation, paragraph 3.13).
- 3.16** Education focused on art to level 1, information and communications technology (ICT), English for speakers of other languages (ESOL), mathematics and English up to level 2.
- 3.17** Accreditation for vocational skills was provided through service level agreements with three training providers. N-Ergy offered customer service qualifications to level 2, Peterborough Regional College provided assessments for catering qualifications up to level 2 and John Laing Training delivered construction-related courses to level 1. The prison provided initial teaching qualifications for a few prisoners who worked as learning support assistants. Work in the laundry, gardens and waste management did not offer any qualifications.
- 3.18** Functional skills support was offered to a small number of learners in workshops, but was not available across all work or residential areas.
- 3.19** Prisoners made multiple applications for education, training and work opportunities on arrival, and long waiting lists existed for a few activities. Allocation processes efficiently matched prisoners' applications to activities as they became available. However, allocations to education were not prioritised based on the results of the initial assessment or for prisoners with English and maths skills below level 2. The sequencing of activities required improvement to drive up attendance as sessions were often interrupted by prisoners leaving to attend other appointments.

Recommendations

- 3.20** **The prison should provide additional accredited vocational and work activities to better prepare prisoners for employment.**
- 3.21** **English and mathematics support should be available in work areas for prisoners with skills below level 2.**

3.22 The coordination and sequencing of activities should be improved to prioritise attendance at education and training.

Quality of provision

- 3.23** Induction to learning, skills and work was effective. Prison staff and well-qualified prisoner peer workers provided useful information and guidance to prisoners. All new arrivals had an initial assessment of their English and mathematics skills.
- 3.24** In the best lessons teachers planned a good range of engaging activities, ensuring each prisoner received the support they needed. The art course was good and learners made excellent progress. However, too many teachers did not use the results of the initial assessment sufficiently to plan learning. As a result learners found many lessons dull; and they became disengaged, which slowed their progress. Individual coaching in vocational areas varied but was not consistently good. Coaching met the needs of learners new to the construction multi-skills course, however those with prior experience and skills were not sufficiently challenged, and their progress was limited.
- 3.25** Monitoring of learners' progress in education classes was insufficient. In a minority of lessons, teachers planned individual tasks effectively and monitored learners' progress well. But too often, learners were not set tasks specific to their learning needs and therefore neither they nor the teacher could measure the progress they had made.
- 3.26** Education learners received insufficient feedback to enable them to understand what they had achieved and what they had to do to improve. In vocational training, assessment results and learners' progress were recorded well and appropriately monitored.
- 3.27** Resources in most classrooms were appropriate. However, teachers in ESOL classes had insufficient resources to ensure all learners made good progress.
- 3.28** Workshop resources and facilities were good. The prison kitchen was well equipped to commercial standards. Prisoners used personal protective equipment appropriately and demonstrated safe working practices. However, the atmosphere in the carpentry workshop was occasionally poor as the extraction system was not effective enough. Workshop activities did not always promote good industry practice and prisoners were often under-occupied.
- 3.29** Wing workers were well engaged in relevant activities, although they were not sufficiently challenged by the work they did.
- 3.30** Despite there being no learners with an identified additional learning support need, well-qualified learning support assistants (LSA) offered individual support to prisoners when teachers requested this. This informal support helped learners make at least satisfactory progress, but it was poorly recorded and its impact inadequately assessed.
- 3.31** The management of behaviour in lessons was good. Learners were generally well behaved in education and training sessions and relationships between staff and learners were good.

Recommendation

- 3.32 All activities should occupy and challenge prisoners throughout the working day.**

Housekeeping points

- 3.33** Suitable resources to support learning in ESOL classes should be provided.
- 3.34** Dust extraction in the carpentry workshop should be improved.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.35** Achievements on ICT, ESOL and short courses in mental health and alcohol and substance misuse awareness had been high in 2013–14. Achievements in English and mathematics and functional skill qualifications were low over the same period. Achievement rates on these courses had increased but needed further improvement. Most prisoners on vocational training programmes made satisfactory progress and success rates were high.
- 3.36** Learners developed a range of useful skills and work produced by those on the art course was outstanding. Prisoners in workshops developed good craft tool skills, and the carpentry workshop produced high quality products for retail sale in the community. Kitchen workers demonstrated appropriate standards in food preparation and handling techniques. However, the small number of learners in the level 1 multi-skills workshop, who had previously been self-employed in the construction industry, as well as those on the carpentry, English and mathematics courses, made slow progress. Prisoners' significant personal and employability skills development was inadequately recognised and recorded.

Recommendations

- 3.37** **The proportion of prisoners achieving English, mathematics and functional skills qualifications should be improved.**
- 3.38** **Methods of recognising and recording prisoners' knowledge and skills development should be introduced in non-accredited areas to enhance self-esteem and provide evidence for use in employment on release.**

Library

- 3.39** Two prison staff, supported by three orderlies, ran the small library. It was open six days a week and prisoners had good access. The range and quantity of materials met the needs of the population and current Prison Service orders and up-to-date legal texts were available. An additional library was in the final stages of being introduced to accommodate the increased prisoner numbers.
- 3.40** A small number of prisoners on distance learning courses made good use of the library's three computers. Prison orderlies delivered Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children) and the Toe by Toe reading scheme well. Few additional library activities were available to promote literacy. Books were made available on request for prisoners in the health care and segregation units.
- 3.41** The collection and use of data to monitor library use by different prisoner groups was insufficient. However, library staff had started to monitor the ethnicity of the prison population to ensure resources met prisoners' diverse needs.

Housekeeping point

- 3.42** The prison should analyse data on library use by different groups to ensure equality of access for all prisoners.

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.

3.43 *The range of physical education (PE) facilities was good and access to activities had improved. However, vulnerable prisoners had fewer opportunities to participate. External links were used well to enrich prisoners' experiences and motivate them.*

3.44 PE provision was good. Most prisoners could take part in two or more recreational PE sessions per week but vulnerable prisoners were limited to one gym session, in addition to a weekly outdoor football session. In our survey, 40% of prisoners said they went to the gym three or more times a week against a 26% comparator; none of the vulnerable prisoners said this was the case. The prisons own data showed that 54% of the population attended regularly.

3.45 The PE department was well managed and staffed by 12 appropriately qualified and experienced full-time staff, supported by four orderlies. Facilities were good and comprised a spacious cardiovascular suite and sports hall. The main gym consisted of a games area and well-maintained resistance and free weight equipment. Indoor sports offered included badminton, football, basketball and circuit training. Outdoor facilities consisted of an external all-weather five-a-side football pitch. Shower and changing facilities were adequate and all prisoners had routine access to clean gym kit.

3.46 PE staff worked well with health care staff to provide specialist support, including in areas such as weight management, low self-esteem, post-surgery exercise, and improving poor posture. There were no specific sessions for older prisoners. Healthy living and lifestyles were promoted well, although rarely linked to sentence plan objectives.

3.47 The PE department used external links well to enrich prisoners' experience, for example visiting professional footballers and managers ran practical training sessions and seminars. An appropriate range and quantity of accredited learning courses were available to support employment in the fitness industry; achievement rates for these courses in 2013–14 were good.

Housekeeping point

- 3.48** The prison should introduce PE sessions for older prisoners.

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 strategic management of resettlement was very good. The Link and Outside Links offered excellent resettlement services and support from resettlement staff, peer workers and partnership staff was good. Prisoners had opportunities for release on temporary licence (ROTL) but they did not provide sufficiently detailed plans for resettlement overnight release (ROR).*

- 4.2** The prison had a good understanding of the resettlement needs of the population. The strategic management of resettlement was very good and consisted of a clear 'whole-prison' approach to reducing reoffending and assisting with prisoners' resettlement. The comprehensive resettlement strategy described offender management and resettlement pathway work, including an action plan. It also outlined prisoners' needs across several specific prisoner groups. The strategy, which was based on a needs analysis completed in 2012, required updating, but an analysis completed in 2014 had been used to inform service provision (see section on attitudes, thinking and behaviour).
- 4.3** The well-attended resettlement committee, which met monthly, was informed by a variety of comprehensive resettlement data, including prisoner case studies.
- 4.4** The centrally based Link continued to provide prisoners with excellent one-stop-shop resettlement services. Representatives from partnership agencies, resettlement officers and well-trained and knowledgeable prisoner peer workers based in the Link, provided effective support in a relaxed environment (see section on reintegration planning). More prisoners than the comparator felt that a staff member had helped them prepare for release (18% against 11%).
- 4.5** The excellent Outside Links facility, providing prisoners with 'through-the-gate' support, was based in the visits centre within the prison; it also ran a drop-in facility in the city centre, which had been set up since the previous inspection (see section on reintegration planning). Outside Links was an agenda item at resettlement meetings and there was evidence that issues raised by ex-prisoners were acted on. For example, January minutes recorded ex-prisoners raising issues relating to being released from court without money or valuables, and a named manager was responsible for investigating the viability of prisoners being able to obtain their valuables at court.
- 4.6** A wide variety of partnership agencies provided resettlement support, and the community resettlement coordinator organised multi-agency meetings every six to eight weeks, increasing awareness and providing opportunities for information sharing.
- 4.7** The successful One Service, a pilot programme supporting prisoners serving less than 12 months and in place during the previous inspection, was due to end in April in advance of the introduction of the community rehabilitation company (CRC) (responsible for the

supervision of most individuals on release from prison). Senior managers had met representatives from the CRC in order to plan the delivery of resettlement services.

