

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMYOI Aylesbury

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

1–12 June 2015

This inspection was carried out with assistance from colleagues at the General Pharmaceutical Council and in partnership with the following bodies:



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	65
Appendix I: Inspection team	65
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	67
Appendix III: Prison population profile	75
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	77
Appendix V: Photographs	93

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.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

Introduction

HMYOI Aylesbury is a young offender institution holding up to 444 young adult men, and is designated as a training prison. It is a challenging prison to run not least because it holds young men serving among the longest sentences for this age group in the country. Over 80% of those held are serving in excess of four years and 30% are serving more than 10 years to life. Had they been a little older at the time of sentence, it is arguable that many Aylesbury prisoners would have found themselves allocated to a high security prison with the additional resources and better supervision that would entail. The risks the prison manages are significant.

This inspection took place at a difficult time for the prison, with debilitating staff shortages that required the ongoing deployment of temporary staff from other establishments. Our overall judgement was that the prison had deteriorated, with failings evident across all four of our healthy prison tests, but particularly in safety, respect and purposeful activity.

Aylesbury was not safe enough. In our survey half of all respondents reported feeling unsafe at some point during their stay and just under a quarter felt unsafe at the time of the inspection. Levels of violence were high and some incidents were serious. Some useful work was being done to address gang affiliations and to introduce new initiatives aimed at combating violence, but much more needed to be done to ensure a coherent evidence-based strategy that would be effective. Many of those suspected of involvement in violence were managed through an excessively punitive incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our view, lacked legitimacy and was regularly ineffective. In addition to the more predictable causes of violence, the long periods of lock up and inactivity most prisoners experienced caused frustrations that contributed to the likelihood of violence and aggression.

As well as violence, other indicators such as the use of formal disciplinary procedures, cellular confinement, use of force and segregation were also high, although generally procedures and accountability concerning these responses were satisfactory. The segregation unit environment and regime however, were poor. Security was managed adequately, although the proportionality of some aspects required review and wing supervision was sometimes not good enough. Intelligence was managed well but drug usage was double the target. Many prisoners thought it was easy to get drugs in the prison and there was evidence of the availability of undetectable synthetic drugs. Security was not well integrated with drug services in the prison.

The number of prisoners who had self-harmed was high and worse than in similar prisons, although arrangements to case manage and oversee the monitoring of those in crisis was reasonable. However, too many prisoners were left isolated in cell without activity or in segregation without adequate consideration of their circumstances. Despite this, some prisoners in crisis spoke highly of the care staff provided.

The quality of the environment was mixed and too often inadequate. Cleanliness required improvement and some cells were also overcrowded. Access to amenities and facilities such as cell equipment, showers or cleaning materials was not good enough. The quality of relationships between staff and prisoners was similarly mixed. We saw some good engagement but the numbers of temporary staff was inevitably undermining the quality and usefulness of relationships. It was telling that only 61% of prisoners thought there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem, which was much worse than comparable prisons. The promotion of equality had improved through, for example, the better identification of those with protected characteristics, the appointment of an equalities officer and the work of prisoner diversity representatives. However, many weaknesses were still evident.

Faith provision was very good and the high profile and well-led chaplaincy was a strength of the prison. Prisoners had little confidence in the prison's complaints system, but health outcomes were reasonably good. Prisoners expressed very positive views about the quality of the food, although in our view the timing of food, the way food was served, and cleanliness at the serving of meals all required improvement.

Perhaps Aylesbury's greatest failing remained its inability to provide a meaningful training regime. As at the last inspection, we graded the provision of purposeful activity as 'poor', and colleagues in Ofsted judged the overall effectiveness of learning, skills and work provision as 'inadequate'. During the inspection we found between 30 and 40% of young prisoners locked up during the working day, which was representative of restrictive and punitive unlock arrangements. In a training prison context this was completely inadequate. A quarter of prisoners were registered unemployed and only a third of the remainder were in full-time activity. The management of learning and skills was weak, many classes and workshops were closed owing to staff shortages, and punctuality was poor. Learners made some progress in vocational classes but the education curriculum was narrow, the quality of teaching needed improvement, and achievements in English and mathematics were not good enough.

The prisons' work to reduce reoffending and support resettlement was one of the better features of the prison, although here too deterioration was evident. Staff shortages were undermining offender management with heavy caseloads, a backlog of offender risk assessments and some quite limited sentence planning. In the context of Aylesbury's high-risk population these were shortcomings that needed to be put right. Public protection work was generally better and the few prisoners the prison discharged were well supported, but this seemed to happen in spite of the newly introduced 'through the gate' resettlement service. Work across the resettlement pathways evidenced some good outcomes, although domestic visitors needed to be welcomed more respectfully. Offending behaviour work was impressive with some new innovative and encouraging initiatives being introduced.

The population at Aylesbury presented risks but it was reasonably stable. The purpose and function of the prison was clear but the prison was uncertain about how to set about delivering its core functions in a coherent and joined up way. For example, there was some good work taking place to address violence but this was undermined by poor data, or by a very poor regime that fostered inactivity and indolence. The prison held long-term prisoners and yet many practices were punitive and regressive. Trust was too limited and relationships unpredictable. There was too little to motivate young men, or to encourage their personal investment in their futures while at the prison. Staffing shortages were a chronic weakness but it was hard to see how HMYOI Aylesbury could progress until there was a fundamental improvement in the quality of learning, skills and work offered.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Aylesbury holds long-term sentenced young adult males.

Prison status

Public

Region

South Central

Number held

8.6.15: 377

Certified normal accommodation

410

Operational capacity

444

Date of last full inspection

2-12 April 2013

Brief history

The prison opened as a county gaol in 1847 and in 1890 became a women's prison. Two new wings added in 1902 served initially as an 'inebriates' centre' and in the 1930s as a girl's Borstal. In 1959 the prison was converted to house adult male prisoners and in 1961 it changed again to house young male offenders aged between 17 and 21. In 1989, Aylesbury was designated as a long-term young offender institution, and now holds the longest sentenced young adult males in the English prison system.

Short description of residential units

A to E wings and G wing are residential units. F wing holds vulnerable prisoners in an 'enabling environment'. There is also a segregation unit

Name of governor

Kevin Leggett

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service providers

Care UK

Oxford Health NHS Trust

Learning and skills provider

Milton Keynes College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Ian Wilkinson

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.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission or Healthcare Inspectorate Wales, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

This report

- A9 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.
- A10 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.
- A11 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' early days in custody were managed reasonably well, except for their induction. Safety remained a concern. The prison's strategy for managing the high levels of violence focused excessively on punitive measures that were not effective, and in some cases not decent. The use of adjudications and the basic regime was very high. Too many prisoners in crisis and at risk of self-harm were isolated with no access to purposeful activity. Security arrangements were adequate but too little was done to combat the high availability of drugs. Use of force was high but its governance was good and the cases we reviewed were proportionate. The use of segregation was high and the regime was poor. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Aylesbury were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 21 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, eight had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3 Most journey times for prisoners arriving at the prison were relatively short and the vans we inspected were reasonably clean. Reception was bright and welcoming and staff had created a relaxed and friendly atmosphere. First night interviews were conducted in private and officers took time to help new arrivals. Prisoners were closely monitored on their first night, which was positive. However, in our survey, only two-thirds of respondents said that they felt safe on their first night. Delivery of the formal induction programme was inconsistent, and tracking to ensure that all prisoners received it was not effective. Some of the first night cells were dirty and had graffiti.
- S4 In our survey, more than half of prisoners said they had felt unsafe at some time at Aylesbury and almost a quarter felt unsafe during the inspection. Levels of violence were far higher than similar establishments. Some of the violence was serious, involving weapons and multi-perpetrator assaults. Prisoners also reported high levels of victimisation and we found evidence that some of this was related to gang affiliation. However, prisoners told us that many of these issues were caused by long periods of lock up and lack of meaningful activity.
- S5 The safer custody meeting was well attended but the violence reduction report contained inaccurate data, which hampered the analysis of patterns and trends. Investigations into incidents of violence and bullying were often delayed, and the tool for monitoring perpetrators and victims of bullying was underused. The Aylesbury Pathway Service, which aimed to address prisoners' offending behaviour, was a promising intervention for those with the most challenging and violent behaviour. The 'enabling environment' approach for vulnerable prisoners was also impressive. The introduction of prisoner violence reduction representatives was a good initiative and had facilitated valuable communication about issues around violence.
- S6 Despite a high risk population, there had been no deaths in custody since the previous inspection. There continued to be a high level of self-harm. Some at-risk prisoners on case management spoke highly of the support they had received, particularly from in-reach mental health staff and the chaplaincy, and they had some reasonable plans. However, some plans had not been followed and too many prisoners spent long periods locked in bleak conditions without activity. Prisoners had good access to Listeners – prisoners trained by the

- Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners. Prisoners at risk of self-harm did not receive additional assessment at an appropriate level before they were placed in segregation, and once there they received poor care.
- S7 Although the prison had no safeguarding adults policy, it had well-established links with the local safeguarding adults board and systems to meet social care needs.
- S8 Procedural and dynamic security arrangements were reasonable but some measures were disproportionate and not always targeted effectively. Regime curtailment caused tension among prisoners. The prison had strong links with local police forces and effective management of intelligence on gang affiliations. Security committee meetings were given a high profile but there was no representation from drug service providers and no drug strategy meeting. In our survey, more prisoners than last time and than the comparator said drugs were easy to get in the prison, and more than the comparator said they had developed a drug problem while in Aylesbury. Mandatory drug testing rates were relatively high and use of undetectable Spice was prevalent.
- S9 The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was overly punitive and often applied too rigidly, which made it ineffective in promoting good behaviour. The basic regime was overused with a fifth of the population subject to its inadequate regime. It was unacceptable that prisoners on basic level were given reduced access to showers, exercise and telephones – which are not privileges.
- S10 The number of adjudications was high and had nearly doubled since the last inspection. Hearings were usually conducted fairly but some punishments were too severe. The use of force had increased significantly and remained high, but governance was good and video recordings of planned removals were scrutinised properly. The relevant documents were completed correctly and demonstrated efforts to de-escalate incidents. The wearing of body cameras by officers was also a good initiative. The use of segregation remained too high and some prisoners spent long periods there with a poor regime, which was potentially damaging to their well-being. Plans to challenge behaviour, case manage and reintegrate prisoners had not been adequately developed. Some of the cells were dirty and the communal areas were often filthy. More positively, the staff-prisoner relationships we observed in segregation were affable.
- S11 The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) delivered an improved, good quality service that many prisoners found helpful, but there was no published supply reduction strategy or action plan.

Respect

- S12 *Living conditions and access to facilities for many prisoners were poor. Staff-prisoner relationships were mostly reasonable, although the use of detached duty, high staff sickness and restricted regimes had affected some relationships. Arrangements for equality and diversity had improved but outcomes for some minority groups required investigation. The chaplaincy provided particularly good faith and pastoral support. Management of complaints was inadequate. Health services were reasonable overall. Prisoners remained positive about the prison food, although there were concerns about how and when it was served. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S13 *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Aylesbury were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 31 recommendations in the area of*

respect. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, 13 had been partially achieved and 11 had not been achieved.

- S14 Many of the wings and cells were grubby and neglected, and the offensive displays policy was not enforced. However, the exercise yards were well equipped and impressive. Some showers were in poor condition but the installation of privacy screening had brought some improvement. We saw some staff working hard to ensure that prisoners could shower within the restricted time out of cell, but found that too many were unable to access them every day. The tracking of applications was inadequate and prisoners had little confidence in the system.
- S15 Despite some poor survey findings, the quality of staff-prisoner relationships we observed was mainly relaxed and friendly, although there was a lack of staff engagement in some areas. It was clear that the high numbers of detached duty (officers drafted in temporarily from other prisons to cover staff vacancies) and high levels of staff sickness were affecting the quality of relationships and the ability for prisoners to get things done. The prisoner council continued to be a useful forum.
- S16 Provision for equality work had improved and the identification of prisoners with protected characteristics was reasonably good. There were regular equality meetings and prisoner equality representatives were starting to meet regularly as a group, although they did not attend the main equality meeting. Strategic management of this area was underdeveloped, and there was no equality action plan or support group structure for prisoners with protected characteristics. Few discrimination complaints were submitted and the resulting investigations varied in quality. Although there was useful external quality assurance, the findings had yet to be explored. Work with foreign national prisoners was reasonably good with regular access to Home Office surgeries. Our survey and some prison data showed that prisoners from a black or minority ethnic background, Muslim prisoners and those with disabilities were disadvantaged across some key areas. The prison had yet to explore or act on this adequately.
- S17 Faith provision and facilities at the prison were good, offering excellent pastoral care that included bereavement counselling and a visitor scheme. There was a good range of classes and services, and prisoners were very positive about the chaplains, who were visible, inclusive and involved in day-to-day prison life.
- S18 Prisoner confidence in the complaints system remained low and prisoners waited too long for replies that were then mostly of poor quality. The provision for legal services was good, although legal visits still took place in the open visits room, which could compromise confidentiality.
- S19 There was a suitable range of primary health care services with appropriate risk assessment of new arrivals and timely referrals to GP, mental health and substance misuse services. Access to nurses and the dentist was good for most prisoners, with mostly short waits to see the GP. Management of long-term conditions was sound but some prisoners had not attended for review. Management of medicines met needs overall but there was limited privacy for prisoners receiving or collecting their medicines. Mental health provision was reasonable and most prisoners had good access to support. There were significant delays in Mental Health Act assessments and transfers.
- S20 The quality and quantity of food were reasonable and prisoners were more positive about it than the comparator. The serving of food required greater supervision, and there were no opportunities for prisoners to eat communally or prepare their own food. Meals were served too early and it was disrespectful to leave them at cell doors or in empty cells,

particularly when food was not packaged hygienically. The consultation arrangements for food and purchases were reasonable and there was evidence that follow-up action was taken as a result. However, it took too long for prisoners to receive orders they had bought from catalogues.