- 4.8** A total of 13 prisoners had benefited from 613 ROTL events in the previous six months, the majority of events had been for working in the community on day release (589); 24 events had been on ROR. Assessments were thorough and offender management approval was evident in all cases we saw. Prisoners provided details of where they would be located on overnight release but not sufficiently detailed plans on their ROTL application forms about how they intended to spend their time; and not all sentence plans contained a ROTL objective.

Recommendation

- 4.9 Prisoners should complete ROTL application forms in detail, setting out the purpose of ROR and providing a clear plan for release detailing what they plan to do, where, why and with whom.**

Good practice

- 4.10** *The strategic approach to resettlement was underpinned by excellent provision inside the prison, on release and post-release; the Link and Outside Links facilities provided excellent innovative resettlement reintegration support through committed staff and peer workers.*

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.

- 4.11** *The offender management unit (OMU) was well established; many prisoners felt well supported by offender supervisors who encouraged prisoners to undertake planned work. Most prisoners had an offender assessment system (OASys) document, although some had not been completed within expected timescales or with sufficient quality. Not all home detention curfew (HDC) releases were prompt. Public protection work was robust.*

- 4.12** The OMU was well established. Staff were knowledgeable and enthusiastic; their time was ring-fenced and they were not deployed elsewhere. All prisoners were allocated alphabetically to one of five 'pods' each populated by two offender supervisors, a case administrator and an allocated resettlement officer based in the Link (see section on reintegration planning). In addition to the 10 offender supervisors there were two Probation Service officers seconded from the National Probation Service. There were insufficient case administrators but additional posts were to be filled imminently. OMU staff had received suitable training but only Probation Service officers received formal supervision.

- 4.13** In our survey, 45% of prisoners said they had a named offender supervisor against a comparator of 30% and more than the comparator (48% against 35%) said they had a sentence plan. There was evidence that offender supervisors ensured prisoners understood their sentence plans, motivated them and carried out other work with them, including

involving them in offending behaviour programmes. However, this was not always recorded accurately or promptly enough. Contact with prisoners was frequently recorded on P-Nomis (the Prison Service IT system) and staff in other departments had access to the information, but some continued to be recorded on alternative databases with limited access. Prisoners could easily request meetings with offender supervisors using wing kiosks; one prisoner told us: 'They're always visible and answer queries really quickly.'

- 4.14** Inspectors looked at 12 cases in detail; six cases in scope for offender management (prisoners serving 12 months or more and classified as posing a high risk to the public) and six out of scope (those not subject to offender management arrangements). Overall offender management work was reasonably good and better than we normally see.
- 4.15** Most prisoners had a current OASys document and we observed some good work by offender supervisors in out of scope cases. However, some assessments had not been completed within the expected timescale or to a sufficient standard as a result of the introduction of the National Offender Management Service's OASys prioritisation interim policy issued in January 2015. The policy discouraged OMU staff from undertaking full assessments and reviews on all except high-risk prisoners, and introduced 'risk reviews' for lower priority prisoners. The work completed by external offender managers was inferior compared with what we reviewed from prison-based offender supervisors.
- 4.16** In the previous six months, 59 prisoners had been released on HDC. The prison did not routinely monitor the timeliness of HDC releases, but data from seven prisoners who had been released in February showed that two had been released on their eligibility date; another two men had been released two and 10 days later respectively; three men had been released two, three and nearly four weeks late.

Recommendations

- 4.17** **The OMU should take action to ensure that assessments and plans from offender managers are current, timely and of a high standard.**
- 4.18** **Prisoners deemed suitable for HDC should be released on their eligibility date.**

Public protection

- 4.19** Public protection staff were located alongside OMU staff, which ensured information was easily and effectively shared. Public protection arrangements were robust and all prisoners appropriately screened on arrival. Those posing a potential risk were prevented from seeing or contacting children until fact checks had been undertaken and prisoners subject to restrictions were seen individually by an offender supervisor to have their situation explained.
- 4.20** A total of 73 prisoners were subject to child safeguarding, 83 were registered sex offenders, 125 subject to harassment orders and 88 prisoners were on the violent sex offender register. Eighty-three were subject to monitoring under the Interception of Communications Commissioner's Office.
- 4.21** Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were well managed, and processes ensured organisations were prepared for prisoners pre-release. Monthly inter-departmental risk management meetings assessed and reviewed prisoners presenting the greatest risk to others and contributed to MAPPA meetings. Thirty-six prisoners were identified at MAPPA

level 1, five at MAPPA level 2 and a further 120 were MAPPA nominals (potentially subject to MAPPA arrangements on release).

Categorisation

- 4.22** Initial assessment and categorisation decisions were made promptly on arrival, based on information about a prisoner's offence and previous convictions. Prisoners were told of their categorisation verbally and in writing during induction.
- 4.23** Re-categorisation decisions were timely, based on an appropriate range of information and prisoners were told of their categorisation in writing. Clinics were held to enable men to ask questions about categorisation, but as reported in 2011, prisoners were not interviewed individually and did not contribute formally to re-categorisation reviews.
- 4.24** Thirty-eight prisoners had been re-categorised from C to D, and nine from B to C in the previous six months. Most prisoners could make progressive moves and could be transferred to establishments in their CRC areas pre-release.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.25** Eighteen prisoners were serving indeterminate sentences, 11 for public protection reasons. There were no specific forums or policies for this group; however all were allocated to an offender supervisor. Progressive moves were planned once prisoners had completed the multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel report. Some remained at the prison for parole reviews and parole reports were up to date. Offender supervisors said they would provide verbal information to remand prisoners facing a likely indeterminate sentence, but no specific published information was provided.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.26** *The resettlement needs of prisoners were assessed on arrival and prisoners' individual resettlement plans were reviewed pre-release. The Link and Outside Links were excellent innovative resources and all prisoners were offered good resettlement support pre- and post-release. Reintegration pathway provision was very good.*

- 4.27** Offender supervisors promptly completed basic custody screenings (BCSs) for all prisoners, except those who had been transferred from other prisons; peer workers completed needs assessments with this group and made referrals as necessary. The BCS covered all pathways and was passed to resettlement officers on completion so that individual resettlement plans could be produced; copies went to prisoners and resettlement and wing staff. Plans detailed objectives, actions required and the person responsible; they were reviewed pre-release. A senior resettlement officer quality assessed them.

- 4.28** Prisoners attended appointments with resettlement officers and partnership agency representatives in the Link (see section on strategic management of resettlement, paragraph 4.4). Resettlement officers had received suitable training and attended sentence planning meetings.
- 4.29** All prisoners were released via the visitors' centre where family and friends could wait. Resettlement officers and prisoner peer workers from the Outside Links office based in the centre met prisoners. Help and advice offered included practical help, such as charging mobile phones. Prisoners also received a card detailing the Outside Links facility in the city centre. A senior officer followed up all releases with a telephone call. Some prisoners were met by partnership agency representatives and escorted to approved premises or community appointments (see section on drugs and alcohol).
- 4.30** The Outside Links facility in the city centre, staffed by a resettlement officer and peer workers who were on ROTL from the prison, was available on weekdays; it had also been open on Christmas Day and Boxing Day mornings. Ex-prisoners could contact staff in the Outside Links centre using a freephone number, email or by dropping into the bright and comfortable centre for advice and support. Its use was monitored (see section on strategic management of resettlement) and individual casework, much of which addressed prisoners' immediate practical needs, recorded. It was also a meeting point for support agencies and a representative from charity Safeguarding of Vulnerable Adults (SOVA) was based there (see section on drugs and alcohol). Resettlement staff worked with statutory and non-statutory services and support was also provided to family members.

Accommodation

- 4.31** Resettlement officers were knowledgeable about accommodation issues and there were good links with a variety of accommodation providers. Peer workers involved in accommodation support all attended the SOVA-run pre-tenancy course, which was also open to prisoners serving less than 12 months. Prisoners who attended were followed up six and 26 weeks post-release. Most were released locally and during 2014, 92% had been released to settled accommodation. Monthly reports to resettlement meetings reported on the reasons for all those released without a fixed address during the month.

Education, training and employment

- 4.32** Information, advice and guidance for prisoners were satisfactory. Prisoner peer workers involved with education, training and employment had initial advice and guidance level 3 qualifications and some were working towards customer service qualifications at level 2. There were no links with the National Careers Service (NCS) to support resettlement post-release. The pre-release programme was effectively delivered with support from agencies such as the Saint Giles Trust and Jobcentre Plus; around 31% of prisoners progressed into employment and 5% into training.

Recommendation

- 4.33** **Effective links should be established with the National Careers Service to support resettlement.**

Health care

- 4.34** Pre-release arrangements were effective and a member of staff from the primary health care team saw and reviewed all prisoners and supplied them with medicines to take with them. They also provided GPs in the community with information about the prisoners' care and treatment in the prison. GPs liaised closely with the local clinical commissioning groups to promote consistent and clinically effective pain management care. The mental health team had effective links with community and hospital services.
- 4.35** Palliative care arrangements had been established and procedures reflected expected contemporary practice.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36** Resettlement opportunities were good. The recovery service could refer prisoners to Adfam, a drug and alcohol support agency (see section on children and families), and SOVA, which provided a gate pick-up service and mentoring support. Additionally, workers from a range of other agencies visited the Link every week to meet prisoners prior to release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37** Information and support was available from resettlement officers and a Money Advice advisor. Ninety-one bank accounts had been opened in the six months before our inspection. Prisoners who were not eligible received help to access credit unions.
- 4.38** Jobcentre Plus staff were available every day to advise prisoners about benefits and employment. They also saw all prisoners pre-release to offer advice and set up jobseeker's allowance before prisoners were released. Prisoners could attend a money management course. In our survey prisoners were more positive than the comparator about where to find help with employment, benefits and finances.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.39** Children and families work was comprehensive. A strategy meeting was held quarterly and an action plan was based on a needs analysis and ongoing feedback from prisoners and families. Adfam (see section on drugs and alcohol) had a help desk in the visitors' centre and provided families with general support. The Ormiston Trust offered prisoners from Cambridge support, including 'through-the-gate' relationship advice and counselling. Prisoners had access to the Parenting in Action course.
- 4.40** The children and families pathway lead staff member offered prisoners and their families individual support. Prisoners' family status was checked at reception and the lead staff member saw all primary carers within a day of their arrival. Prisoners could apply for family visits, additional letters and help to maintain contact with their families via the kiosks.
- 4.41** The new visitors' centre was pleasant and welcoming and we saw Adfam and prison staff interact positively with prisoners. First-time visitors were well supported. Visitors were admitted promptly and visits started on time. Prisoners booked visits using wing kiosks. Although the number of visits had not increased since our previous inspection, prisoners responded positively in our survey to questions about maintaining contact with family and friends, and we received no complaints about access to regular visits.

- 4.42** The visits hall was large and bright with soft furnishings. The visits we observed were relaxed and prisoners wore discreet wristbands. Mainstream prisoners and those who were being safeguarded attended visits together and staff were aware of safeguarding and child protection issues. Closed visits booths were out of sight of the main visits hall.
- 4.43** All prisoners could apply for family visits and 10 were planned for 2015. The visits were well attended and prisoners appreciated them. A private family room was available and was used often when additional privacy was necessary.

Good practice

- 4.44** *Prisoners received a comprehensive range of support to help them build and maintain relationships with their families and maintain contact with others outside the prison.*

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.45** A good range of interventions included three accredited programmes: the Thinking Skills Programme, Building Skills for Recovery and Control of Violence for Angry Impulsive Drinkers (see section on substance misuse). Waiting lists were manageable and prisoners appropriately prioritised. Unaccredited courses included anger management, Caring Dads (encouraging fathers to appreciate the impact on children of parental conflict) and Stop the Hurt (for male perpetrators of domestic abuse).
- 4.46** The needs analysis undertaken in 2014 had identified a need for victim awareness courses and the Sycamore Tree restorative justice course was due to start in April 2015, while the Victim-Focused Rehabilitation programme was set to begin in March 2015.
- 4.47** Communication between the OMU and the programmes department was good, which enabled offender supervisors to support prisoners' involvement and celebrate successful outcomes by attending end of programme reviews. Some family members also attended. Offender supervisors did not undertake any one-to-one work.
- 4.48** In our survey more prisoners than the comparator said they had been involved in an offending behaviour programme at the prison (58% against 53%) and that it was easy to get on to programmes (28% against 18%).

Additional resettlement services

- 4.49** Unusually for a male prison, the BCS assessed whether prisoners had experienced sexual and/or childhood abuse or domestic violence or whether they had undertaken sex work. When necessary prisoners were referred to a named officer who could provide one-to-one support and helped prisoners to contact support agencies. Those who had been victims of domestic violence or abuse had access to groups such as Men's Aid, Men's Advice Line and ManKind. Hibiscus also worked with men identified as having been involved in trafficking or modern slavery. Anyone who wished to initiate an application for an injunction if there were concerns of a specific risk on release received assistance to complete the relevant paperwork.

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 the governor

- 5.1** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved. (S42)

Recommendations

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.2** Prisoners should not wait for long periods at court after completing their cases. (1.4)

Early days in custody

- 5.3** Holding rooms in reception should be well equipped, all first night cells should be clean and both should be free of graffiti. (1.14)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.4** Managers should ensure there is an integrated strategic approach to behaviour management in which incentives and antisocial behaviour measures work together coherently, taking into account any patterns and trends in violence. (1.24)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.5** A single death in custody action plan should be drawn up to monitor progress in implementing recommendations from all investigations carried out. (1.30)

Security

- 5.6** The establishment should ensure that the MDT programme is adequately resourced by trained testing officers so that all requested suspicion tests are undertaken. (1.43)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.7** Prisoners should be able to retain their enhanced status when they arrive from another prison. (1.48)
- 5.8** Reviews for prisoners completing the entry level should be held on time. (1.49)

Discipline

- 5.9** Prisoner debriefs following use of force should be carried out for all prisoners and reviewed so lessons can be learned. (1.57)
- 5.10** Lighting in the special accommodation should be appropriate and prisoners should be provided with a mattress subject to security and safety considerations. (1.58)

Residential units

- 5.11** Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared. (2.7, repeated recommendation 2.7)
- 5.12** Ventilation in cells should be improved. (2.8, repeated recommendation 2.8)

Equality and diversity

- 5.13** The poor perceptions of minority groups should be explored and addressed. (2.30)
- 5.14** The identification of disabled prisoners should be improved so that their needs can be met effectively. (2.31)
- 5.15** Monitoring data about young adult prisoners should be introduced and their specific needs identified and met. (2.32)

Health services

- 5.16** Prisoners should be able to make a confidential complaint directly to health providers. (2.52)
- 5.17** Prisoners should have a care plan, based on an initial review; appropriately trained and well-supervised staff should carry out subsequent periodic reviews. (2.53)
- 5.18** All wing staff should receive regular first aid and resuscitation training and there should be sufficient trained staff to use emergency equipment. (2.54, repeated recommendation 5.16)
- 5.19** The facilities used by the triage nurse in the wellbeing centre should be upgraded to allow more appropriate secondary health screening and interventions to take place. (2.64)
- 5.20** The high non-attendance rate should be investigated to ensure men with genuine health needs are not disadvantaged and that services are delivered efficiently. (2.65)
- 5.21** Waiting times for optician and podiatry services should be equivalent to those in the community. (2.66)
- 5.22** Access to the pharmacy and CD cabinet should be audited, as should any medicines taken from the pharmacy room out of hours; all checks should be recorded. (2.75)
- 5.23** The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock should be used only if unavoidable. (2.76, repeated recommendation 5.29)
- 5.24** A policy for prisoners reporting sick to nurses should be implemented and regularly reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied. (2.77, repeated recommendation 5.30)

- 5.25** All prison staff should attend mental health awareness training. (2.89, repeated recommendation 5.45)
- 5.26** The transfer of patients to hospital under the Mental Health Act should occur within Department of Health transfer target timescales. (2.90)

Catering

- 5.27** Prisoners should have sufficient hot water during the night. (2.96)

Purchases

- 5.28** Prisoners should be able to access a full canteen order within 72 hours of arrival. (2.102)