Purposeful activity

S21 *Time out of cell was wholly inadequate for a young adult training prison. The severely restricted regime led to boredom, frustration and long periods of isolation for many. The provision of learning and work activity was poorly managed and equally concerning. Twenty-five per cent of the population were unemployed and only a third of those in employment were full time. Despite efforts to increase vocational training, this was regularly cancelled due to staff shortages. However, when vocational training did run, instructors were supportive and success rates were high. English and maths were not sufficiently integrated and achievements were low. Staff shortages and regime curtailment limited access to the library and gym for some prisoners. **Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.***

S22 *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Aylesbury were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that two of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S23 The published core day indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve about nine hours unlocked during the working day. In reality, the average time out of cell was nearer to six hours a day for fully employed prisoners, and could be as little as 1.5 hours for the significant number of prisoners who did not work or were on restricted regimes. As at the last inspection, we found daily slippage in the regime, and observed that prisoners were often unlocked late and locked up early. At a roll check when prisoners should have been unlocked, we found between 30% and 40% of the population locked in their cells.

S24 Leadership and management of learning, skills and work were inadequate. The recently strengthened quality improvement group had taken some appropriate action but had not effectively challenged the poor performance. Managers at all levels had failed to take decisive action to raise the poor standards identified at the last inspection. The staffing of learning and skills was inadequate to meet the needs of the population, resulting in courses being cancelled and a very narrow curriculum. Curriculum planning was lacking and failed to meet the needs of prisoners. Prison managers were insufficiently involved in monitoring the quality of learning sessions and failed to analyse data to identify weaknesses.

S25 There were insufficient places for the population with a quarter unemployed, and only a third of those employed in full-time employment. It was positive that the number of vocational workshops had increased since the last inspection, but too many were closed due to staff shortages.

S26 The learning and skills induction did not sufficiently prepare prisoners for their time in the prison. Access, support and achievement for prisoners on distance learning and Open University degree courses were good. Coaching and support in vocational training and workshops were good and focused on individual needs. Peer mentors were used well in the motorcycle and motor vehicle workshops to support prisoners. However, individual learning targets in education and in vocational training were poor. Additional learning support was identified at initial assessment, but Milton Keynes College was unable to provide sufficient learning support for all of those who required help to progress in lessons.

- S27 Too many prisoners failed to complete their courses but for those who did, vocational training success rates were high. Overall achievements in English require improvement and in mathematics remained inadequate. Attendance at activities still required improvement and the prison withdrew too many prisoners from learning for security reasons. Assessment of prisoners' work was satisfactory, and in vocational workshops instructors provided helpful feedback on work, including spelling, punctuation and grammar. Education classrooms were well resourced and equipped, although teachers did not always use a sufficiently wide range of available learning resources to engage all prisoners.
- S28 The library was better located than previously and well stocked with a wide range of resources to meet the needs of the population. Most prisoners were registered library users but too few had regular access. Library staff promoted a good range of well-attended reading activities and initiatives, including the Toe by Toe reading mentoring scheme.
- S29 Induction to the gymnasium was adequate and staff provided a wide range of activities and recreational training, but no accredited vocational qualifications. Access for most prisoners was sufficient, if they were not on one of the restricted regimes. Some prison workers also found it difficult to attend more than once a week. Recent staff shortages had compounded the problem of access, although staffing was now up to full complement. Facilities in the gym were good and well maintained, although the changing areas were too small.

Resettlement

S30 *Strategic management of resettlement was now well integrated and the service provided was reasonable. However, the cross-deployment of uniformed offender supervisors and probation vacancies meant that not all prisoners had adequate contact, and some had no sentence plan. Public protection work remained good, although some management risk levels were identified too near to the prisoner's release. Resettlement pathway work was generally good but the visits provision remained poor. Offending behaviour work was good and highly regarded by participants, and there were some promising creative initiatives aimed at the most complex cases. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test***

S31 *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Aylesbury were good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, six had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S32 The reducing reoffending strategy was underpinned by a comprehensive prisoner needs analysis, and the offender management, public protection and resettlement pathways teams worked together effectively. Governance arrangements and structures for the strategic management of offender management remained appropriate. Efforts had been made to improve understanding of the pivotal role of offender management, but not all staff were sufficiently aware. Staff shortages in the offender management unit and cross-deployment of uniformed offender supervisors had affected the service offered to many prisoners.
- S33 All prisoners were allocated an offender supervisor but caseloads were unwieldy. Efforts were being made to reduce a significant backlog of OASys (offender assessment system) assessments. The quality of assessments and sentence plans was reasonably good but too many prisoners had no sentence plan. Contact with prisoners from uniformed offender supervisors was not sufficiently regular. However, there were efforts to develop these staff through supervision and quality assurance of their work. Public protection arrangements were appropriately robust, considering the nature of the population, but we were concerned

that prisoners were not always allocated a multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) risk management level soon enough before their release.

- S34 All new arrivals received an initial assessment from their offender supervisor and necessary referrals were made. There were formal pre-discharge arrangements three months before release for those who were released from Aylesbury. Despite efforts from the prison, there were some difficulties in moving prisoners on to other prisons for resettlement or progression. Arrangements with community rehabilitation companies were not yet working as intended, but due to the effort of the prison, outcomes for prisoners released were generally good. Liaison between offender supervisors and offender managers in the community before release was variable.
- S35 All prisoners left Aylesbury with accommodation to go to and there was sufficient support for debt and money management issues, with prisoners able to set up a bank account before release. The 'virtual campus' – giving prisoners internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities – was underused. Prisoners were logged on to the system at induction, but there were very few opportunities for them to use this resource.
- S36 Prisoners were seen routinely by health care staff up to two weeks before release or transfer and given health information. Prisoners with mental health needs were effectively linked with their local community teams. The DART had good working links with local and regional community support agencies when devising reintegration plans.
- S37 Fewer prisoners than the comparator said they had received support in maintaining family ties. Visitors and prisoners told us that visits regularly did not start at the advertised time, and we observed visitors experiencing unacceptable delays despite arriving early after long journeys. The visits hall was bright but cramped, and facilities for closed visits were not sufficiently private.
- S38 The extensive range of accredited and non-accredited interventions was appropriate for the population and broadly met identified need with no significant gaps. Places were prioritised appropriately and had a good rate of completion, despite the challenging population. There was some innovative work addressing gang affiliation and for young men with complex needs. Some prisoners also benefited from targeted one-to-one work with the psychology team and some seconded probation offender supervisors.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S39 Concern: In our survey, more than half of prisoners said they had felt unsafe at some time at Aylesbury and almost a quarter felt unsafe during the inspection. Levels of violence were high and we were not assured that data were accurate enough to help the prison draw useful conclusions on violent incidents or antisocial behaviour.

Recommendation: The prison should reduce the number of violent incidents. The violence reduction strategy should be informed by consultation with prisoners, the safer custody team should monitor patterns of violence and take action where appropriate, and there should be an effective approach to dealing with perpetrators and supporting victims of bullying and violence.

- S40 Concern: Too many prisoners on restricted regimes spent long periods locked in bleak conditions without activity and with poor access to any kind of decent regime.

Recommendation: At-risk prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management should be set timely objectives in care

plans, and should receive an enhanced risk assessment, approved at a senior level, before being located in the segregation unit. Prisoners on regimes restricted for security reasons and those in segregation should receive daily showers, exercise and telephone calls, and have access to a more productive regime built around individual care plans designed to engage and motivate them.

- S41 Concern: The strategy for managing the high levels of violence and antisocial behaviour focused on excessive punitive measures, including very high use of the basic privilege level, which were not effective in encouraging positive behaviour and, in some cases, not decent.

Recommendation: Prisoners on the basic regime should be properly reviewed after shorter periods of time, and the prison's incentives and earned privileges scheme should focus more on promoting good behaviour. The basic regime should not withdraw access to provisions that ensure decency and maintain family ties, such as a daily shower, exercise and telephone calls.

- S42 Concern: Too many prisoners were not engaged in meaningful activity and activity places were not managed efficiently. Ofsted judged the quality and leadership of learning and skills activities to be inadequate.

Recommendation: The prison should increase the quantity and quality of work and training opportunities available for prisoners and maximise the use of these to increase the number of prisoners involved in substantive purposeful activity.
(Repeated recommendation S47)

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

I.1 *Journey times for prisoners to the prison were relatively short and the vans we inspected were reasonably clean. However, fewer prisoners than the comparator said they felt safe during journeys.*

I.2 With some notable exceptions, prison records showed that journey times for most prisoners were relatively short, and usually less than two hours. We observed that escort staff were polite to prisoners, and those we spoke to were clearly focused on prisoner safety. The vans we inspected were clean and free from graffiti. Information about prisoners was shared through conversation with prison officers in reception, and the written escort records were up to date and informative. Despite this, in our survey only 74% of prisoners said that they felt safe during their journey, against the comparator of 83% and 88% at the previous inspection.

I.3 Prisoners were not handcuffed when escorted between the vans and reception, which was proportionate to the risk. As at the previous inspection, all admissions were planned and late arrivals at the prison were rare.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

I.4 *Reception was bright and reasonably clean. Reception processes were well developed and officers created a relaxed and friendly atmosphere. The first night wing was reasonably clean but some first night cells were dirty and had graffiti. First night interviews took place in private and officers ensured that prisoners understood how to access services. However, in our survey only 66% of respondents said they felt safe on their first night. Delivery of the induction programme was inconsistent and tracking systems to ensure that all new arrivals received it were ineffective.*

I.5 The reception area was clean and brightly decorated. The main holding room was large and displayed up-to-date notices on walls and had a television. Pot plants and pictures helped to soften the environment.

I.6 Reception officers' attitudes were particularly positive and they were clearly aware of the potential risks for new prisoners. They were welcoming and had created a relaxed and friendly atmosphere. New arrivals were asked if they understood what had happened to them before transfer and if they had any immediate needs. We observed two officers

carrying out searching procedures sensitively in private cubicles. New arrivals were not routinely strip searched.

- I.7** Reception processes were well developed and allowed arrivals to move quickly to first night cells on D wing. Their property was mostly processed on their day of arrival, but took place the next day for the few who arrived later in the afternoon. Trained induction officers met all new arrivals in reception and interviewed them in private, and they effectively identified and addressed their immediate needs. Staff took time to ensure that new arrivals understood how to access prison services if they needed help on their first night, and gave them information about this. A Listener – a prisoner trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners – worked in reception and saw all new prisoners shortly after they arrived. Health services staff also saw all new arrivals on the day they arrived.
- I.8** Living conditions on D wing, the first night unit, were mixed. Although communal areas were reasonably clean, some cells were dirty and had graffiti. All new arrivals were allowed a telephone call, shower and some association until about 6.45pm. As at the last inspection, handover arrangements between day and night staff were effective, and new arrivals were checked hourly. However, the regime on D wing was poor. Although most prisoners were usually moved to other wings within two weeks, they spent too much time locked in their cells without anything meaningful to do. The prison had addressed some of our previous concerns about the negative preconceptions of new arrivals. However, in our survey, only 66% of prisoners, fewer than the comparator and than at the last inspection, said that they felt safe during their first night.
- I.9** Delivery of the formal induction programme, due to start the morning after arrival, was inconsistent and there were no tracking systems to ensure that all new prisoners received it. We were not assured that some planned sessions were delivered at all – including those on how to access available services, make applications and generally deal with prison life. In our survey, only 38% of respondents who had received formal induction said that it covered what they needed to know, which was worse than the comparator.

Recommendations

- I.10** **New arrivals on D wing should have access to a full regime.**
- I.11** **A full induction programme should be delivered to all prisoners, and this should be checked through a tracking system.**

Housekeeping point

- I.12** First night cells should be clean and free from graffiti.

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.13** *More prisoners felt unsafe at Aylesbury than at similar prisons. The prison's violence reduction measures were ineffective in reducing the high levels of violence, some of which was serious.*
- I.14** In our survey, over half of prisoners said they had felt unsafe at Aylesbury, and 23% felt unsafe at the time of the inspection, which were above the comparators. The levels of violence were high, with 115 assaults on prisoners and staff and 46 fights during the previous six months. Some incidents were serious and had involved weapons and sustained group assaults. In our survey, as well as in groups and individually, prisoners reported high levels of victimisation. The prison was managing a large number of young adults with gang affiliations, and prisoners also cited frustration caused by long periods of lock up and a chronic lack of meaningful activity as a cause of friction and violence. The lack of activity also limited the opportunity for prisoners to earn money, leaving some at risk of falling into debt.
- I.15** The bullying and violence reduction policy did not address the causes of violence at Aylesbury, was not informed by consultation with prisoners and did not fully reflect current practice in the prison. While there had been some positive initiatives, including the introduction of violence reduction representatives and the Aylesbury Pathway Service (see paragraph 4.48), there was a lack of a prison-wide approach to violence reduction. (See main recommendation S39.)
- I.16** Perpetrators of violence were mainly dealt with through the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and the adjudications system, but this approach had been ineffective in reducing the levels of violence. Personal intervention plans (PIPs) were meant to be used to monitor perpetrators and victims of bullying, but we found many incidents of bullying where a PIP had not been opened. The quality of the PIPs was poor, with many containing generic targets and perfunctory entries by staff.
- I.17** Violence and bullying were discussed at monthly safer custody meetings, which were well attended by staff from across the prison. However, the report considered at these meetings contained inaccurate data, hampering attempts to measure trends and patterns of violence. All incidents of violence or bullying were reported through the intelligence report system, but a backlog of these and the frequent redeployment of the violence reduction officer led to significant delays in investigations.
- I.18** The recent recruitment of six violence reduction prisoner representatives was positive and facilitated good consultation about violence, although their role needed to be better defined and promoted.
- I.19** Most vulnerable prisoners were held on F wing. In our survey, prisoners on F wing had similar perceptions of safety as other prisoners, although they told us they felt unsafe in areas where they mixed with the general population, including in health care. F wing had established an 'enabling environment' to involve prisoners more in examining problems that affected their lives, such as conflict, violence and gang affiliations. This work aimed to help them deal with their problems more effectively and ultimately reduce them. This approach

was planned to be rolled out across the prison. At the time of the inspection, it was too soon to assess if the initiative had made any significant impact.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.20** *There were a high number of incidents of self-harm. Care for prisoners in crisis was mixed; while some prisoners received good support from some staff, too many spent long periods locked in bleak cells without activity. Access to Listeners was good.*
- I.21** There had been 180 incidents of self-harm during the past six months, which was higher than similar prisons and at the previous inspection. A number of prolific self-harmers accounted for many of these incidents. All serious incidents of self-harm were investigated by the safer custody manager. There had been no self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection.
- I.22** The prison's suicide and self-harm policy was appropriately focused on the care of prisoners in crisis. The monthly safer custody meetings (see also paragraph I.17) discussed some analysis of trends in open assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm, and self-harm incidents. A multidisciplinary complex case meeting was a good initiative for managing prisoners with multiple needs – including those on ACCT case management as well as those repeatedly involved in violence or who spent long periods in segregation or on the basic regime – with additional support for those who needed it. Despite our previous recommendations, only 58% of staff had completed suicide prevention training.
- I.23** Staff had opened 96 ACCT documents during the previous six months. Most of those we reviewed were of a reasonable standard, showing well-attended case reviews and regular entries by staff. Some prisoners in crisis spoke highly of the support from staff, particularly the chaplaincy and mental health teams. However, despite actions in care maps to ensure prisoners were engaged in activity, too many prisoners in crisis spent long periods locked in bleak conditions without any meaningful activity. (See main recommendation S40.)
- I.24** A significant number of prisoners in crisis were located on F wing, (see also paragraph I.19) and the prison had responded to the additional need by establishing a peer support group on this unit, which prisoners valued. Prisoners had good access to a group of 15 trained Listeners who were supported by the local Samaritans.
- I.25** Two constant watch cells had been used on 35 occasions for 20 prisoners during the previous six months. Prisoners who had spent time in these cells also told us of periods where they had little to occupy themselves.
- I.26** Nine prisoners on an open ACCT had been located in the segregation unit in the previous six months. We were concerned that there was no additional assessment before prisoners in crisis were located in the segregation unit, and were not assured this was always in response to exceptional circumstances. (See main recommendation S40.)