Time out of cell

- 5.29** All prisoners should have the opportunity to spend one hour a day in the open air. (3.5, repeated recommendation 6.5)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.30** Data should be used more effectively to monitor and evaluate the participation and outcomes of different groups of prisoners in activities. (3.12)
- 5.31** A detailed analysis of prisoners' training needs should be undertaken to ensure the range of education and training provision meets the needs of prisoners and local employers. (3.13)
- 5.32** The prison should provide additional accredited vocational and work activities to better prepare prisoners for employment. (3.20)
- 5.33** English and mathematics support should be available in work areas for prisoners with skills below level 2. (3.21)
- 5.34** The coordination and sequencing of activities should be improved to prioritise attendance at education and training. (3.22)
- 5.35** All activities should occupy and challenge prisoners throughout the working day. (3.32)
- 5.36** The proportion of prisoners achieving English, mathematics and functional skills qualifications should be improved. (3.37)
- 5.37** Methods of recognising and recording prisoners' knowledge and skills development should be introduced in non-accredited areas to enhance self-esteem and provide evidence for use in employment on release. (3.38)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.38** Prisoners should complete ROTL application forms in detail, setting out the purpose of ROR and providing a clear plan for release detailing what they plan to do, where, why and with whom. (4.9)

Offender management and planning

- 5.39** The OMU should take action to ensure that assessments and plans from offender managers are current, timely and of a high standard. (4.17)
- 5.40** Prisoners deemed suitable for HDC should be released on their eligibility date. (4.18)

Reintegration planning

- 5.41** Effective links should be established with the National Careers Service to support resettlement. (4.33)

Housekeeping points

Discipline

- 5.42** The use of special accommodation should be properly documented. (1.59)

Health services

- 5.43** All staff should have clinical supervision. (2.55)
- 5.44** The prison should consider establishing a dedicated patient health forum. (2.56)
- 5.45** The strategy to promote health and wellbeing among the prisoner population should include easier access to barrier protection. (2.57)
- 5.46** All clinical environments and assessment/treatment rooms should comply with infection prevention standards and be subject to regular audit. (2.58)
- 5.47** All inpatient beds should be removed from the list of certified normal accommodation. (2.67, repeated recommendation 5.39)
- 5.48** The ambient temperature of the pharmacy should be monitored and appropriate steps taken to ensure it provides an appropriate environment for medicines to be stored. (2.78)
- 5.49** Storage should be reviewed for dispensed medication in the house block 5 treatment rooms. (2.79)
- 5.50** Officers supervising administration queues should consistently enforce the rules preventing overcrowding in the hatch areas. (2.80)
- 5.51** PGD supplies should be dispensed in accordance with the policy and recorded on the patient record. (2.81)
- 5.52** There should be a separate area for decontaminating equipment. (2.84)

Catering

- 5.53** Prisoners should be appropriately dressed when serving food. (2.97)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.54** Suitable resources to support learning in ESOL classes should be provided. (3.33)
- 5.55** Dust extraction in the carpentry workshop should be improved. (3.34)
- 5.56** The prison should analyse data on library use by different groups to ensure equality of access for all prisoners. (3.42)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.57** The prison should introduce PE sessions for older prisoners. (3.48)

Examples of good practice

- 5.58** The wellbeing centre offered a welcoming and informal setting for newly arrived prisoners to access a wide range of support offered by both staff and prisoners. (1.15)
- 5.59** The strategic approach to resettlement was underpinned by excellent provision inside the prison, on release and post-release; the Link and Outside Links facilities provided excellent innovative resettlement reintegration support through committed staff and peer workers. (4.10)
- 5.60** Prisoners received a comprehensive range of support to help them build and maintain relationships with their families and maintain contact with others outside the prison. (4.44)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Karen Dillon	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Michelle Bellham	Researcher
Njilan Morris-Jarra	Researcher
Amy Radford	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Steve Eley	Health services inspector
Peter Gibbs	Pharmacist
Andrea Crosby-Josephs	Care Quality Commission inspector
Elizabeth Wands-Murray	Care Quality Commission inspector
Richard Beaumont	Ofsted inspector
Nigel Bragg	Ofsted inspector
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Joe Coleshill	Offender management inspector
Caroline Nicklin	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, reception procedures were mostly satisfactory but first night procedures were not sufficiently supportive. Most men felt safe but the violence reduction strategy needed to be given more attention to ensure it was effective. Suicide and self-harm procedures were very good. The segregation unit operated professionally. Use of force was not high but needed more oversight. Integrated drug treatment system support was very effective. Appropriate priority was given to drug supply reduction practice. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Suitable first night and induction accommodation with a dedicated focus on supporting prisoners during their first days in custody should be provided. (HP42)

Achieved

Outcomes from the safer prisons survey and information from the safer custody monthly report should be discussed with prisoners and at the violence reduction meeting to inform the development of a more effective violence reduction and anti-bullying strategy. (HP43)

Achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should be held in court cells for the minimum possible time and arrive at the prison before 7pm except in exceptional circumstances. (1.6)

Not achieved

Unless there are security concerns, all prisoners should receive 24 hours notice of transfer. (1.7)

Not achieved

More use should be made of the video link for court appearances. (1.8)

Achieved

Officers interviewing new arrivals should give good personal attention to prisoners to ensure immediate needs and anxieties are identified and dealt with. (1.20)

Achieved

Prisoners should be held in reception for as short a time as possible. (1.21)

Not achieved

Prisoners' monies should transfer with them from other prisons without delay. (1.22)

Achieved

Unconvicted prisoners should not be asked to share cells with convicted prisoners unless they consent to share with a particular convicted prisoner. (1.29)

Achieved

First night procedures, including the opportunity to shower and ensuring that men are informed of the Listener and Samaritans service, should be followed for all prisoners irrespective of their time of arrival. (1.30)

Achieved

Anti-bullying procedures should be strengthened to ensure that investigations identify underlying reasons for anti-social behaviour and prisoners are appropriately challenged rather than a routine resort to placing prisoners on the basic regime. (3.12)

Achieved

Formalised procedures to support victims should be developed. (3.13)

Partially achieved

Attendance at the safer custody meetings should be improved and include prisoner representatives. (3.14)

Achieved

All prisoners needing protection from others should be held in dedicated accommodation that provides an equitable and safe regime. (3.18)

Achieved

As long as prisoners are regarded as at risk from others, they should not be removed from the vulnerable prisoner accommodation. (3.19)

Achieved

Key messages from the safer custody coordinator's detailed reports should be identified and used to inform the strategy. (3.31)

Achieved

A wider range of interventions including a counselling service should be developed to support prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm. (3.32)

Achieved

All prisoners should be issued with a copy of the rules of the prison. (7.8)

Achieved

The use of force committee should be chaired by a senior manager and meet regularly to review data to ensure all use of force is appropriate and to identify and promulgate learning points. (7.16)

Achieved

Prisoners in special accommodation should not routinely be left in darkness. (7.17)

Achieved

Prisoners should not be routinely strip searched on entry to the segregation unit. (7.22)

Achieved

Clinical reviews for prisoners on the integrated drug treatment system (IDTS) should involve the GP and the prisoner's named CARAT worker and IDTS nurse. (3.55)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2011, staff-prisoner relationships were reasonably good and personal officer work was more developed than previously. Living conditions were clean and decent. Prisoners were actively involved in some useful diversity work across most strands. There was too little use of translated material and interpretation services to support men who did not speak or understand English well. A new application system was beginning to be more effective. Health services were good. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Residential staff, particularly personal officers, should engage fully with foreign national men, using formal and professional telephone interpreters as necessary, to ensure they understand the prison's routines and procedures and know how to get help. (HP44)

Achieved

The health care appointment system should be reviewed to reduce the rate of non-attendance at clinics and ensure that men are able to access services quickly. (HP45)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Cells designed for one prisoner should not be shared. (2.7)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.7)

Ventilation in cells should be improved. (2.8)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.8)

Prisoners should be able to use the telephones in private. (2.9)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be able to shower in private. (2.16)

Not achieved

Prisoners should not move cell unnecessarily during their time in custody at Peterborough and thus impair relationships with personal officers. (2.25)

Achieved

Personal officers should record meaningful contact in wing files to build up an accurate chronological account of a man's time at Peterborough and any significant events affecting him. (2.26)

Achieved

Prisoners should be given the opportunity to eat meals out of their cells. (8.6)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be able to place orders within 24 hours of arrival. (8.12)

Achieved

Equality monitoring should extend beyond race. (4.5)

Achieved

Ethnic monitoring should extend to specific groups within the black and minority ethnic population to check for equality of outcomes. (4.14)

Achieved

Processes should be introduced to ensure that prisoners currently or previously convicted of a racially aggravated offence are identified and that staff are aware of such prisoners on their wing. (4.15)

Achieved

Foreign national prisoners should routinely receive a free telephone call to their family abroad without surrendering visits. (4.25)

Achieved

Systems should ensure that all prisoners with a disability are identified and routinely consulted about their needs. (4.30)

Partially achieved

All staff should be aware of prisoners requiring additional help during emergency evacuations. (4.31)

Achieved

A formal prisoner paid carer scheme for prisoners requiring additional ongoing support should be introduced. (4.32)

Achieved

Retirement pay should be increased to be sufficient for those with no other source of income and retired prisoners should not have to pay for their television. (4.33)