Recommendations

- I.27 All staff should receive a refresher course in safer custody training.** (Repeated recommendation I.31)
- I.28 Prisoners in crisis should be provided with in-cell activities and encouraged to attend work or education.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.²

I.29 *The prison had well-established links with the local safeguarding adults board and systems to meet social care needs, but there was no safeguarding adults policy.*

I.30 Although the prison had no safeguarding adults policy, it had well-established links with the local safeguarding adults board. Health care, prison and education staff identified some safeguarding needs during new arrivals' first night and induction processes. Health care staff carried out a social care screening with all new arrivals and referred any who needed support to the local authority for further assessment.

Recommendation

I.31 The prison should work with the local safeguarding adults board to introduce a safeguarding policy to ensure concerns about vulnerable adults are systematically addressed.

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.32 *Security intelligence was usually managed adequately but there some gaps in processing information reports. Procedural security was generally reasonable but some practices were overly restrictive. The security department were managing complex intelligence systems to identify and deal with many forms of gang activity and there were strong links with local police, but links with drug service providers were underdeveloped.*

² We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

- I.33** The small security department was reasonably well managed and the monthly security committee was well attended, with an appropriate agenda that included a thorough analysis of information reports received. The security team analysed common patterns in information and monitored the progress of actions generated by information reports. Information from these and other incident reports was collated into an intelligence report and presented to the security committee, which agreed security objectives. However, some gaps in processing information reports had resulted in a backlog that had not been fully processed.
- I.34** The challenges facing the security department were not underestimated and there were clearly some significant risks to manage. Security staff effectively managed complex intelligence systems to identify and deal with many forms of gang activity, and had established strong links to policing teams. Procedural security was generally well managed but some measures were disproportionate, and we were not assured that they were always targeted effectively or reviewed appropriately. For example, following some violent incidents, all prisoners were now searched when leaving the wings and activity areas, including visits. The prison no longer allowed lower risk prisoners to move unescorted outside of main movement times. Although there was free-flow movement of prisoners to activities at set times, it was over-controlled. Furthermore, because only half of the residential units could move at one time, they routinely arrived late for their activity. The security department had become increasingly effective at identifying prisoners who needed to be kept apart, usually as a result of external gang activity. However, a negative consequence of this was that over 20 prisoners had been placed on restricted regimes, spending most of the day locked in their cells, and were not always able to have daily showers and telephone calls. These measures may have been justified if they had led to a reduction in the levels of violence, but we found no evidence of this.
- I.35** There was some inconsistency in the approach to supervision. In some places it was over controlled (see paragraph I.34 above) and in others it was sometimes weak, for example on the residential units when prisoners were unlocked. This impacted on the effectiveness of some elements of dynamic security which relied on interaction between staff and prisoners; we observed some distant relationships. The poor access to a purposeful regime clearly caused tension among prisoners, affecting security in the prison.
- I.36** Closed visits were used frequently, with 25 during the inspection, and many were applied for reasons not directly related to visits. Reviews took place monthly, but many were cursory and prisoners usually stayed on restrictions for at least three months without further supporting information.
- I.37** In our survey, 39% of prisoners said it was easy to get drugs in the prison, against the comparator of 25%, and 10%, against 6%, said they had developed a drugs problem in the prison. The positive random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate for the six months to the end of May 2015 was relatively high at 9.3%, and was well in excess of the target of 4.5%. Most positive MDTs were for cannabis. Finds, data and our discussions with prisoners indicated the wide availability of Spice (a synthetic drug that mimics the effects of cannabis but is much stronger with no discernible odour and cannot be detected by drug tests). Prisoners said that it was particularly popular given its lack of odour and non-detectability under MDT.
- I.38** In the previous six months, 110 suspicion drug tests had been requested but only 26 were completed. Shortages in testing officer availability had contributed to the low number of tests, but some requests were also delayed through the analysis and administration process.
- I.39** The prison had disbanded the drug strategy committee, which meant that the security committee was the only regular forum to discuss drug supply and the effects of drugs on the whole prison. However, that meeting did not include representation from the drug and

alcohol recovery team (DART), which affected the prison's strategic approach to drug supply. There was also no published drug supply reduction strategy or action plan.

Recommendations

- I.40** Procedural security measures should be proportionate and not unnecessarily restrict prisoner access to a full regime.
- I.41** Dynamic security should be strengthened, including improved supervision of prisoners.
- I.42** Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence of trafficking of unauthorised items through visits. (Repeated recommendation I.45)
- I.43** The prison should establish a drug supply reduction strategy and action plan to be overseen by the security committee or a drug strategy committee, with the active involvement of the drug and alcohol recovery team.

Incentives and earned privileges

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 scheme was overly punitive and ineffective in incentivising good behaviour. A very high number of prisoners were on the basic regime, with limited access to visits, showers and telephones.*

- I.45** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at the last inspection, and against the comparator, said that the IEP scheme had encouraged them to change their behaviour. The prison had implemented the national scheme since the previous inspection, and we found there was little to incentivise positive behaviour.
- I.46** At the time of the inspection 20% of the population were on the basic regime – this was five times higher than at the previous inspection and far higher than we usually see at similar prisons. The basic regime was overly punitive. Although prisoners could attend work, there was a lack of activity places. Prisoners on the basic regime who were not assigned to an activity received only two showers and telephone calls a week, as well as shorter visits. (See main recommendation S41.) The basic regime was applied inflexibly. Prisoners were initially downgraded for 28 days and any additional warning issued during this period resulted in a further 28 days on basic – even if there had been considerable periods of good behaviour since the warning. As a result, some prisoners spent long periods on the basic regime. (See main recommendations S40 and S41.)

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.47 *The number of formal adjudications was very high and had increased since the last inspection. Hearings were usually conducted fairly but some punishments were too severe. Use of force was very high and had also significantly increased, but governance was good and the documentation was completed correctly. Relationships between staff and prisoners in the segregation unit were generally reasonable, but some cells were dirty, communal areas were filthy and the regime was very poor. Care planning was underdeveloped and too many prisoners remained segregated for long periods with little to prevent psychological deterioration.*

Disciplinary procedures

I.48 The number of adjudications was high at 1,345 in the previous six months and had almost doubled since the previous inspection. Many were for violent or antisocial behaviour. The written records of hearings we examined and those we attended indicated that proceedings were conducted fairly, and prisoners were given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events. However, some punishments were too severe. For example, it was not unusual for prisoners to receive a period of cellular confinement followed by a longer period of what was described as 'removal from wing'. We could see no difference between these two punishments and in reality this meant that prisoners were segregated (in the segregation unit) for long periods. In some cases, prisoners had been kept in segregation for 21 days as punishment for offences such as the refusal of orders.

Recommendation

I.49 **Punishments following adjudications should be fair and proportionate.**

The use of force

I.50 Use of force was very high and had significantly increased since the last inspection. In the previous six months, there had been 284 incidents involving the use of force compared with 191 in 2012. This was also higher than we see at comparable prisons.

I.51 Despite the high numbers, governance arrangements were good. Information about the nature of all incidents was collated, and there was sufficient analysis to identify patterns and trends at the use of force review meetings chaired by senior staff. The spontaneous and planned interventions we reviewed were well organised, properly carried out and documentation was generally completed correctly. Proper authority was recorded; senior staff supervised all incidents and planned interventions were filmed. We also saw examples where de-escalation techniques had been used to good effect. Managers and segregation unit officers wore body cameras and could record spontaneous incidents quickly, sometimes as they began.

I.52 In the previous six months, batons had been drawn eight times and used by officers on three occasions during particularly violent incidents. Although extreme, these measures appeared justified on these occasions.

- I.53** Special cells in the segregation unit had been used to accommodate prisoners twice in the previous six months for short periods. We were satisfied that use was justified for short periods and properly authorised.

Recommendation

- I.54** **The use of force should be reduced.**

Segregation

- I.55** Use of segregation remained high compared with other young adult prisons, with about 229 cases in the previous six months. At the time of our inspection there were 21 prisoners in segregation – 12 for good order or discipline, eight segregated as punishment and one awaiting adjudication. The average stay of this population was about three weeks, but a large number had been segregated for months. Segregation staff and managers told us that 60% of the current population had refused to locate in the main prison because they were not safe there and were waiting to be transferred to other prisons or to be discharged at the completion of their sentence.
- I.56** The environment in the segregation unit was poor and conditions had deteriorated since the last inspection. Although brightly decorated, communal areas were filthy in places and many occupied cells were dirty. There was graffiti scratched on to doors and windows and many toilets were stained and dirty. Some important aspects of basic hygiene were not sufficient. For example, prisoners were not given adequate opportunity to clean their cells, cleaning material was not readily available and showers were restricted to two a week. Late in the morning, we saw dirty plates on floors outside cells that had not been collected from the previous evening.
- I.57** Relationships between unit officers and prisoners were reasonably good but the regime was very poor and had also deteriorated since the last inspection. Telephone calls were offered only twice a week and exercise in one of the two caged yards was limited to 30 minutes a day. Education staff no longer visited the unit and, although a few long stay prisoners were allowed to have a television, most prisoners were left in their cells with little distraction – nearly all prisoners remained locked in their cells for 22 hours a day. There was too little to help prevent psychological deterioration caused by long periods of segregation.
- I.58** There was some evidence that reintegration planning was developing slowly, and a few prisoners had attended incremental periods on normal wings for association. One prisoner segregated during our inspection was able to attend offending behaviour sessions with the Aylesbury Pathway Service (see also paragraphs 1.15 and 4.48). However for most, reintegration or care planning was not effective. Although reviews of individual cases took place on time they were often cursory, and we saw little to assure us that progress in behaviour or circumstances was monitored effectively or acted upon. There were no individual care plans, behaviour targets were not set and staff were not engaged in formal planning.

Recommendations

- I.59** **The segregation unit should always be kept clean.**
- I.60** **The regime for longer stay prisoners in the segregation unit should include purposeful activities to help prevent psychological deterioration.**

- I.61** There should be individual care and reintegration plans to manage prisoners effectively during long periods of segregation and to help prisoners return to normal location.

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.62 *Demand for clinical treatment for substance misuse was very low. DART delivered an improved, good quality service that prisoners found helpful. Information given on Spice was good. The recovery champion programme worked well.*

- I.63** Clinical drug treatment services, such as opiate substitution, were delivered by Care UK - providers of primary care and in-reach services - although there was very little demand and no prisoners were receiving treatment at the time of the inspection. Psychosocial services were run by Inclusion through the drug and alcohol recovery team (DART).
- I.64** DART delivered good quality, age-appropriate and needs-led interventions. These included one-to-one casework and group work on a range of substance misuse-related subjects. Prisoners could also engage in the more intensive Inclusion Recovery Programme (IRP), which some who had completed the course said had been a 'life changing experience'. Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings were held weekly by an external facilitator.
- I.65** DART had improved its publicity strategy since the last inspection, and prisoners clearly understood the range and eligibility criteria of the interventions on offer. The DART caseload included 41% of the prisoner population, and in our survey, more than the comparator said the support they had received had been helpful. DART had responded well to the prison-wide problem with Spice (new psychoactive substance), through information leaflets and posters on wings, group and one-to-one packages for prisoners, and information and training for staff.
- I.66** There was an effective 'recovery champions' peer support programme. At the time of the inspection there were six champions working one-to-one with prisoners and co-facilitating DART group sessions. Peers felt well supported and supervised.

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** *Communal areas showed signs of neglect and were grubby. Outside exercise areas were maintained well. Some cells contained graffiti and were dirty. Not all prisoners could have daily access to showers or telephones. Prisoners could wear their own clothes, although most wore prison-issue clothing. General applications were not tracked and some went unanswered for lengthy periods.*
- 2.2** Communal areas showed signs of wear and tear that were not being dealt with. Although cleaners worked on the wings each day, these areas were often grubby and supervision of cleaners was sometimes lax. There was a reasonable amount of association equipment, and outside exercise areas were well equipped with exercise equipment and benches (see photographs, Appendix V). Commendably, some exercise areas also had telephones in booths for prisoners to use.
- 2.3** Many cells designed to hold one prisoner held two and were cramped. Cell furniture was mostly adequate, though some was deteriorating. Double cells did not have lockable cabinets, although there were plans to provide these. Some prisoners told us that theft was a problem on the wings.
- 2.4** Some cells were dirty, and some empty cells had been left in a poor condition and were not cleaned properly before the next occupant moved in. Prisoners told us that cleaning material was inadequate, which made it difficult for those who wanted to keep their cells clean. Rubbish behind the grilles over cell windows was common and often only dealt with once the cell was empty. In-cell toilets were a particular problem with heavy staining, despite the use of steam cleaners. Prisoners had to eat all their meals in proximity to their toilets, which did not always have seats or lids. Toilets in double cells were screened by a shower curtain, which was inadequate. A cell painting programme had just been introduced to deal with graffiti and badly marked walls in cells. The offensive display policy was not enforced. (See section on catering, paragraph 2.100.)
- 2.5** In our survey, 28% of respondents, against the comparator of 34%, said that their cell call bell was answered within five minutes. We observed varying staff responses to bells, with some not answered quickly enough.
- 2.6** Privacy screens had now been installed into communal showers, but work to improve their condition, including the flooring, had not been approved. Not all prisoners had daily access to showers (see main recommendations S40 and S41). Some staff did their best to ensure prisoners could get showers within the confines of the regime but, despite this, in our survey only 50% of respondents said that they could shower daily, against the comparator of 90%.
- 2.7** All prisoners could wear their own clothes but many wore prison-issue clothing. Each wing had a laundry, but the one on D wing was broken during the inspection and, despite contingency arrangements, prisoners were washing and drying items in their cell. New

arrivals were issued with clean bedding and towels, which could be washed or exchanged weekly. Prisoners experienced delays in gaining access to their property held in reception.

- 2.8** In our survey, 38% of respondents said that they had problems getting access to telephones, against the comparator of 30%. Although the number of telephones was adequate, the lack of evening association for most prisoners limited access to telephones when their families or friends were available. Arrangements for incoming and outgoing mail and 'emailprisoner' – which allowed families and friends of prisoners to send emails into the prison – worked well. However, in our survey more prisoners than the comparator, 44% against 37%, said that staff had opened their legal correspondence when they were not present – there were six recorded instances of this in 2015 to date.
- 2.9** Most prisoners found it easy to make applications, using a carbon copy system. Tracking of applications was however, not robust enough and we found unanswered applications dating back two months to April 2015, supporting prisoners' views that applications were not dealt with speedily.

Recommendations

- 2.10** **Communal areas should be maintained to an acceptable standard, and prisoners expected to keep their cells and communal areas clean.** (Repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 2.11** **Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two.** (Repeated recommendation 2.11)
- 2.12** **Communal showers should be maintained in good condition and be well ventilated, and in-cell toilets should be descaled and properly screened.**
- 2.13** **Emergency cell call bells should be answered within five minutes.** (Repeated recommendation 2.14)

Housekeeping points

- 2.14** The offensive displays policy should be adhered to.
- 2.15** Applications should be tracked and followed up when not responded to.

Good practice

- 2.16** *The telephone booths in the exercise areas provided additional opportunities for prisoners to make telephone calls in private.*

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.

2.17 *Prisoners were still mostly negative about staff. We observed variation in the quality of staff-prisoner relationships, and staff did not always address prisoners by their preferred name. Personal officer work was not recorded regularly enough and was too often narrowly focussed on wing behaviour. Prisoner consultation arrangements remained meaningful.*

2.18 During the inspection, Aylesbury relied on detached duty staff (drafted in temporarily from other prisons to cover staff vacancies) to provide a consistent regime for prisoners and cover staff absences. While most stayed for three months, the dependence on temporary staff affected the development of staff-prisoner relationships and prisoners' ability to get things done. In our survey, only 61% of respondents, against the comparator of 70%, said that there was a member of staff they could turn to for help, and it was evident that some staff knew the prisoners better than others. In our groups, several prisoners said they would turn to a member of the chaplaincy if they needed help.

2.19 The quality of staff relationships with prisoners we observed varied from helpful and relaxed to distant and disengaged. Staff sometimes referred to prisoners by their surnames alone, and we saw a small number of staff swearing in front of prisoners and setting a bad example. We also saw and heard about caring behaviour by officers who focused on prisoners' well-being, and observed staff who were confident in their ability to manage prisoners without being overly directive.

2.20 Two-thirds of prisoners in our survey said they had a personal officer, but only 41% of those, against the comparator of 58%, said they found them helpful. Electronic case notes on prisoners showed infrequent entries by some personal officers and no consistent management checks. Prisoners' case notes generally contained entries from a range of staff across the prison, with personal officers focusing mainly on wing behaviour rather than wider issues of relevance to a prisoner's time in custody.

2.21 The prisoner council made up of elected prisoner representatives continued to be a meaningful platform for prisoners to express their views and see follow-up action taken.

Recommendations

2.22 **Prisoners' negative perceptions about staff should be addressed, and staff who appear to be indifferent to prisoners should be required to take a more pro-social approach.** (Repeated recommendation 2.22)

2.23 **Personal officer entries in prisoners' case notes should evidence good knowledge of the prisoners they are responsible for, and there should be regular management checks to assess the quality of staff record keeping and encourage meaningful staff engagement with prisoners.**

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 characteristic³ 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.

2.24 *There had been some progress in the strategic approach to diversity but more improvement was needed. A regular equality team meeting considered monitoring data. There was no equality action plan or consultation with minority groups. Identification of prisoners with protected characteristics was reasonable but the support available for them required strengthening.*

Strategic management

- 2.25** A quarterly equality meeting had been introduced since the previous inspection, when there had been no strategic forum to discuss equality and diversity. The meeting did not yet include any prisoner representatives, although there were plans to do so. The meeting discussed most protected characteristics, but not foreign nationals, which was a concerning omission.
- 2.26** There was one full-time equality officer, who had been frequently redeployed to other duties, although this situation was improving. The equality policy was clear, but did not cover all the protected characteristics in the same detail, and there was no equality action plan. The prison used equality monitoring data reasonably well and carried out some local monitoring on areas not covered by the NOMS equality tool, for example, the ethnic composition of prisoners by wing. The prison had identified areas for further investigation following out-of-range monitoring results, but this was not yet completed and needed to be prioritised (see paragraphs 2.33 and 2.36). Monitoring data were not shared with prisoners.
- 2.27** There were no formal support groups for prisoners from any minority groups. There were 13 prisoner equality representatives across the residential wings. They were clear about their role and met as a group with the equality officer to discuss relevant issues. Not all prisoners were aware of them, and the plans to make them more visible needed to be implemented. Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were readily available, but some prisoners were not aware of what they were for and only 24 had been submitted in 2014. The quality of investigation into complaints was variable, and on many DIRFs there was no evidence that the complainant had been informed about the outcome. There had been external quality assurance of all the DIRFs in 2014, but there had not yet been action on some useful recommendations to inform future practice.

Recommendations

- 2.28 An equality action plan should be developed.**

³ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

- 2.29** The equality policy should address all protected characteristics in equal depth.
- 2.30** There should be prompt investigation into out-of-range results from equality monitoring and the necessary follow-up action taken.
- 2.31** All prisoners should be made aware of discrimination incident reporting forms and there should be consultation to determine why so few are submitted. External quality assurance should be used to improve investigation of and follow-up action arising from discrimination complaints.

Housekeeping point

- 2.32** Discussion of foreign nationals should be included in the quarterly equality meeting.

Protected characteristics

- 2.33** Around 56% of the population were from a black or minority ethnic background. Our survey results from these prisoners were worse than white prisoners across a range of safety and respect indicators. The prison's own monitoring showed disproportionate outcomes for this group in relation to the basic privilege level, use of force and segregation, and the reasons for this were being investigated. Black and minority ethnic prisoners we spoke to generally raised similar issues as white prisoners, but in groups we were told about some derogatory terms that had been used by staff. There was no specific forum where black and minority ethnic prisoners could raise these issues as a group.
- 2.34** Processes to identify prisoners from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background were not effective. The prison had only identified three prisoners from this group (our survey suggested there were more than this) and there was no specific support for them.
- 2.35** Foreign national prisoners made up about 12% of the population. Initial identification was good, with offender supervisors taking the lead in offering support and signposting foreign nationals to relevant services. There was information about telephone interpreting services in wing offices and, although not all staff were aware of how to use the service, we were told that staff used it appropriately for sensitive interviews. Some information in foreign languages and books were available in the library. Home Office staff visited the prison monthly and all foreign national prisoners were invited to meet them. Independent immigration advice was not available and we were told that restrictions on legal aid made it difficult for prisoners to obtain legal representation. One prisoner was held solely under immigration powers, having been due for release just before the inspection. The decision to detain him had been made close to his release date, and after a release plan had been arranged for him. Foreign prisoners could make a free telephone call monthly if they did not receive visits, and 12 prisoners had taken advantage of this in the previous month.
- 2.36** A third of the population were Muslim. As at the previous inspection, survey results from Muslim prisoners were mixed. They were positive about their religious beliefs being respected but more negative than non-Muslim prisoners about respect and victimisation by staff. The prison's quarterly monitoring of key outcomes by religion showed over-representation of Muslim prisoners in the use of segregation and on the basic regime, and this required further investigation.
- 2.37** The prison had improved its identification of prisoners with disabilities and was aware of over 70 such prisoners – which was consistent with the 17% of respondents to our survey who reported a disability. The majority of disabilities identified were learning or mental

illness related. The three prisoners with physical disabilities each had a personal emergency evacuation plan but few staff (including night staff) knew which prisoners had them or where to find the plans. There was a large adapted cell suitable for a prisoner with a mobility disability, and a lift to ensure access to and from the wing. We were not assured that all prisoners with learning disabilities received adequate follow-up or support (see paragraph 3.19).

- 2.38** In our survey, 4% of prisoners identified themselves as gay or bisexual but there was no specific support for them. The library stocked some magazines but there was little else to promote positive images. The policy for transgender prisoners was clear and useful, building on previous experience of supporting prisoners who were transgendered.

Recommendation

- 2.39** **There should be regular support groups/forums for prisoners from each protected characteristic.** (Repeated recommendation 2.37)

Housekeeping points

- 2.40** All staff should be made aware of the professional interpreting service and how and when to use it.
- 2.41** All staff should know where to locate the personal emergency evacuation plans for the prisoners in their care.

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.

- 2.42** *Faith provision and facilities were very good, and prisoners remained positive about the support offered by the chaplaincy.*

- 2.43** Faith facilities were good, following a change in accommodation, which included a chapel, a multi-faith area with washing facilities and a large office. The chapel and multi-faith area were big enough to accommodate the number of prisoners who attended corporate worship. The large chaplaincy covered most faiths, and was an integral part of prison life. The temporary lack of an Anglican chaplain had been covered by community volunteers and a new chaplain was due to start. The managing chaplain and the deputy were both Muslim chaplains and were very visible around the prison. Prisoners were very positive about their inclusive style of leadership and support. All chaplains were well known to prisoners and staff, and attended several key strategic and prisoner specific care meetings. Prisoners were positive about the support provided by chaplains.

- 2.44** Faith services had good attendance, and one-to-one sessions were offered to prisoners not allowed to attend group services. There was a good range of classes and groups, supported by a large number of volunteers. These included bereavement counselling, a volunteer prison visitors' scheme and financial support for prisoners with limited funds.

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.

2.45 *There had been some improvements in the monitoring of responses to complaints, but prisoners were still negative about the system and their confidence in it remained low.*

2.46 There had been 337 complaints in the six months to May 2015, with the majority about access to stored property and residential matters. In our survey, prisoners were more negative than the comparators in their views of the complaints system, and many we spoke to had little confidence in it. Complaint forms were not readily available on wings, and prisoners told us that when they did manage to make a complaint, they received mixed responses, depending where the complaint was sent. This was confirmed in our sampling of responses. In our survey, only 18% of prisoners, against the comparator of 36%, said that complaints were dealt with quickly, and in the complaints we sampled there were too often delays in some managers' responses. Although there had been some improvements in the quality assurance of responses to complaints – 10% were randomly sampled each month and feedback given to the managers concerned – this had not yet improved the quality or timeliness of responses or prisoners' confidence in the system.

Recommendation

2.47 **The prison should ensure that complaints are dealt with according to Prison Service orders and within the correct timescale.**

Housekeeping point

2.48 Complaint forms should be readily available to all prisoners.

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.

2.49 *Legal services support was reasonably good but facilities for legal visits remained unsuitable.*

2.50 Two officers who had received training in legal services were available to advise prisoners, mostly on eligibility for legal aid, finding solicitors and appeals. They could facilitate free telephone calls to legal representatives, and free solicitors' letters were also available. The library stocked relevant publications.

- 2.51** In our survey only 33% of respondents, against the comparator of 44%, said that it was easy to attend legal visits. Legal visits took place on one day each week in the main visits area, which could compromise confidentiality.

Recommendation

- 2.52** **Legal visits provision should be improved, to ensure confidentiality and provide more opportunities for prisoners to speak to their legal adviser.** (Repeated recommendation 2.53)

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.

- 2.53** *Governance of health provision required some improvement. Most prisoners had prompt access to nurses and GPs. Management of long-term conditions was compromised by the failure to recall prisoners on restricted regimes to health care for security reasons. Health promotion and service user engagement were developing. Some prisoners had delays in getting their prescribed medicines. Dental waits were reasonable, as were access and support for prisoners with mental health problems. Mental Health Act assessments and transfers were often delayed.*
- 2.54** *The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁴ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.55** The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- 2.56** Care UK provided primary care and in-reach services and Oxford Health NHS Trust provided mental health services. There was an interim primary care manager and no coordination of the different contracted services, which affected leadership of health services.
- 2.57** A quarterly prison cluster partnership board involving several prisons in the area included appropriate representation and focus. The health needs assessment was out of date but was under review. A cluster clinical governance meeting was suitably focused but poorly attended by key stakeholders.
- 2.58** Formal line management arrangements for nursing staff were unclear and there was no clinical supervision. Some core staff training, such as in resuscitation and triage, were not fulfilled or out of date.