Achieved

Gay and bisexual prisoners should have access to external support networks and be consulted about what support mechanisms would be helpful in the prison. (4.37)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should have free access to application forms and should be able to submit these throughout the day. (3.37)

Partially achieved

Responses to complaints should be comprehensive and address the matters raised. (3.38)

Achieved

Prisoners should have appropriate IT facilities to help conduct defences and appeals. (3.42)

Achieved

The reception health care room should be secured with a health care suite key and have sluicing facilities for the disposal of waste samples. (5.5)

Partially achieved

Men who need specialist medical equipment and mobility aids should receive them in good time. (5.13)

Achieved

Men should be able to access physiotherapy and occupational therapy where necessary. (5.14)

Achieved

Prisoners should be able to speak to a pharmacist through pharmacy-led clinics. (5.15)

Achieved

All wing staff should receive regular first aid and resuscitation training and there should be sufficient trained staff to use emergency equipment. (5.16)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.54)

All health care staff should be trained in the use of SystmOne. (5.17)

Achieved

Prisoners should have timely access to painkillers such as paracetamol and ibuprofen. (5.28)

Partially achieved

The medicines and therapeutics committee should review the use of general stock. Named patient medication should be used wherever possible and general stock should be used only if unavoidable. (5.29)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.76)

A policy for prisoners reporting sick to nurses should be implemented and regularly reviewed by the medicines and therapeutics committee to ensure that all appropriate medicines can be supplied. (5.30)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.77)

The high failure to attend rate should be investigated and action taken to reduce it. (5.36)

Partially achieved

All inpatient beds should be removed from the list of certified normal accommodation. (5.39)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated as housekeeping point, 2.67)

All prison staff should attend mental health awareness training. (5.45)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.89)

Day care services should be available to prisoners with mental health problems who find it difficult to cope on the wings. (5.46)

Not achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2011, time out of cell and the number of activity places were comparatively good for a local prison. However, there were not enough activity places to keep everyone occupied and those without an allocated activity spent too long locked in their cells. Opportunities for men to spend time in the open air were too restricted. The range of learning and skills places was too limited and most education and training was at a low level, with little for the more able. Access to the library was poor. PE provision was satisfactory. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The learning and skills curriculum should be reviewed in line with the annual needs analysis and prisoner forums to introduce more learning above level 1 and in subjects relevant to prisoners' length of stay, abilities and interests, to provide sufficient places to keep men active and in particular to provide appropriate provision for vulnerable prisoners and those who stay at the prison longer. (HP46)

Not achieved

Recommendations

All prisoners should have the opportunity to spend one hour a day in the open air. (6.5)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 3.5)

Learning and skills strategic planning should be reviewed to ensure objectives are appropriately focused on the specific learning needs of men, including vulnerable prisoners, to ensure greater equality of opportunity in the provision. (6.17)

Partially achieved

The number of prisoners successfully completing accredited courses should be increased by investigating reasons for non-completion and achievement and taking action to address the causes. (6.18)

Not achieved

The self-assessment process should be improved to ensure it systematically includes feedback from prisoners, staff and external partners and focuses separately on male prisoners in its evaluation and subsequent action planning for improvements. (6.19)

Achieved

Regular risk assessments and audit checks should be carried while prisoners are working in prison work areas, including industry workshops, to ensure good health and safety practices are followed. (6.29)

Achieved

Literacy, numeracy and language support should be provided in work areas to encourage those with below level 2 assessed skills to improve their skills to help in gaining employment on release and for communicating with their family and community. (6.30)

Partially achieved

Ways of recognising and recording prisoners' knowledge and skills development should be introduced into non-accredited areas to enhance their self-awareness and enable them to value new skills and gain evidence for use on release for employment. (6.31)

Not achieved

Support for prisoners with additional learning needs should be implemented to enable them to participate more fully in learning and improve their skills for reducing re-offending. (6.41)

Not achieved

Access to the library should be improved. (6.45)

Achieved

Greater use should be made of the gym for recreational activities during the day to allow more prisoners to participate, particularly those without allocated activities. (6.54)

No longer relevant

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2011, the resettlement strategy was satisfactory, although not based on a needs analysis of the population. Prisoners were able to access some good reintegration services. Offender management and sentence planning for men who were eligible operated reasonably well. Although there was no formal custody planning system for men serving short sentences or on remand, men serving short sentences benefited hugely from the excellent through-the-gate services of the social impact bond project, which provided intensive support to help resettlement in the community. Some good family work was provided. Offending behaviour interventions were limited. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The resettlement strategy should be based on a needs analysis to identify and meet the specific needs of the full range of prisoners, including those serving short sentences, those on remand and older men. (HP47)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

A comprehensive offender management strategy and action plan should be developed to draw together all the different functions, roles and responsibilities, with the aim of raising its profile across the establishment. (9.18)

Partially achieved

Prisoners not in formal scope for offender management should receive regular and meaningful contact throughout their sentence to ensure the plan of work is delivered as intended. (9.19)

Achieved

The quality of sentence plans should be improved to ensure they are outcome-focused and meaningful. (9.20)

Partially achieved

All prisoners, including unconvicted men, should have a thorough initial assessment of need backed up by an effective custody planning process. (9.21)

Achieved

Prisoners should be interviewed as part of the categorisation and allocation process to determine their specific needs and preferences. (9.25)

Not achieved

Foreign national prisoners should be considered for category D status whether or not they face deportation. (9.26)

Partially achieved

The prison should ensure appropriate involvement in all relevant multi-agency public protection arrangement meetings. (9.31)

Achieved

Delays in identifying the level of public protection restrictions should be reduced. (9.32)

Achieved

Indeterminate sentenced prisoners should move to appropriate training prisons within six weeks of sentence. (9.35)

Partially achieved

Aggregate data should show how many prisoners have been helped by the prison to secure accommodation. (9.40)

Achieved

The dedicated housing adviser should not be cross-deployed to other operational duties. (9.41)

No longer relevant

Opportunities for prisoners to participate in release on temporary licence for work placements should continue to be extended. (9.47)

Achieved

Prisoners' finance, debts and benefits needs should be assessed on arrival and appropriate services provided. (9.50)

Achieved

The number of visits places available should be increased, particularly at weekends. (9.68)

Not achieved

Entry procedures for visitors should be improved and prisoners should arrive in visits on time. (9.69)

Achieved

Family liaison services should be further developed to meet identified need. (9.70)

Achieved

The type of offending behaviour work provided should be based on regular and thorough needs analyses. (9.79)

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	10	458	69.5
Recall	1	50	7.6
Convicted unsentenced	7	47	8
Remand	13	85	14.6
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	2	0.3
Total	31	642	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	20	140	23.8
Less than 6 months	3	57	8.9
6 months to less than 12 months	3	37	5.9
12 months to less than 2 years	1	81	12.2
2 years to less than 4 years	3	149	22.5
4 years to less than 10 years	1	134	20.1
10 years and over (not life)	0	25	3.7
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	10	1.5
Life	0	9	2.8
Total	31	642	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 18		
Under 21 years	31	4.6
21 years to 29 years	264	39.2
30 years to 39 years	208	30.9
40 years to 49 years	114	16.9
50 years to 59 years	40	5.9
60 years to 69 years	8	1.2
70 plus years	8	1.2
Please state maximum age here: 84		
Total	673	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	23	552	85.4
Foreign nationals	8	88	14.3
Total	31	642	99.7

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	21	139	23.8
Uncategorised sentenced	4	0	4.2
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	30	4.5
Category C	0	420	62.4
Category D	0	29	4.3
Other	6		.8
Total	31	642	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	17	445	68.6
Irish		8	1.3
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	1	9	1.3
Other white	4	49	7.9
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	2	14	2.4
White and black African		2	0.3
White and Asian		2	0.3
Other mixed		3	0.4
Asian or Asian British			
Indian			
Pakistani	1	23	3.6
Bangladeshi		4	0.6
Chinese			
Other Asian		9	1.3
Black or black British			
Caribbean	1	35	5.3
African	3	11	2.1
Other black		11	1.6
Other ethnic group			
Arab			
Other ethnic group	2	7	1.3
Not stated			
Total	31	642	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England		78	12.1
Roman Catholic	5	123	19
Other Christian denominations	7	80	12.9
Muslim	9	74	13.1
Sikh		2	0.3
Hindu		4	.6
Buddhist		8	1.2
Jewish		3	.5
Other		9	1.3
No religion	10	261	41.2
Total	31	642	100

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)		23	
Total		23	

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	9	1.3	153	22.7
1 month to 3 months	1	0.1	115	17.1
3 months to 6 months	0	0	85	12.6
6 months to 1 year	0	0	22	3.3
1 year to 2 years	0	0	3	0.4
2 years to 4 years	1	0.1	123	18.3
4 years or more	0	0	1	0.1
Total	11	1.6	502	74.6

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/ restrictions).	1	139	20.8
Total	1	139	20.8

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	9	5.6	49	30.6
1 month to 3 months	5	3.1	48	30
3 months to 6 months	5	3.1	34	21.3
6 months to 1 year	1	0.6	7	4.4
1 year to 2 years	0	0	2	1.3
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total	20	3	140	20.8

Unable to complete

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person			
Sexual offences			
Burglary			
Robbery			
Theft and handling			
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences			
Other offences			
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded/holding warrant			
Total			

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 establishment⁸. 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 17 February 2015 the prisoner population at HMP Peterborough was 671. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 210 prisoners.