⁴ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC's standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>

- 2.59** The electronic clinical incident system was sound and well used by nursing staff with 51 incidents reported in the last year; approximately 30% were medicines related. A separate dental reporting template had recently been introduced; however, some reportable incidents were not included, such as failures in referral to external hospital. There was evidence of learning from errors. Policies on infection control and communicable diseases were out of date and lacked local protocols to reflect the prison environment.
- 2.60** The overall health care environment was visibly clean but arrangements for clinical treatment rooms did not meet NHS-equivalent standards.
- 2.61** There had been few formal health complaints in the last year; responses were reasonable but the system was not confidential and there was scope to improve feedback. Prisoner consultation was developing with prisoner representatives on most wings. A regular monthly meeting was suitably focused and starting to explore more active methods of engaging prisoners with health matters. A dedicated and enthusiastic nurse led a developing health promotion agenda.
- 2.62** Out-of-hours GP care was provided by Bucks Urgent Care and included visits if needed, but this had rarely happened. There were no recorded delays of ambulances accessing the prison.
- 2.63** Emergency equipment was sited in the health care department and regularly checked. There were three prison-owned automated defibrillators located elsewhere throughout the prison. There was no 24-hour health cover, and too few prison staff had been trained in basic life support (28%) and use of the automated defibrillator (10%) against a backdrop of serious violent incidents.

Recommendations

- 2.64** **There should be clear coordination and leadership across and between the different clinical services to ensure safe and consistent outcomes for prisoners.**
- 2.65** **Health staff from all providers should have clear arrangements for their line management, clinical supervision and training in core skills.**
- 2.66** **All health and prison staff should have up-to-date basic life support skills, including use of an emergency defibrillator.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.67** The prison should work with key stakeholders to ensure they attend core multi-professional clinical meetings.
- 2.68** The system for making dental referrals to secondary care should be coordinated with the system for the primary health care provider.
- 2.69** The health complaints system should be confidential.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.70** A nurse saw all new arrivals in reception, with some late arrivals given a brief risk and welfare screening followed up more fully the next day. We observed good quality

assessment and engagement by nursing staff. There was no formal secondary health assessment and for those on restricted regimes, including segregation, there was the risk that health needs went unidentified.

- 2.71** Prisoners could request to see a nurse by application. The special sick policy required prisoners to let wing staff know if they were unwell or needed to see a nurse and they were then called to attend health care. Nurses made special visits to the wings to follow up prisoners on restricted movements.
- 2.72** The range of primary care services was reasonable, and included physiotherapy. Nursing staff were available between 8am and 7.30pm Monday to Thursday with slightly shorter hours on Friday and the weekend. In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said that access to the GP was good but we found that waits for the GP were generally short. There were efforts to ensure patient continuity by scheduling patients to see the same GP.
- 2.73** Management of long-term conditions was reasonable but some prisoners with asthma had failed to attend follow-up reviews because they were on restricted regimes for security reasons or were too fearful of potential bullying to attend health care. Care planning was not always used to meet more complex health needs.
- 2.74** Nurses regularly monitored planned and spontaneous use of force incidents and we noted good identification by a nurse of a potential risk to a prisoner, which was subsequently raised with the prison management. However, there had been occasions when there had been significant delays before health staff were alerted to use of force.
- 2.75** External hospital referrals were not usually cancelled. However, there was no monitoring and tracking system for external GP referrals and we noted several hospital referrals where there had been delays in referrals sent or no clear audit trail. A new protocol was developed and agreed during our visit.

Recommendations

- 2.76** **All new arrivals should have a secondary health assessment to ensure adequate identification of health needs, and prisoners on restricted movements, including those in the segregation unit, should have appropriate and prompt access to health services.**
- 2.77** **Clinical review of patients with long-term conditions should be timely.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.78** The new protocol for referrals to secondary care should be audited to check and improve its effectiveness.

Pharmacy

- 2.79** An external pharmacy supplied medicines with appropriate patient information. Some prisoners had delays in getting their medications. Few prisoners took up the opportunity to see the pharmacist.
- 2.80** Twice daily administration of supervised medicines was safe but privacy at the hatch was frequently compromised. Staff identified prisoners who missed their medication and followed

them up appropriately. Night time medicines were given in possession but a few prisoners on supervised medicines with sedative effect were given their medicines too early. Prisoners in the segregation unit were given their medicines individually in their cells, but security arrangements affected the timeliness of this.

- 2.81 Prisoners could buy a limited range of over-the-counter medicines from the pharmacy, but there were no arrangements for simple analgesia after nursing staff had left the prison in the evening or for prisoners needing antibiotics or pain relief for dental pain overnight and weekends. Medicines taken from the out-of-hours cupboards were not well audited.
- 2.82 Most medicines were stored appropriately, although there were some loose blisters noted by the pharmacy staff, but not recorded. Refrigerator temperatures were appropriately managed.
- 2.83 A prescribing formulary was not always followed and the reasons for this were not always recorded. Appropriate in-date policies were used, but the in-possession policy had not been ratified. Most prisoners received their medicines in possession, except those on F wing where we were told more medication was supervised; the reason for this was not clear.
- 2.84 A cluster medicines management meeting had suitable focus on key issues, but attendance was variable.

Recommendations

- 2.85 **All prisoners should be able to obtain their prescribed medicines, simple pain relief and antibiotics promptly as needed, including overnight and at weekends.**
- 2.86 **The in-possession medicines policy should be ratified and applied to ensure safe use and administration of medicines.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.87 Use of the out-of-hours medicines cupboard should always be recorded and audited.

Dentistry

- 2.88 The dental service was provided by Haddenham Dental Clinic. Prisoners waited approximately eight weeks for a routine dental appointment with a 'did not attend' rate of approximately 33%. Urgent needs were dealt with promptly. Patient privacy and dignity were compromised because the suite door was routinely left open during treatments. Advice about oral hygiene and general care was provided individually, including written oral health information.
- 2.89 The dental suite had been refurbished and complied fully with current national standards. Decontamination processes were suitable but there was no illuminated magnifying glass to check that reusable instruments were visibly clean before sterilisation.

Recommendation

- 2.90 **Prisoners should receive dental treatment in privacy and with confidentiality, except where a specific risk has been identified.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.91** The reasons for the dental non-attendance rate should be explored and session time maximised.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.92** Care UK provided 'in-reach' primary mental health services, and Oxford Health NHS Trust provided services for prisoners with severe and enduring mental health needs. Services were well integrated with some commendable joint pathway working to ensure prisoners were supported, and there were effective links with the new Aylesbury Pathway Service (see paragraph 4.48).
- 2.93** One primary mental health nurse and two forensic mental health nurses provided the day-to-day service, an adult general psychiatrist and forensic psychiatrist provided weekly medical input, and a sessional clinical psychologist supported a small number of prisoners with specific behavioural needs; this had included assessment for ASD (Autistic Spectrum Disorder). There was no specific support for young men with learning disabilities. The team lacked administrative support to organise and manage their team meetings and caseload effectively.
- 2.94** All referrals went to the primary mental health nurse for an initial mental health assessment, and were then allocated to the most appropriate service and practitioner. A weekly 'single point of access' meeting was attended by both mental health services and primary care; the meeting reviewed all current referrals including at-risk prisoners on ACCT case management. The meeting was poorly structured and lacked focused action planning.
- 2.95** There was no clear line management support for the two forensic mental health nurses, and no suitable clinical supervision arrangements for primary mental health and temporary staff (see recommendation 2.65). Clinical record keeping varied and there were some delays in completion. While some records showed robust clear risk assessments, there were some examples of weak assessments that failed to identify risks.
- 2.96** In the previous six months, seven prisoners had been identified as needing assessment under the Mental Health Act 2007. There had been lengthy delays in completion of assessments and transfers, including one young man who had been transferred to an inpatient unit in another prison, pending transfer to a suitable secure placement.

Recommendation

- 2.97** **There should be administrative support for the mental health team.**

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.

2.98 *Prisoners were mostly positive about the food, which was generally of an acceptable standard. Supervision of food service was sometimes weak, and prisoners could not dine in association.*

- 2.99** In our survey, 34% of prisoners said that the food was good, against the comparator of 16%, and we heard few complaints about the food. The quality and quantity of food were generally acceptable, but the breakfast packs were issued the day before they were to be eaten and were inadequate. The four-week menu cycle was balanced, offered variety and catered for special diets, including halal, vegan and vegetarian. Information about food choices on one wing noticeboard was out of date and did not include halal options.
- 2.100** Lunch was put in prisoners' cells or at their doors before they returned from activities – some of the food was not wrapped and the practice was not hygienic or respectful. The evening meal was served earlier than the advertised time on some units. There was no opportunity for prisoners to prepare their own food or dine in association, and they ate in their cells alongside inadequately screened toilets that often did not have lids. (See section on residential units, paragraph 2.4.)
- 2.101** Supervision of food service was variable, and we saw some prisoners taking extra cereal packs and others given additional food by servery workers. Servery workers did not routinely wear hats and some of their protective clothing was grubby, some served food with their gloved hand rather than the appropriate utensil, and they did not always use separate halal utensils. Serveries did not have hygiene screen covers, and food trolleys were not fully cleaned. (See recommendation 3.25.)
- 2.102** The kitchen was kept clean and properly maintained. Halal food was stored and prepared separately. Ten prisoners worked in the kitchen but they were not able to obtain any qualifications there.
- 2.103** There was a twice yearly food survey and food was discussed at the prisoner council, although the catering manager did not routinely attend.

Recommendations

- 2.104** **Prisoners should collect their own food for all meals, lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal before 5pm, and breakfast should be adequate and served on the day it is to be consumed.**
- 2.105** **Prisoners should be able to dine in association.** (Repeated recommendation 2.99)
- 2.106** **Serveries should be kept clean and properly maintained, servery workers should be appropriately dressed, and correct utensils used to serve food.**
- 2.107** **Prisoners who work in the kitchen should be able to achieve relevant qualifications.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.108 *New arrivals could wait for almost two weeks to receive their first prison shop order. Shop consultation arrangements were adequate, but black and minority ethnic prisoners were less content about the range of goods available.*

2.109 New arrivals could buy a smokers or non-smokers grocery pack but, depending on their day of arrival, some waited up to almost two weeks to receive their first full shop order, leaving them open to getting into debt with other prisoners and possible bullying.

2.110 The shop was discussed at the prisoner council, and agreed changes were made to the list quarterly, although some prisoners we spoke to were unaware how they could influence the choice of goods available. In our survey, black and ethnic minority prisoners had poorer responses than white prisoners about the availability of goods in the shop to meet their needs, although we found that the goods on sale were suitable for the needs of the population.

2.111 Prisoners could shop from catalogues but orders still incurred a 50p handling charge, and prisoners said there were lengthy delays in receiving their orders from reception. Newspapers and magazines could be bought through a local newsagent.

Recommendations

2.112 **New arrivals should be able to buy items from the prison shop within their first 24 hours.**

2.113 **Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders.**

Housekeeping points

2.114 Prisoners should receive clear information about consultation on items available from the prison shop.

2.115 There should be no undue delays in prisoners receiving their catalogue orders.

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁵

3.1 *Time out of cell was poor, particularly for a training prison, and clearly caused tensions between staff and prisoners.*

3.2 The published activity schedule for prisoners that described the times that they were unlocked (the 'core day') indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve about nine hours a day out of their cell on Monday to Thursday and about six hours on Friday. Prisoners received much less at weekends when they were unlocked for only about two hours a day. In practice, the average time out of cell was nearer to six hours a day for fully employed prisoners and could be as little as 1.5 hours for the many prisoners who did not work or were on restricted regimes. This included a period of exercise that was restricted to a very limited 30 minutes. Unemployed prisoners on the basic level got little more than 4 and a half hour a week out of cell (see also paragraph 1.46).

3.3 As at the last inspection, we found daily slippage in the regime, and observed that prisoners were often unlocked late and locked up early. Staff and managers told us that education and work sessions were often cancelled at short notice, and during inspection we saw classes cancelled every day.

3.4 At a roll check taken when prisoners should have been unlocked, we found between 30% and 40% of the population locked in their cells. Throughout the week we observed that prisoners were frustrated and angry about being locked in their cells for very long periods without anything meaningful to do, and this clearly caused tensions. (See also main recommendation S42.)

Recommendations

3.5 **The prison should operate a predictable and equitable regime that allows all prisoners to attend purposeful activity regularly and provides a reasonable amount of time out of cell.**

3.6 **Prisoners should receive at least one hour's exercise in the open air every day.**

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

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

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.

3.7 *The management of learning and skills and work was inadequate, as were the leadership and management by Milton Keynes College. Quality improvement actions had not had sufficient impact. The strategy for improving prisoners' English and mathematics skills was also inadequate. The prison failed to provide sufficient activity spaces to ensure that all prisoners were purposefully engaged. Too many classes and workshops were cancelled because of staff shortages, attendance was low, and the prison withdrew too many prisoners from activities without providing a planned return to them. The curriculum did not meet the needs of the population. Outcomes for prisoners in vocational training were high, although English and mathematics outcomes were too low. Teaching, learning and assessment required improvement. Induction and initial assessment arrangements were adequate. The prison library was now accessible, well stocked and supported prisoners' wider learning.*

3.8 *Ofsted⁶ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

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

Management of learning and skills and work

3.9 The leadership and management of learning, skills and work were inadequate. Partnership working between the prison and the learning provider, Milton Keynes College, had improved and the recently strengthened quality improvement group had taken appropriate actions. However, the prison had not effectively challenged the weak performance of the learning provider or made sufficient progress in raising the poor standards we identified previously.

3.10 The staffing of learning and skills was inadequate and did not meet the needs of the population. Courses were cancelled too often, the curriculum was very narrow, and too many prisoners were unemployed or insufficiently engaged in purposeful activities.

3.11 The observation of teaching and learning process failed to include all the purposeful activity sessions that prisoners could attend, and college observers' reports were too generous in their assessment of the quality of sessions. Prison managers were insufficiently involved in monitoring the quality of learning sessions.

3.12 Prison managers did not sufficiently analyse data on attendance, retention and achievement to monitor trends in performance of groups of prisoners to identify weaknesses and promote improvement. Many judgements in the self-assessment report were too generous and not supported by accurate data.

3.13 Curriculum planning failed to meet the needs of prisoners. The strategy for improving prisoners' skills in English and mathematics was inadequate and failed to set aspirational

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

targets in these important subjects. The promotion and development of prisoners' English and mathematics in vocational training and in work were weak.

Recommendations

- 3.14** The prison should set clear targets and expectations for the quality of activities; managers should monitor these rigorously, analyse data effectively and take appropriate actions to ensure urgent improvements. (Repeated recommendation 3.15)
- 3.15** The prison should implement effective quality assurance arrangements, including monitoring the quality of learning sessions, to gain a better understanding of the quality of provision and to improve prisoners' experience. (Repeated recommendation 3.16)
- 3.16** The college should ensure that there are sufficient learning and skills staff to provide a wide range of high-quality activities.
- 3.17** The prison should develop a strategy to improve prisoners' skills in English and mathematics.

Provision of activities

- 3.18** The prison did not provide sufficient purposeful activity to engage all prisoners. Although the number of prisoners engaged had increased, to 75%, only a third of those were in full-time employment, and 25% of prisoners remained unemployed. (See also main recommendation S42.)
- 3.19** The half-day induction for new arrivals failed to provide sufficient opportunities for them to gain a thorough understanding of the range of activities available. It was mostly taken up with the assessment of functional skills and guidance on using the 'virtual campus' (giving them internet access to community education, training and employment opportunities), a resource that was underused and not readily accessible to all prisoners (see recommendation 4.36). The initial assessment was satisfactory and identified each prisoner's English and mathematics abilities, as well as the potential barriers to their learning. The assessment results were used well to direct prisoners to appropriate activities. Two part-time support workers provided additional support for those identified as requiring extra help (although one post was currently vacant). College managers acknowledged that not all prisoners who needed extra support to help them progress received it. The use of individual learning plans to record progress and set targets was weak.
- 3.20** Too many classes and workshops were cancelled as a result of staff shortages and absences. The range of education provision was too narrow. The only courses offered at the time of inspection were in English and mathematics. Personal and social development, employability and art were not offered due to staff shortages. Information and communications technology (ICT) classes had run only intermittently for the past two years. The number of vocational workshops had increased to include recycling, cycle repair, motorcycle maintenance and laser technology. However, barbering, brickwork, cookery and motor vehicle mechanic workshops were not offered due to lack of staff.
- 3.21** Prisoners working as cleaners and servers on the wings did not receive pre-work training and there were no qualifications in cleaning or training in food hygiene. Work for prisoners

in the gardens, kitchens, laundry and recycling was productive and helped promote a good work ethic.

- 3.22** Access and support for prisoners on distance learning and Open University courses were good, the number of prisoners studying courses at advanced and undergraduate level had increased, and prisoners took great satisfaction from progressing in their subject. Prison staff were effective in helping prisoners apply for the external funding needed to support such courses.

Recommendations

- 3.23** The prison should provide more activity places that take appropriate account of prisoners' prior education, aptitude and remaining time in custody.
- 3.24** The learning, skills and work induction for new arrivals should be more effective and rigorous.
- 3.25** The prison should establish vocationally relevant training in all areas, and urgently introduce appropriate training for wing cleaners and all workers involved in handling food.
- 3.26** The prison should improve the rigour and quality of target-setting in individual learning plans to identify short-term targets and measure achievement more frequently.

Quality of provision

- 3.27** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment required improvement, as reflected in the poor attendance at education sessions and the low achievement rates in English and mathematics. Punctuality was also poor in too many sessions.
- 3.28** Tutors and instructors were well qualified. In many education classes, teachers integrated short periods of study in the library to break up the session, which prisoners appreciated. However, the range of learning strategies used was often too narrow and provided few opportunities for prisoners to demonstrate their understanding or engage purposefully in learning. Classrooms were well equipped and electronic teaching boards were installed in most, although teachers made little use of this resource to enhance learning.
- 3.29** Prisoners enjoyed and made good progress in vocational training workshops. Instructors briefed learners on the expectations of the session, and worked well with orderlies and peer mentors to provide good coaching and support focusing on prisoners' individual needs – such as supporting prisoners in stripping and rebuilding engines or negotiating difficult corners when lining wallpaper. However, prisoners in the motor vehicle workshop were unable to test their car maintenance skills and confirm their learning, as the cars were old and did not work.
- 3.30** Assessment of prisoners' work required improvement. In vocational workshops and cookery (when it had been running), instructors provided prisoners with good-quality feedback on written work. Spelling and grammar corrections were helpful in showing prisoners how to improve. However, the quality of feedback on prisoners' mathematics work was poor.

Recommendations

- 3.31** The prison should ensure that lessons start on time and that attendance is improved by minimising disruptions and cancellations. (Repeated recommendation 3.36)
- 3.32** The prison should provide working cars in the motor vehicle workshop to enable prisoners to test their skills and confirm their learning.
- 3.33** Teachers should make better use of the available information learning technology resources to make learning more engaging and interactive.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.34** As a result of the prison withdrawing so many prisoners from purposeful activities for security reasons, with no alternative opportunities for their return, too many prisoners failed to complete their courses. Those who did achieved well, especially in vocational training. Achievement on English courses required improvement and mathematics achievements were inadequate (see recommendation 3.17). The development of prisoners' practical and vocational skills was appropriate for the low-level qualifications they were working towards. Pass rates on A level, GCSE and vocational programmes were good.

Recommendation

- 3.35** Prisoners who are withdrawn from activities should have alternative opportunities to return to learning, skills and work.

Library

- 3.36** Buckinghamshire County Council provided library services, staffed by two part-time librarians and assisted by a prison orderly. The library was now in accessible accommodation, well furnished and organised. It provided a welcoming environment and a range of resources that met prisoners' needs, including foreign nationals. It also provided 'quick-read', audio books and legal materials. However, access to desktop computers was limited.
- 3.37** Opening hours were adequate to meet the needs of the population. Prisoners were entitled to one library visit a week, although regime restrictions meant that there were rarely sufficient officers to escort them to the library more than two or three times a month. The librarians maintained detailed records of library use. Most prisoners had registered with the library and the number who regularly borrowed books and other resources was impressively high. Prisoners on the segregated unit in F wing did not have scheduled visits to the library, but library managers provided a range of books and other resources on the wing.
- 3.38** Library managers regularly updated wing notices to inform prisoners about the resources and activities available. They also worked well in partnership with prison staff to promote a range of activities, such as Storybook Dads (enabling prisoners to record a story for their children), the 'Six Book Challenge' (where participants choose six reads, review them, and enter prize draws) and a reading group for prisoners with mental health difficulties run by an external organisation. Toe by Toe, a peer-led mentoring scheme to help other prisoners to read, also operated.

Recommendation

3.39 All prisoners should be able to visit the library at least once a week.

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.

3.40 *Prisoners had reasonable access to a range of recreational physical training, although there was no accredited vocational training. Most prisoners could go to the gym at least twice a week, but some in full-time work had to choose between doing that or using that time for domestic activities, such as taking a shower or making telephone calls.*

3.41 The physical education provision was recovering from a long period of erratic staffing that had affected the quality of provision. However, there was now a full complement of six physical training officers. Gym staff produced a regular newsletter that promoted clubs and events well. However, no accredited training was offered.

3.42 New arrivals completed an induction to the gym that included useful guidance on emergency first aid, safe use of equipment, lifting techniques, healthy living and well-being. Around two-thirds of the population regularly used the gym facilities. Unemployed prisoners and wing workers could attend at least twice a week, but a minority of full-time workers found it difficult to use it more than once a week.

3.43 Regime limitations and low levels of staffing had affected inter-wing activities and rugby and football matches with local teams. However, prisoners could participate in a wide range of indoor and outdoor activities. Structured coaching sessions included yoga, rugby, cricket and weight training.

3.44 Gym equipment was well maintained and in good order, although there was no plan to replace the older expensive cardiovascular equipment. The PE classroom was well resourced, but underused as there was no accredited training. The large sports hall, cardiovascular area and weight training facilities were used intensively during recreational sessions. Most exercise yards attached to the wings had body-weight resistance training equipment, but prisoners used this infrequently. Changing facilities were clean but too small, which restricted the number of prisoners who could use the gym. Showers were well used and maintained.

Recommendations

3.45 The prison should introduce appropriate vocational training in the gym.

3.46 The prison should provide adequate changing facilities, and plan to replace the cardiovascular equipment.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *The reducing reoffending strategy was comprehensive and meetings were properly focused, and work was underpinned by a needs analysis. Provision was appropriate for the population but not as good as at the last inspection. Staff shortages and cross-deployment of uniformed offender supervisors made some caseloads unmanageable, and affected the frequency and quality of contact with prisoners.*

4.2 The comprehensive reducing reoffending strategy was underpinned by a prisoner needs assessment and described how the elements of offender management, public protection and resettlement pathways should work. There had been efforts to widen staff awareness of the pivotal role of offender management at Aylesbury, but it was still not always fully understood by staff throughout the prison.

4.3 Quarterly reducing reoffending meetings were well attended and discussed relevant issues. Monthly offender management unit (OMU) team meetings and management meetings were properly focused and discussed priorities for the team.

4.4 The work was managed through two separate strands: all work on resettlement, including resettlement pathway and programme provision, was managed under the head of reducing reoffending; all that on offender management, including public protection and work with indeterminate sentence prisoners, under two joint heads of offender management. The arrangement worked reasonably well with evidence of good links between the various departments to ensure appropriate prisoner engagement.

4.5 There were five teams made up of a business administrator, probation officer and uniformed offender supervisor, which was an appropriate model to deliver effective offender management. However, at the time of the inspection there were significant staff shortages in the OMU. Instead of 5.6 whole-time-equivalent probation officers and five uniformed offender supervisors, there were only 2.1 and 4.5 respectively – with the latter also subject to considerable cross-deployment to cover supervising officer duties in the prison. Throughout the inspection, both staff and managers expressed frustration with this, and with caseloads that were sometimes large and difficult to manage effectively. Prisoners in our groups and individually complained about the frequency and quality of contact with offender supervisors.

4.6 There was generally appropriate provision to meet prisoners' needs across the resettlement pathways. The high number of offending behaviour programme places was sufficient to meet the needs of the population identified through a comprehensive needs analysis.

4.7 Aylesbury no longer had a role as a resettlement prison but at the time of inspection still held prisoners who were likely to be released from there. It had received no support from any of the community rehabilitation companies (CRCs) that should be responsible for

delivering the resettlement needs of prisoners due for release, and had raised these concerns appropriately to both regional and national leads in NOMS responsible for delivering the 'through the gate' service (see paragraph 4.31).

Recommendations

- 4.8 The prison should ensure that there are sufficient offender supervisors dedicated to offender management duties.**
- 4.9 Community rehabilitation companies (CRCs) responsible for the resettlement needs of prisoners to be released from Aylesbury should ensure they are delivering an appropriate service to such prisoners.**

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.

4.10 *Although some offender supervisors carried unmanageable caseloads they generally saw new arrivals quickly. Too few prisoners had an up-to-date OASys (offender assessment system) assessment, and the quality of some of these and associated sentence plans was too variable. Contact between prisoners and offender supervisors was often too infrequent but was mostly prioritised at key points during the sentence. Monitoring of offender supervisors' work focused properly on the quality and effectiveness of their engagement with prisoners, but these were not always put into practice due to significant staff shortages and cross-deployment of uniformed offender supervisors. Public protection arrangements were sound. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners was reasonable.*

- 4.11** All new arrivals were allocated an offender supervisor quickly. Probation offender supervisors managed all prisoners on an indeterminate sentence for public protection. The remainder of the population, including lifers, were managed across the whole team. The head of offender management oversaw caseloads to ensure they were fair and equitable but, due to staff shortages, some caseloads were too large and we were concerned about how they could be managed effectively.
- 4.12** Since the last inspection, the head of OMU had made considerable efforts to offer uniformed offender supervisors an equitable level of professional supervision and casework quality assurance in line with probation staff. This was not only appreciated by uniformed staff but also resulted in better awareness of risk factors. However, this was not always put into practice as some offender supervisors were less experienced, and the frequency and quality of their contact with prisoners were also affected by staff shortages and cross-deployment.
- 4.13** During the inspection we were joined by colleagues from HM Inspectorate of Probation who undertook a detailed analysis of 12 cases (six assessed as high or very high risk of harm, and six as low or medium risk). We considered a further 18 cases in less detail.
- 4.14** There continued to be a large backlog of OASys assessments. There had been efforts to chase up late assessments with community offender managers, where necessary escalating the request via the senior probation officer in the prison and their counterpart in the

community. Completion of OASys assessments in the prison had been prioritised, although because of the nature of the offences committed by most prisoners in Aylesbury, the majority of cases were a priority or the responsibility of the National Probation Service. External community probation officers had been employed by the prison on a sessional basis to help clear the prison-generated backlog. These actions had not yet had the desired effect, and around one in three assessments, were outstanding at the time of the inspection.

- 4.15** An offender supervisor generally saw new arrivals within 10 days. Although reviews were usually undertaken, sentence plans were sometimes not updated to reflect what was available at Aylesbury, and OASys assessments were not routinely reviewed and updated on arrival. Following induction and assessments by offender supervisors and other staff, including in education and substance misuse, the prison attempted to sequence attendance at appropriate offending behaviour activities, which was positive and worked reasonably well.
- 4.16** Too many prisoners did not have a sentence plan. Although this did not necessarily mean that they were not undertaking appropriate interventions, without a plan it was not always clear how their overall assessed risks and needs would be addressed. In some cases we found that the prisoner had had a three-way meeting with their offender manager (via video link) and offender supervisor, which included a discussion about their sentence plan and objectives, but in many cases the prisoner had not been fully consulted throughout the process.
- 4.17** In around half the cases we inspected, there was little or no evidence of sufficient and meaningful communication between the offender supervisor and prisoner. Contact levels varied from infrequent, with entries describing the current circumstances of the prisoner, to very regular contact and full records. Staff acknowledged that there had been a loss of face-to-face contact with prisoners due to staffing issues. Contact and recording of that contact was generally better by probation officer offender supervisors. Offender supervisors had just started to run OMU surgeries on the wings, to address common queries, but it was too early to assess the impact of this initiative.
- 4.18** Responses from prisoners about the service from their offender supervisors were mixed. Staff contact log entries mainly related to monitoring and checking the prisoner's circumstances, rather than active work based on his sentence plan. There was some limited evidence that contact focused on developing motivation or challenging offending attitudes and thinking. Some records indicated that contact often took place ad hoc during prisoner movements or while uniformed offender supervisors were on their wing duties, which affected the quality of the contact. The personal officer scheme did not operate effectively and we were not assured that all personal officers contributed to helping prisoners achieve their identified goals (see paragraph 2.20), which further highlighted that offender management did not have the pivotal role it needed in the context of such a high risk population.
- 4.19** Despite the issues around levels of contact and the quality of recorded contact, we were assured that head of OMU prioritised the needs of most prisoners at key stages in their sentence through a monthly tasking list and contact during supervision. Some points, however, were carried forward and consequently there were some delays to actions. With some exceptions, most OASys assessments and sentence plans were at least of an adequate standard.
- 4.20** Liaison between offender supervisors and offender managers in the community about prisoners before their release was variable. In our sample, where relevant, contact between offender supervisors and offender managers was not sufficient and meaningful in around half the cases.