We received a total of 166 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 79%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Sixteen respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 11 questionnaires were not returned and 17 were returned blank.

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

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
House block 3	45
House block 4	64
House block 5	32
Royce	19
Health care	3
Segregation unit	3

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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 significant⁹ 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 Peterborough in 2015 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 33 local prisons since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMP Peterborough in 2015 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Peterborough in 2011.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2015 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 2015 survey between the vulnerable prisoner wing (Royce) and the rest of the establishment.

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

Survey summary

Section I: About you

QI.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See Shortened Methodology	
QI.2	How old are you?	
	Under 21	6 (4%)
	21 - 29.....	69 (42%)
	30 - 39.....	45 (27%)
	40 - 49.....	31 (19%)
	50 - 59.....	11 (7%)
	60 - 69.....	1 (1%)
	70 and over	3 (2%)
QI.3	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	118 (72%)
	Yes - on recall.....	11 (7%)
	No - awaiting trial.....	18 (11%)
	No - awaiting sentence	17 (10%)
	No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)
QI.4	How long is your sentence?	
	Not sentenced.....	35 (21%)
	Less than 6 months.....	16 (10%)
	6 months to less than 1 year	11 (7%)
	1 year to less than 2 years	27 (16%)
	2 years to less than 4 years	27 (16%)
	4 years to less than 10 years.....	36 (22%)
	10 years or more.....	10 (6%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	3 (2%)
	Life.....	0 (0%)
QI.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship.)	
	Yes.....	17 (10%)
	No.....	149 (90%)
QI.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	159 (98%)
	No.....	3 (2%)
QI.7	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes.....	161 (98%)
	No.....	4 (2%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	108 (65%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 0 (0%)
	White - Irish	2 (1%)	Asian or Asian British - other
	White - other.....	20 (12%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean 5 (3%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	4 (2%)	Mixed race - white and black African... 1 (1%)
	Black or black British - African	7 (4%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 2 (1%)
	Black or black British - other	3 (2%)	Mixed race - other
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	1 (1%)	Arab
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	8 (5%)	Other ethnic group..... 2 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	1 (1%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		10 (6%)
	No.....		150 (94%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	57 (35%)	Hindu..... 1 (1%)
	Church of England	36 (22%)	Jewish..... 0 (0%)
	Catholic	36 (22%)	Muslim..... 19 (12%)
	Protestant.....	3 (2%)	Sikh
	Other Christian denomination	9 (5%)	Other
	Buddhist.....	2 (1%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		159 (97%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		2 (1%)
	Bisexual.....		3 (2%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability? (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs.)		
	Yes		37 (22%)
	No.....		128 (78%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes		8 (5%)
	No.....		157 (95%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		54 (33%)
	No.....		109 (67%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		99 (60%)
	No.....		65 (40%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	Less than 2 hours		115 (70%)
	2 hours or longer		44 (27%)
	Don't remember		6 (4%)

Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	115 (71%)
	Yes	20 (12%)
	No.....	24 (15%)
	Don't remember	4 (2%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	115 (70%)
	Yes	1 (1%)
	No.....	46 (28%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	109 (66%)
	No.....	45 (27%)
	Don't remember	12 (7%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	130 (80%)
	No.....	31 (19%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	46 (28%)
	<i>Well</i>	69 (42%)
	<i>Neither</i>	43 (26%)
	<i>Badly</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	1 (1%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	117 (71%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	34 (21%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	139 (85%)
	No.....	22 (13%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	64 (39%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	92 (56%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	132 (82%)
	No	26 (16%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	31 (19%)
	Well.....	84 (53%)
	Neither.....	32 (20%)
	Badly.....	6 (4%)
	Very badly.....	7 (4%)
	Don't remember.....	0 (0%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of property.....	23 (14%)
	Housing problems.....	50 (31%)
	Contacting employers.....	10 (6%)
	Contacting family.....	28 (18%)
	Childcare.....	2 (1%)
	Money worries.....	39 (24%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	39 (24%)
	Physical health.....	19 (12%)
	Mental health.....	43 (27%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	12 (8%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	40 (25%)
	Other.....	5 (3%)
	Did not have any problems.....	50 (31%)
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	32 (21%)
	No.....	72 (47%)
	Did not have any problems.....	50 (32%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco.....	141 (86%)
	A shower.....	61 (37%)
	A free telephone call.....	138 (84%)
	Something to eat.....	116 (71%)
	PIN phone credit.....	90 (55%)
	Toiletries/ basic items.....	102 (62%)
	Did not receive anything.....	0 (0%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain.....	83 (52%)
	Someone from health services.....	115 (72%)
	A Listener/Samaritans.....	62 (39%)
	Prison shop/ canteen.....	59 (37%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	25 (16%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you.....	57 (36%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	51 (32%)
	How to make routine requests (applications).....	52 (33%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	49 (31%)
	Health services.....	62 (39%)
	Chaplaincy.....	61 (38%)
	Not offered any information.....	67 (42%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes.....	132 (80%)
	No.....	27 (16%)
	Don't remember.....	5 (3%)

Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	114 (70%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	24 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (5%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>Yes</i>	72 (45%)
	<i>No</i>	62 (39%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	10 (6%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	84 (52%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	33 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	13 (8%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to...						
		<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>	19 (12%)	53 (33%)	26 (16%)	22 (14%)	16 (10%)	25 (16%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	15 (10%)	54 (35%)	26 (17%)	16 (10%)	9 (6%)	34 (22%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	12 (8%)	18 (13%)	21 (15%)	16 (11%)	21 (15%)	54 (38%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	<i>Not had any letters</i>						38 (23%)
	<i>Yes</i>						53 (33%)
	<i>No</i>						72 (44%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	<i>Yes</i>						65 (40%)
	<i>No</i>						13 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i>						85 (52%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	109 (68%)	47 (29%)	5 (3%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	152 (93%)	5 (3%)	6 (4%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	142 (87%)	12 (7%)	9 (6%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	135 (84%)	17 (11%)	8 (5%)			
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	84 (52%)	44 (27%)	34 (21%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	108 (66%)	50 (31%)	5 (3%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	50 (31%)	64 (40%)	45 (28%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	<i>Very good</i>						19 (12%)
	<i>Good</i>						71 (44%)
	<i>Neither</i>						37 (23%)
	<i>Bad</i>						26 (16%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						9 (6%)

Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>	11 (7%)
	Yes.....	62 (38%)
	No.....	91 (55%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes.....	92 (56%)
	No.....	11 (7%)
	Don't know.....	61 (37%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	85 (53%)
	No.....	20 (12%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	56 (35%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	88 (54%)
	No.....	14 (9%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	60 (37%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	47 (29%)
	Very easy.....	36 (22%)
	Easy.....	33 (20%)
	Neither.....	9 (6%)
	Difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know.....	26 (16%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes.....	114 (73%)
	No.....	26 (17%)
	Don't know.....	17 (11%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (<i>If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	31 (20%) 85 (55%) 39 (25%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	31 (21%) 63 (42%) 56 (37%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes.....	94 (59%)
	No.....	22 (14%)
	Don't know.....	43 (27%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (<i>If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.</i>)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	79 (49%) 34 (21%) 47 (29%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	79 (52%) 28 (19%) 44 (29%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes.....	21 (13%)
	No.....	140 (87%)

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>	64 (40%)
	<i>Very easy.....</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Easy.....</i>	37 (23%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>	27 (17%)
	<i>Difficult.....</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Very difficult.....</i>	7 (4%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is.....</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>	87 (54%)
	<i>No.....</i>	41 (26%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>	16 (10%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is.....</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Yes.....</i>	72 (45%)
	<i>No.....</i>	52 (33%)
	<i>Don't know.....</i>	20 (13%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>No.....</i>	145 (90%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months.....</i>	118 (76%)
	<i>Very well.....</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Well.....</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Badly.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Very badly.....</i>	8 (5%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	129 (81%)
	<i>No.....</i>	31 (19%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	113 (72%)
	<i>No.....</i>	45 (28%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes.....</i>	60 (38%)
	<i>No.....</i>	100 (63%)

Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Never</i>	23 (14%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	33 (20%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	51 (32%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	29 (18%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	13 (8%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	112 (70%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	16 (10%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	112 (73%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	4 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	52 (32%)
	<i>No</i>	111 (68%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>No</i>	141 (87%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	111 (71%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>At work</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>During movement</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>At education</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>At health services</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	4 (3%)
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	49 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	113 (70%)

Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Medication</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Debt</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your age</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	6 (4%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	45 (28%)
	No	116 (72%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Medication</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your age</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	99 (70%)
	Yes	14 (10%)
	No	28 (20%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	31 (19%)	15 (9%)	33 (21%)	23 (14%)	33 (21%)	24 (15%)
	The nurse	28 (18%)	23 (15%)	51 (33%)	23 (15%)	17 (11%)	12 (8%)
	The dentist	43 (29%)	10 (7%)	18 (12%)	12 (8%)	26 (17%)	41 (27%)

Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?					
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>
	The doctor	31 (19%)	13 (8%)	52 (33%)	24 (15%)	18 (11%)
	The nurse	24 (15%)	30 (19%)	50 (32%)	26 (17%)	14 (9%)
	The dentist	65 (42%)	12 (8%)	24 (16%)	20 (13%)	13 (8%)
						<i>Very bad</i>
						21 (13%)
						12 (8%)
						19 (12%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?					
	<i>Not been</i>					20 (13%)
	<i>Very good</i>					14 (9%)
	<i>Good</i>					50 (32%)
	<i>Neither</i>					24 (16%)
	<i>Bad</i>					22 (14%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					24 (16%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?					
	Yes					78 (49%)
	No					81 (51%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?					
	<i>Not taking medication</i>					81 (51%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>					17 (11%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>					19 (12%)
	<i>No</i>					43 (27%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?					
	Yes					66 (42%)
	No					92 (58%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)					
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>					92 (59%)
	Yes					23 (15%)
	No					40 (26%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?		
	Yes	44 (28%)	
	No	113 (72%)	
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?		
	Yes	27 (17%)	
	No	129 (83%)	
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?		
	<i>Very easy</i>	31 (20%)	
	<i>Easy</i>	12 (8%)	
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (8%)	
	<i>Difficult</i>	6 (4%)	
	<i>Very difficult</i>	10 (6%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	84 (54%)	

Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	10 (6%)
	Easy.....	4 (3%)
	Neither.....	10 (6%)
	Difficult.....	13 (8%)
	Very difficult.....	24 (15%)
	Don't know.....	94 (61%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	5 (3%)
	No.....	152 (97%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	7 (4%)
	No.....	149 (96%)
Q10.7	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.....	110 (72%)
	Yes.....	26 (17%)
	No.....	17 (11%)
Q10.8	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.....	129 (83%)
	Yes.....	18 (12%)
	No.....	9 (6%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help.....	115 (77%)
	Yes.....	31 (21%)
	No.....	3 (2%)

Section II: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	26 (17%)	18 (12%)	44 (29%)	20(13%)	23(15%)	22 (14%)
	Vocational or skills training	37 (24%)	17 (11%)	39(26%)	25(16%)	23(15%)	11 (7%)
	Education (including basic skills)	32 (22%)	27 (18%)	47(32%)	25(17%)	9 (6%)	8 (5%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	60 (40%)	11 (7%)	31(21%)	24(16%)	12 (8%)	11(7%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	Not involved in any of these.....					36 (24%)	
	Prison job.....					85 (56%)	
	Vocational or skills training.....					17 (11%)	
	Education (including basic skills).....					35 (23%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes.....					11 (7%)	
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	31 (23%)	45 (33%)	44 (32%)	17 (12%)		
	Vocational or skills training	44 (39%)	31 (27%)	22 (19%)	16 (14%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	37 (31%)	45 (38%)	20 (17%)	18 (15%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	48 (42%)	25 (22%)	23 (20%)	18 (16%)		

Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	33 (21%)
	<i>Never</i>	36 (23%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>	50 (32%)
	<i>About once a week</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>	14 (9%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	
	<i>Don't use it</i>	57 (38%)
	<i>Yes</i>	40 (26%)
	<i>No</i>	54 (36%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	35 (22%)
	<i>0</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	36 (23%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	47 (30%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	16 (10%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	41 (26%)
	<i>0</i>	51 (32%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	39 (25%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	18 (11%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>0</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	121 (77%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	18 (12%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	20 (13%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	64 (42%)
	<i>No</i>	87 (58%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	60 (39%)
	<i>No</i>	95 (61%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>No</i>	137 (88%)

Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	32 (20%)
	<i>Easy</i>	37 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	22 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (6%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	35 (22%)
	<i>Yes</i>	72 (46%)
	<i>No</i>	51 (32%)

Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	86 (54%)
	<i>No contact</i>	34 (22%)
	<i>Letter</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>Phone</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Visit</i>	22 (14%)

Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	69 (45%)
	<i>No</i>	85 (55%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	35 (22%)
	<i>Yes</i>	59 (37%)
	<i>No</i>	65 (41%)

Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	100 (63%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	18 (11%)
	<i>Involved</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	10 (6%)

Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	100 (66%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	9 (6%)

Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	100 (64%)
	<i>Yes</i>	39 (25%)
	<i>No</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	7 (4%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?
Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced..... 100 (64%)
 Yes 8 (5%)
 No..... 35 (22%)
 Don't know 13 (8%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?
Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced..... 100 (64%)
 Yes 17 (11%)
 No..... 20 (13%)
 Don't know 19 (12%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?
 Yes 8 (5%)
 No..... 61 (40%)
 Don't know 82 (54%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?
 Yes 27 (18%)
 No..... 124 (82%)

Q13.12 Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (please tick all that apply to you.)

	<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Employment	33 (23%)	42 (29%)	69 (48%)
Accommodation	31 (22%)	43 (30%)	67 (48%)
Benefits	30 (21%)	54 (38%)	60 (42%)
Finances	33 (24%)	34 (25%)	70 (51%)
Education	36 (28%)	31 (24%)	63 (48%)
Drugs and alcohol	44 (33%)	37 (28%)	51 (39%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?
Not sentenced..... 35 (23%)
 Yes 61 (39%)
 No..... 59 (38%)

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Peterborough 2015

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
Number of completed questionnaires returned		35	130	17	149	19	146
1.3	Are you sentenced?	74%	81%	63%	80%	84%	79%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	23%	7%			16%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	98%	82%	100%	95%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	98%	82%	99%	95%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			47%	18%	84%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	8%	0%	7%	0%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	46%	2%	17%	11%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	26%	0%	25%	10%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	5%	6%	5%	0%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	26%	36%	69%	29%	26%	34%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	65%	72%	69%	71%	67%	71%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	72%	71%	71%	71%	63%	72%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	74%	85%	88%	81%	79%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	75%	82%	71%	69%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	76%	67%	56%	70%	73%	68%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	68%	74%	53%	74%	63%	73%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	69%	84%	47%	84%	74%	81%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	88%	94%	89%	95%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	43%	46%	44%	45%	39%	46%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	63%	70%	63%	68%	63%	68%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	92%	100%	93%	90%	95%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	51%	52%	56%	51%	47%	53%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	43%	59%	38%	58%	53%	56%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	20%	43%	44%	37%	16%	40%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	43%	59%	38%	58%	58%	56%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	70%	48%	67%	51%	78%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	53%	56%	54%	79%	51%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	66%	75%	56%	75%	69%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	59%	47%	60%	67%	59%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	49%	57%	25%	58%	53%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	37%	48%	31%	47%	37%	47%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	11%	6%	10%	10%	10%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	82%	88%	80%	90%	79%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	58%	75%	59%	73%	69%	72%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	20%	27%	12%	28%	31%	25%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	23%	33%	31%	30%	16%	32%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	30%	47%	30%	37%	32%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	12%	23%	12%	21%	12%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	40%	28%	29%	30%	31%	30%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	26%	13%	6%	17%	21%	15%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	14%	2%	0%	5%	10%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	11%	2%	6%	4%	16%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	3%	1%	6%	1%	10%	0%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	5%	0%	4%	5%	3%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	35%	25%	17%	29%	37%	26%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	6%	0%	8%	16%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	1%	6%	2%	10%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	1%	6%	2%	16%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	3%	1%	6%	1%	10%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%	5%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	33%	20%	31%	22%	31%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	35%	52%	36%	49%	26%	52%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	46%	50%	38%	50%	37%	50%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	37%	43%	31%	43%	31%	43%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	18%	30%	13%	29%	17%	29%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	59%	54%	56%	56%	65%	54%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	12%	6%	12%	0%	13%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	34%	20%	38%	21%	23%	23%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	3%	8%	6%	7%	0%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	38%	20%	13%	25%	44%	21%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	47%	39%	40%	40%	61%	38%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	18%	16%	27%	16%	16%	17%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	77%	67%	78%	77%	78%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	12%	14%	13%	14%	12%	14%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	50%	35%	29%	40%	53%	37%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	18%	11%	6%	13%	16%	12%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Peterborough 2015