- 4.21** Given the population, relatively few prisoners were eligible for home detention curfew release. In the previous six months, three prisoners had been considered and three had been successful. Decisions to decline applications were appropriate and based on the prisoner's past behaviour. Few prisoners met the criteria for release on temporary licence (ROTL), and the prison offered no opportunities for such release.

Recommendations

- 4.22** The backlog of OASys assessments should be reduced.
- 4.23** All prisoners should have a sentence plan, be given the opportunity to discuss the objectives, and understand what they need to achieve while they are in custody.
- 4.24** The frequency and quality of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners should be more focused on risk reduction, and fully recorded.

Public protection

- 4.25** Public protection arrangements were good. All multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases (equating to 77% of the population), along with individuals identified as having a current or past sex offence, were screened and referred for a child protection assessment where necessary. At the time of the inspection, 74 were identified as sex offenders and 25 prisoners were on telephone or mail restrictions for reasons of harassment or child protection.
- 4.26** The well-attended interdepartmental risk management team met fortnightly to discuss all new arrivals, review current restrictions and amend where necessary, and review prisoners due for release in the next six months. There were some issues which the prison was sighted on that they consistently escalated to senior probation officers in the National Probation Service (NPS), with prisoners being allocated a MAPPA level far too close to release; in one case the level had not been set six days before release. As a result the prison completed a report for all prisoners that ensured that, regardless of their MAPPA level, community offender managers were fully aware of all risks that the prison felt the prisoner continued to pose.

Recommendation

- 4.27** Community offender managers should ensure that MAPPA levels are set six months before the prisoner's release to ensure effective pre-release planning and to manage risk.

Categorisation

- 4.28** All prisoners had their categorisation status reviewed and set on or shortly after their 21st birthday. The assessment was led by offender supervisors who consulted with offender managers, and documentation and decisions were appropriate – three prisoners had been recategorised to category D in the previous six months. Despite 118 transfers from the prison in the previous six months, of which 41 were progressive moves and 15 for resettlement, the prison said there were difficulties with onward allocations of prisoners for such reasons and for those who had become adults. This was evident in that 18 prisoners aged 22 and 23 remained at Aylesbury (see recommendation 4.33).

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.29** The prison held 49 indeterminate sentence prisoners, including 13 sentenced for public protection (ISPP) and 36 mandatory life cases, which was a reduction since the last inspection. Work with indeterminate sentence prisoners was generally appropriate, and probation offender supervisors saw most ISPPs reasonably frequently. There was little information specifically for indeterminate sentence prisoners. The previously good provision for lifers, including lifer days, had ceased but was being revived during the inspection.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.30 *Relatively few prisoners were released from Aylesbury. Although there was no involvement from community rehabilitation companies, pre-release discharge arrangements were mostly good. Resettlement pathways provision was mostly appropriate, except children and families work. There was particularly good work to address attitudes, thinking and behaviour.*

- 4.31** The prison released an average of 10 prisoners a month. Since May 2015, a small number of these should have had their resettlement needs met by a community rehabilitation company⁷ (CRC) (see recommendation 4.9) but, although the prison had escalated its concerns regionally and nationally, it had not yet benefited from involvement by a CRC. However, the prison had not allowed this to affect its discharge planning for prisoners due to be released from Aylesbury. Although some prisoners should have been transferred to resettlement prisons before their release for progression or resettlement, Aylesbury often experienced difficulties in getting other establishments to accept them, and it regularly raised these concerns in NOMS.
- 4.32** All prisoners were invited to a multidisciplinary pre-discharge meeting three months before their release. The meeting was chaired by a member of the resettlement team and attendance included an offender supervisor and representatives from Milton Keynes College, Department of Work and Pensions, Trailblazers (which offered a 'through the gate' mentoring service) and the drug and alcohol recovery team (DART); offender managers rarely attended. The meeting focused on accommodation, finance, benefit and debt, substance misuse and employment or training. The meeting we observed was well attended, explained the process of release well and responded to any concerns. The onus was then on offender supervisors to communicate the outcomes to the offender manager in the community, but we found that this was not always recorded and we were not assured that this information was always communicated effectively.

⁷ All prisoners sentenced after 1 February 2015 will be subject to a minimum of 12 months supervision and rehabilitation support on release. Rehabilitation services will be organised through CRCs who will take over the work with medium- and low-risk offenders, with the National Probation Service (NPS) maintaining responsibility for high- and very high-risk offenders. Many rehabilitation services, including accommodation brokerage and retention, employment support, finance and debt services, support for previous sex workers as well as victims of domestic violence and abuse, will be provided in both prisons and the community by the same provider to offer greater continuity between the two.

Recommendation

- 4.33 Prisoners should be transferred quickly to appropriate prisons for progression or resettlement to ensure their needs are met.**

Accommodation

- 4.34** Despite the lack of a dedicated housing service, all prisoners left Aylesbury with accommodation on release. Support with finding accommodation was provided through offender supervisors, and most prisoners returned to live with parents or were accommodated in approved premises on release.

Education, training and employment

- 4.35** The 'virtual campus', enabling prisoner access to community education, training and employment opportunities via the internet, was underused and did not provide an adequate resource for prisoners. Although prisoners were logged on to the system at induction, very few used it outside of formal learning sessions. Learning and skills staff attended the formal pre-release discharge boards for the few prisoners released directly from the prison.

Recommendation

- 4.36 The prison should make better use of the virtual campus to promote and enhance prisoner learning.**

Health care

- 4.37** All prisoners were invited to a pre-release health appointment up to two weeks before release. They were given a written summary of their clinical record and information on registering with a GP and dentist, alongside some helpful health promotion information and condoms. Prisoners with serious and enduring mental health needs were linked effectively with their community teams, and local teams sometimes attended pre-release care programme approach (CPA) meetings.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.38** The DART had good working links with the OMU. Links with local and regional community support agencies were also effective when devising reintegration plans for the relatively low numbers released from Aylesbury. The visiting Alcoholics Anonymous facilitator provided a local gate pick-up service and arranged AA sponsorship opportunities for prisoners on release

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.39** The prison did not have any specialist provision under this pathway, but as many prisoners leaving Aylesbury had entered custody as teenagers the need for support with debts was low and met by offender supervisors. Prisoners could access a money management course through education, see a Jobcentre Plus worker and set up a bank account before release.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.40** In our survey, only 23% of prisoners said it was easy for their family and friends to visit, and we found that visitors had travelled across England to the prison. Prisoners told us that visitors were not always treated well by staff, and that their families and friends experienced long delays entering the prison. Visitors confirmed this during the inspection, and we observed visitors entering the prison 45 minutes after the visit should have started, despite arriving early after long journeys.
- 4.41** The visitors' centre was cramped and needed refurbishment. Volunteers attempted to identify first-time visitors as they arrived, but often had to deal with large numbers of people frustrated by the delays. Visitors were called into the visits hall in groups of three, and it took nearly an hour for all the visitors to arrive there. We observed prison staff in the gate and search area treating exasperated visitors in a polite and understanding way. The visits hall was bright but cramped, with little privacy. There was a small play area for children and a refreshments bar staffed by the same volunteers who ran the visitors' centre, who were sometimes delayed because of the delays in processing visits. Facilities for closed visits offered little privacy.
- 4.42** In our survey, fewer prisoners than the comparator said that a member of staff had helped them to maintain contact with family or friends. The prison had no family support worker, and provision to support family relationships had deteriorated since the previous inspection. There had been no family days in 2015 to date, and the prison was awaiting confirmation from an external contractor about the continuation of relationship education courses. The library continued to coordinate Storybook Dads (see paragraph 3.38) and prisoners had good access to this service, allowing them to record stories for their children.

Recommendations

- 4.43 Visits should start at the advertised time, and all prisoners should have access to the full advertised period.**
- 4.44 Closed visits facilities should be screened from the main visits room and offer privacy.** (Repeated recommendation 4.45)
- 4.45 Prisoners should be able to access support in building and maintaining family ties while at Aylesbury.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.46** The range of accredited offending behaviour programmes was impressive and broadly met the needs of the population with no identified significant gaps. There were 132 available spaces. The prison ran the thinking skills programme (TSP), Resolve (violence management course), a newly introduced pilot of the self-change programme (a high intensity cognitive behavioural programme) and two types of sex offender treatment programme (SOTP). Programmes were managed well and waiting lists were not excessive. The programmes team was very committed and worked hard to engage some challenging prisoners, and their efforts resulted in good retention and completion rates. There was, however, only limited evidence that wing staff or offender supervisors worked with prisoners on completion of programmes to reinforce learning or challenge negative attitudes and behaviour. There were good links with the allocations team to ensure that prisoners went on to appropriate programmes in good time. In our survey, 70% of prisoners, against the comparator of 52%, said that offending behaviour programmes at the prison would help them on their release.

- 4.47** A range of non-accredited programmes was available including the Sycamore Tree (victim empathy) and Project 507 (gang violence). The psychology team was also available for a range of one-one interventions by referral. Some offender supervisors offered one-to-one work with their prisoners.
- 4.48** The Aylesbury Pathway Service was an impressive initiative that had started in September 2014 funded by NHS England. The aim was to reduce risk and improve quality of life for individual prisoners and people around them by changing attitudes, thinking and behaviour. The team was multidisciplinary and there was some appropriately managed crossover with clinical services in the prison. The target group spanned a wide spectrum but had concentrated on prisoners displaying the most challenging behaviour, including repeat perpetrators of violence, involvement with gangs, residents in segregation and those who spent prolonged periods on the basic regime, as well as some prolific self-harmers and those with other complex needs. Links with offender supervisors were good. Although there had been no qualitative evaluation of the success of the initiative so far, there were early signs of progress with some individuals.

Good practice

- 4.49** *The multidisciplinary Aylesbury Pathway Service was making a positive impact through offering interventions to prisoners with a range of complex needs, with the aim of reducing their risk and improving their quality of life through changing attitudes, thinking and behaviour.*

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1** The prison should reduce the number of violent incidents. The violence reduction strategy should be informed by consultation with prisoners, the safer custody team should monitor patterns of violence and take action where appropriate, and there should be an effective approach to dealing with perpetrators and supporting victims of bullying and violence. (S39)
- 5.2** At-risk prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management should be set timely objectives in care plans, and should receive an enhanced risk assessment, approved at a senior level, before being located in the segregation unit. Prisoners on regimes restricted for security reasons and those in segregation should receive daily showers, exercise and telephone calls, and have access to a more productive regime built around individual care plans designed to engage and motivate them. (S40)
- 5.3** Prisoners on the basic regime should be properly reviewed after shorter periods of time, and the prison's incentives and earned privileges scheme should focus more on promoting good behaviour. The basic regime should not withdraw access to provisions that ensure decency and maintain family ties, such as a daily shower, exercise and telephone calls. (S41)
- 5.4** The prison should increase the quantity and quality of work and training opportunities available for prisoners and maximise the use of these to increase the number of prisoners involved in substantive purposeful activity. (S42, repeated recommendation S47).

Recommendations

To NOMS

- 5.5** Community rehabilitation companies (CRCs) responsible for the resettlement needs of prisoners to be released from Aylesbury should ensure they are delivering an appropriate service to such prisoners. (4.9)
- 5.6** Community offender managers should ensure that MAPPA levels are set six months before the prisoner's release to ensure effective pre-release planning and to manage risk. (4.27)
- 5.7** Prisoners should be transferred quickly to appropriate prisons for progression or resettlement to ensure their needs are met. (4.33)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.8** New arrivals on D wing should have access to a full regime. (I.10)

- 5.9** A full induction programme should be delivered to all prisoners, and this should be checked through a tracking system. (1.11)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.10** All staff should receive a refresher course in safer custody training. (1.27, repeated recommendation 1.31)
- 5.11** Prisoners in crisis should be provided with in-cell activities and encouraged to attend work or education. (1.28)

Safeguarding

- 5.12** The prison should work with the local safeguarding adults board to introduce a safeguarding policy to ensure concerns about vulnerable adults are systematically addressed. (1.31)

Security

- 5.13** Procedural security measures should be proportionate and not unnecessarily restrict prisoner access to a full regime. (1.40)
- 5.14** Dynamic security should be strengthened, including improved supervision of prisoners. (1.41)
- 5.15** Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence of trafficking of unauthorised items through visits. (1.42, repeated recommendation 1.45)
- 5.16** The prison should establish a drug supply reduction strategy and action plan to be overseen by the security committee or a drug strategy committee, with the active involvement of the drug and alcohol recovery team. (1.43)

Discipline

- 5.17** Punishments following adjudications should be fair and proportionate. (1.49)
- 5.18** The use of force should be reduced. (1.54)
- 5.19** The segregation unit should always be kept clean. (1.59)
- 5.20** The regime for longer stay prisoners in the segregation unit should include purposeful activities to help prevent psychological deterioration. (1.60)
- 5.21** There should be individual care and reintegration plans to manage prisoners effectively during long periods of segregation and to help prisoners return to normal location. (1.61)

Residential units

- 5.22** Communal areas should be maintained to an acceptable standard, and prisoners expected to keep their cells and communal areas clean. (2.10, repeated recommendation 2.10)
- 5.23** Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two. (2.11, repeated recommendation 2.11)