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		37	128
1.3	Are you sentenced?	81%	78%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	11%	24%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	6%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	37%	32%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	73%	70%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	78%	70%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	89%	63%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	69%	73%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	73%	83%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	86%	91%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	45%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	65%	68%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	56%	51%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	56%	56%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	36%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	68%	53%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	55%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	58%	53%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	73%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	59%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	51%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	40%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	6%	11%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	69%	84%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	17%	29%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	30%	31%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	11%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	49%	24%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	24%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	5%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	3%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	3%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	41%	24%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	11%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	3%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	11%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	34%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	45%	49%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	76%	41%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	75%	33%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	28%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	47%	58%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	12%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	23%	23%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	3%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	17%	26%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	19%	46%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	8%	19%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	80%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	13%	14%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	43%	37%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	14%	12%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Peterborough 2015

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 Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		166	5963	166	169
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	4%	6%	4%	3%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	79%	67%	79%	72%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	9%	7%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	16%	20%	16%	25%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	3%	2%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	13%	10%	18%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	97%	98%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	96%	98%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	21%	24%	21%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	5%	6%	8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	12%	12%	12%	10%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	3%	3%	3%	3%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	24%	22%	20%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	5%	5%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	32%	33%	27%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	60%	53%	60%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	27%	21%	27%	20%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	42%	36%	42%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	2%	9%	2%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	66%	58%	66%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	80%	75%	80%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	67%	71%	62%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	71%	64%	71%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	4%	3%	4%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85%	80%	85%	84%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	39%	41%	39%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	78%	82%	76%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72%	62%	72%	52%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	69%	75%	69%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	14%	15%	14%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	31%	20%	31%	26%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	6%	5%	6%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	18%	32%	18%	33%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	3%	1%	6%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	24%	23%	24%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	24%	22%	24%	18%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	12%	18%	12%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	27%	22%	27%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	7%	7%	7%	10%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	25%	31%	25%	28%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	31%	33%	31%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	86%	80%	86%	90%
3.6	A shower?	37%	31%	37%	24%
3.6	A free telephone call?	84%	56%	84%	83%
3.6	Something to eat?	71%	71%	71%	79%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	55%	54%	55%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	62%	58%	62%	
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	52%	46%	52%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	72%	68%	72%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	39%	32%	39%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	37%	21%	37%	20%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	36%	42%	36%	65%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	38%	32%	51%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	33%	36%	33%	44%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	31%	36%	31%	58%
3.8	Health services?	39%	45%	39%	58%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	38%	40%	38%	50%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	81%	73%	81%	73%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	74%	90%	86%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	50%	51%	50%	57%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	81%	73%	81%	
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	38%	45%	39%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	45%	53%	45%	54%
4.1	Get bail information?	21%	19%	21%	30%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	41%	33%	38%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	40%	36%	40%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	68%	51%	68%	48%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	93%	74%	93%	84%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87%	72%	87%	90%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	84%	54%	84%	80%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	52%	28%	52%	59%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	66%	59%	66%	68%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	32%	21%	32%	28%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	56%	20%	56%	30%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	38%	47%	38%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	53%	56%	55%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	53%	49%	53%	49%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	54%	51%	54%	51%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	42%	44%	42%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	74%	73%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 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 made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	69%	52%	69%	55%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	53%	37%	53%	41%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	50%	59%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	42%	30%	42%	33%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	39%	27%	39%	39%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	13%	20%	13%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	31%	19%	31%	31%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	54%	40%	54%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	41%	45%	51%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	9%	10%	5%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	50%	36%	50%	
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	74%	81%	68%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72%	70%	72%	66%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	38%	27%	38%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	26%	17%	26%	20%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	31%	37%	31%	51%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	67%	66%	67%	55%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	32%	43%	32%	47%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	19%	13%	18%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	30%	30%	30%	27%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	12%	8%	13%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	8%	7%	9%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	16%	15%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	7%	7%	7%	6%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	5%	8%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	4%	4%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	4%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	6%	4%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	6%	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	5%	4%	4%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	31%	28%	23%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	4%	12%	4%	12%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	5%	4%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	7%	13%	7%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	5%	4%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	3%	1%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%	0%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	5%	6%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	3%	1%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	34%	32%	34%	45%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%	21%	30%	33%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	48%	44%	48%	47%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	19%	9%	19%	12%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	51%	39%	51%	43%
9.2	The nurse?	61%	52%	61%	57%
9.2	The dentist?	41%	30%	41%	30%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	48%	36%	48%	34%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	51%	49%	54%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	46%	61%	46%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	42%	38%	42%	34%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	37%	43%	37%	
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	28%	32%	28%	35%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	17%	22%	17%	22%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	34%	28%	31%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	9%	14%	9%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	3%	8%	3%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	8%	4%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	60%	60%	60%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	67%	58%	67%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	91%	76%	91%	79%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	41%	31%	41%	
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	37%	29%	37%	
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	50%	45%	50%	
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	28%	18%	28%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	56%	42%	56%	57%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	11%	9%	11%	11%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	23%	25%	23%	24%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	7%	7%	6%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	77%	67%	77%	80%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	43%	38%	43%	48%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	61%	55%	61%	59%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	45%	45%	45%	42%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	69%	66%	69%	70%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	54%	51%	54%	52%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	58%	53%	58%	58%
	For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	38%	42%	38%	49%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	24%	29%	24%	19%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	27%	32%	27%	
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	40%	26%	40%	41%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	17%	39%	17%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	77%	42%	77%	68%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	14%	9%	14%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	43%	31%	43%	36%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	39%	49%	39%	51%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	12%	35%	12%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	44%	37%	44%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Peterborough 2015	Local prisons comparator	HMP Peterborough 2015	HMP Peterborough 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	59%	61%	59%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	47%	41%	47%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	29%	30%	29%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	14%	13%	14%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	31%	37%	31%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	45%	30%	45%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	48%	35%	48%	43%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	63%	57%	63%	60%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	48%	44%	48%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	39%	32%	39%	
13.6	Offender manager?	17%	28%	17%	
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	2%	11%	2%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	17%	19%	17%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	68%	55%	68%	53%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	14%	27%	14%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	30%	32%	30%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	7%	5%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	11%	18%	18%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	38%	28%	38%	
13.12	Accommodation?	39%	35%	39%	
13.12	Benefits?	47%	38%	47%	
13.12	Finances?	33%	23%	33%	
13.12	Education?	33%	29%	33%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	42%	43%	42%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	51%	47%	51%	48%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Peterborough 2015 (vulnerable prisoners wing)

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

		Vulnerable prisoners wing (Royce)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		19	141
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	5%	3%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	56%	81%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	19%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	26%	8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	21%	21%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	12%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	11%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	27%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	44%	32%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	50%	62%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	27%	26%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	56%	84%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	50%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	84%	69%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	84%	86%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	61%	37%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	84%	82%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoners wing (Royce)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	73%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	73%	68%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	11%	14%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	27%	32%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	6%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	33%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	6%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	27%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	44%	22%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	22%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	39%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	44%	3%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	27%	24%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	61%	89%
3.6	A shower?	16%	40%
3.6	A free telephone call?	84%	84%
3.6	Something to eat?	44%	75%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	39%	58%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	61%	62%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	22%	56%
3.7	Someone from health services?	56%	74%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	22%	41%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	16%	39%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	27%	36%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	16%	34%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	22%	33%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	22%	32%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoners wing (Royce)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.8	Health services?	22%	40%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	27%	39%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	42%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	67%	94%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	65%	83%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	39%	47%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	27%	47%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%	23%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	35%	31%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	22%	44%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	56%	70%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	84%	95%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	95%	87%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	78%	85%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	50%	51%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	27%	71%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	27%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	50%	55%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39%	37%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	56%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	55%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	53%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	39%	43%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	65%	75%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	83%	57%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	6%	13%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	27%	32%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoners wing (Royce)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	47%	45%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	10%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	81%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	58%	74%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	33%	38%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	27%	26%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	33%	31%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	58%	27%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	26%	10%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	53%	26%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	26%	5%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	16%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	5%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	31%	13%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	5%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	10%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoners wing (Royce)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	16%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	4%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	31%	27%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	3%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	10%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	35%	30%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	50%	49%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	20%	19%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	84%	43%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	59%	39%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoners wing (Royce)	All other wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	16%	29%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	11%	17%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	11%	30%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	0%	11%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	3%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	4%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	33%	43%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	22%	40%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	22%	55%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	32%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	56%	58%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	0%	13%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	6%	25%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	0%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	23%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	22%	27%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	0%	45%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	16%	17%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	78%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	16%	14%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	39%	43%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	33%	39%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	6%	13%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	37%	44%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	35%	46%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	6%	20%