- 5.24** Communal showers should be maintained in good condition and be well ventilated, and in-cell toilets should be descaled and properly screened. (2.12)
- 5.25** Emergency cell call bells should be answered within five minutes. (2.13, repeated recommendation 2.14)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.26** Prisoners' negative perceptions about staff should be addressed, and staff who appear to be indifferent to prisoners should be required to take a more pro-social approach. (2.22, repeated recommendation 2.22)
- 5.27** Personal officer entries in prisoners' case notes should evidence good knowledge of the prisoners they are responsible for, and there should be regular management checks to assess the quality of staff record keeping and encourage meaningful staff engagement with prisoners. (2.23)

Equality and diversity

- 5.28** An equality action plan should be developed. (2.28)
- 5.29** The equality policy should address all protected characteristics in equal depth. (2.29)
- 5.30** There should be prompt investigation into out-of-range results from equality monitoring and the necessary follow-up action taken. (2.30)
- 5.31** All prisoners should be made aware of discrimination incident reporting forms and there should be consultation to determine why so few are submitted. External quality assurance should be used to improve investigation of and follow-up action arising from discrimination complaints. (2.31)
- 5.32** 2.39 There should be regular support groups/forums for prisoners from each protected characteristic. (2.39, repeated recommendation 2.37)

Complaints

- 5.33** The prison should ensure that complaints are dealt with according to Prison Service orders and within the correct timescale. (2.47)

Legal rights

- 5.34** Legal visits provision should be improved, to ensure confidentiality and provide more opportunities for prisoners to speak to their legal adviser. (2.52, repeated recommendation 2.53)

Health services

- 5.35** There should be clear coordination and leadership across and between the different clinical services to ensure safe and consistent outcomes for prisoners. (2.64)
- 5.36** Health staff from all providers should have clear arrangements for their line management, clinical supervision and training in core skills. (2.65)

- 5.37** All health and prison staff should have up-to-date basic life support skills, including use of an emergency defibrillator. (2.66)
- 5.38** All new arrivals should have a secondary health assessment to ensure adequate identification of health needs, and prisoners on restricted movements, including those in the segregation unit, should have appropriate and prompt access to health services. (2.76)
- 5.39** Clinical review of patients with long-term conditions should be timely. (2.77)
- 5.40** All prisoners should be able to obtain their prescribed medicines, simple pain relief and antibiotics promptly as needed, including overnight and at weekends. (2.85)
- 5.41** The in-possession medicines policy should be ratified and applied to ensure safe use and administration of medicines. (2.86)
- 5.42** Prisoners should receive dental treatment in privacy and with confidentiality, except where a specific risk has been identified. (2.90)
- 5.43** There should be administrative support for the mental health team. (2.97)

Catering

- 5.44** Prisoners should collect their own food for all meals, lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal before 5pm, and breakfast should be adequate and served on the day it is to be consumed. (2.104)
- 5.45** Prisoners should be able to dine in association. (2.105, repeated recommendation 2.99)
- 5.46** Serveries should be kept clean and properly maintained, servery workers should be appropriately dressed, and correct utensils used to serve food. (2.106)
- 5.47** Prisoners who work in the kitchen should be able to achieve relevant qualifications. (2.107)

Purchases

- 5.48** New arrivals should be able to buy items from the prison shop within their first 24 hours. (2.112)
- 5.49** Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee for catalogue orders. (2.113)

Time out of cell

- 5.50** The prison should operate a predictable and equitable regime that allows all prisoners to attend purposeful activity regularly and provides a reasonable amount of time out of cell. (3.5)
- 5.51** Prisoners should receive at least one hour's exercise in the open air every day. (3.6)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.52** The prison should set clear targets and expectations for the quality of activities; managers should monitor these rigorously, analyse data effectively and take appropriate actions to ensure urgent improvements. (3.14, repeated recommendation 3.15)

- 5.53** The prison should implement effective quality assurance arrangements, including monitoring the quality of learning sessions, to gain a better understanding of the quality of provision and to improve prisoners' experience. (3.15, repeated recommendation 3.16)
- 5.54** The college should ensure that there are sufficient learning and skills staff to provide a wide range of high-quality activities. (3.16)
- 5.55** The prison should develop a strategy to improve prisoners' skills in English and mathematics. (3.17)
- 5.56** The prison should provide more activity places that take appropriate account of prisoners' prior education, aptitude and remaining time in custody. (3.23)
- 5.57** The learning, skills and work induction for new arrivals should be more effective and rigorous. (3.24)
- 5.58** The prison should establish vocationally relevant training in all areas, and urgently introduce appropriate training for wing cleaners and all workers involved in handling food. (3.25)
- 5.59** The prison should improve the rigour and quality of target-setting in individual learning plans to identify short-term targets and measure achievement more frequently. (3.26)
- 5.60** The prison should ensure that lessons start on time and that attendance is improved by minimising disruptions and cancellations. (3.31, repeated recommendation 3.36)
- 5.61** The prison should provide working cars in the motor vehicle workshop to enable prisoners to test their skills and confirm their learning. (3.32)
- 5.62** Teachers should make better use of the available information learning technology resources to make learning more engaging and interactive. (3.33)
- 5.63** Prisoners who are withdrawn from activities should have alternative opportunities to return to learning, skills and work. (3.35)
- 5.64** All prisoners should be able to visit the library at least once a week. (3.39)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.65** The prison should introduce appropriate vocational training in the gym. (3.45)
- 5.66** The prison should provide adequate changing facilities, and plan to replace the cardiovascular equipment. (3.46)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.67** The prison should ensure that there are sufficient offender supervisors dedicated to offender management duties. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.68** The backlog of OASys assessments should be reduced. (4.22)
- 5.69** All prisoners should have a sentence plan, be given the opportunity to discuss the objectives, and understand what they need to achieve while they are in custody. (4.23)

- 5.70** The frequency and quality of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners should be more focused on risk reduction, and fully recorded. (4.24)

Reintegration planning

- 5.71** The prison should make better use of the virtual campus to promote and enhance prisoner learning. (4.36)
- 5.72** Visits should start at the advertised time, and all prisoners should have access to the full advertised period. (4.43)
- 5.73** Closed visits facilities should be screened from the main visits room and offer privacy. (4.44, repeated recommendation 4.45)
- 5.74** Prisoners should be able to access support in building and maintaining family ties while at Aylesbury. (4.45)

Housekeeping points

Early days in custody

- 5.75** First night cells should be clean and free from graffiti. (1.12)

Residential units

- 5.76** The offensive displays policy should be adhered to. (2.14)
- 5.77** Applications should be tracked and followed up when not responded to. (2.15)

Equality and diversity

- 5.78** Discussion of foreign nationals should be included in the quarterly equality meeting. (2.32)
- 5.79** All staff should be made aware of the professional interpreting service and how and when to use it. (2.40)
- 5.80** All staff should know where to locate the personal emergency evacuation plans for the prisoners in their care. (2.41)

Complaints

- 5.81** Complaint forms should be readily available to all prisoners. (2.48)

Health services

- 5.82** The prison should work with key stakeholders to ensure they attend core multi-professional clinical meetings. (2.67)
- 5.83** The system for making dental referrals to secondary care should be coordinated with the system for the primary health care provider. (2.68)
- 5.84** The health complaints system should be confidential. (2.69)

- 5.85** The new protocol for referrals to secondary care should be audited to check and improve its effectiveness. (2.78)
- 5.86** Use of the out-of-hours medicines cupboard should always be recorded and audited. (2.87)
- 5.87** The reasons for the dental non-attendance rate should be explored and session time maximised. (2.91)

Purchases

- 5.88** Prisoners should receive clear information about consultation on items available from the prison shop. (2.114)
- 5.89** There should be no undue delays in prisoners receiving their catalogue orders. (2.115)

Examples of good practice

- 5.90** The telephone booths in the exercise areas provided additional opportunities for prisoners to make telephone calls in private. (2.16)
- 5.91** The multidisciplinary Aylesbury Pathway Service was making a positive impact through offering interventions to prisoners with a range of complex needs, with the aim of reducing their risk and improving their quality of life through changing attitudes, thinking and behaviour. (4.49)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Deborah Butler	Team leader
Angela Johnson	Inspector
Angus Mulready-Jones	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Collette Daoud	Researcher
Njilan Morris-Jarra	Researcher
Rachel Murray	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Nicola Rabjohns	Health services inspector
Huw Jenkins	Care Quality Commission
Sue Melvin	Pharmacist
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Denise Olander	Ofsted inspector
Jai Sharda	Ofsted inspector
Iolo Madoc-Jones	Offender management inspector
Nigel Scarff	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2013, the escort, transfer and reception experience of prisoners was positive and first night assessments were good. Efforts had been made to reduce high levels of violence but the number of serious assaults was high. Although levels of self-harm were high, the care and support of prisoners in crisis were good. Vulnerable prisoners were supported. Security arrangements were generally proportionate. The use of batons had decreased considerably but was still too high. Use of minor reports was high and ungoverned. The segregation unit regime was inadequate but staff offered good support and individualised care. Substance misuse was problematic but substance users received good psychosocial support. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The prison should ensure that prisoners receive accurate information about Aylesbury as soon as possible after they are told they will be going there. New arrivals should be placed in clean accommodation in good repair, and given accessible information about the prison. (S45)

Partially achieved

Drawing/use of batons should be properly recorded and all incidents should be formally scrutinised to ensure proportionality. (S46)

Achieved

Recommendations

First night accommodation should be maintained to a clean and acceptable standard. (1.15)

Partially achieved

Prisoners on induction should not be locked in their cells during the core day. (1.16, repeated recommendation 2.14)

Partially achieved

Prisoners transferring to F wing should receive a full induction programme. (1.17)

Not achieved

All incidents of violence should be accurately recorded. (1.23)

Partially achieved

All staff should receive a refresher course in safer custody training. (1.31)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 1.27)

Some cells should be upgraded to meet the specification of a safer or reduced risk cell. (1.32, repeated recommendation 2.38)

Achieved

Prisoners should only be strip-searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.44)

Achieved

Closed visits should be authorised only when there is significant risk justified by security intelligence. (1.45, repeated recommendation 2.154)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 1.42)

Prisoners should only be placed on the escape list when there is sufficient intelligence to warrant it, and measures to monitor these prisoners should be proportionate to the risk posed. (1.46)

Achieved

Actions identified through security information reports, including target searches and suspicion drug testing, should be completed in a timely manner. (1.47)

Not achieved

The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be tailored for the young adult population, and quality assurance measures put in place to ensure consistency of application. (1.51)

Not achieved

Behaviour improvement targets should be individualised and monitoring by staff should support their delivery. (1.52)

Not achieved

Prisoners on the basic level should have access to showers and telephone calls each day. (1.53)

Not achieved

Adjudication records should demonstrate that charges have been fully explored before a finding of guilt. (1.58)

Achieved

Managerial oversight of the minor reports system should be improved. (1.59)

No longer relevant

Planned interventions should be routinely filmed and reviewed. (1.64)

Achieved

Special accommodation and the body belt should only be used as a last resort in exceptional circumstances and for the shortest time, and authorising documentation and ongoing records should reflect this. (1.65)

Achieved

The regime and environment on the segregation unit should be improved. (1.70)

Not achieved

The drug and alcohol recovery team (DART) should ensure that prisoners are aware of the range and target groups for which their services are designed. (1.78)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2013, residential accommodation was poor, with most areas being dirty and shabby. Interactions between staff and prisoners were mixed. Most staff were positive role models but some displayed an unhelpful attitude to prisoners. There were pockets of very good practice, and preferred names were used. Formal arrangements for equality and diversity were underdeveloped but most prisoners felt supported. Responses to most complaints were satisfactory but prisoners had little confidence in the process. Faith and religious provision was good and the chaplaincy was well respected by prisoners. Overall, the health care service was good. Prisoners were positive about the food provided and the prison shop offered a satisfactory service. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Communal areas and association equipment should be maintained to an acceptable standard, and prisoners encouraged to keep their cells clean. (2.10)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.10)

Cells designed to hold one prisoner should not be used to hold two. (2.11, repeated recommendation 2.15)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.11)

All prisoners should be able to shower and use the telephone every day. (2.12)

Not achieved

Communal showers should be fitted with privacy screens, maintained in good condition and be well ventilated, and in-cell toilets should be de-scaled and properly screened. (2.13)

Partially achieved

Emergency cell call bells should be answered within five minutes. (2.14)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.13)

Prisoners should receive clean and suitable bedding weekly. (2.15)

Partially achieved

Prisoners' negative perceptions about staff should be addressed, and staff who appear to be indifferent to prisoners should be required to take a more pro-social approach. (2.22)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated 2.22)

Personal officers should evidence in weekly wing file entries that the information about prisoners obtained during the introductory interview forms the basis of future interactions and engagement. (2.23, repeated recommendation 2.26)

Not achieved

There should be management checks to assess the quality of staff record keeping and encourage a more meaningful staff engagement with prisoners. (2.24, repeated recommendation 2.25)

Not achieved

The strategic management of all aspects of equality should be improved. (2.29)

Partially achieved

All discrimination incident report forms should be subject to senior management or external review. (2.30)

Partially achieved

There should be regular support groups/forums for prisoners from each protected characteristic. (2.37)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.39)

Professional interpreting services should be used as necessary. (2.38)

Partially achieved

The initial identification of prisoners with disabilities and other protected characteristics and subsequent support should be improved. (2.39)

Partially achieved

The prison should explore the limited confidence in the complaints process and take action to address it. (2.47)

Partially achieved

Legal visits provision should be improved, to ensure confidentiality and provide more opportunities for prisoners to speak to their legal adviser. (2.53)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.52)

The environment in holding area of the healthcare department should be improved. (2.63)

Achieved

A dedicated discipline officer should be deployed to assist health care functions and improve overall patient care. (2.64, repeated recommendation 2.60)

Achieved

Day-to-day working between all health services teams should be collaborative, to achieve good care for prisoners. (2.65)

Partially achieved

The number of immunisation clinics and sexual health clinics should be increased to reduce the waiting time for appointments. (2.71)

Achieved

Medicines should be prescribed, dispensed, stored and administered in line with professional standards, and administration of medication on the wings should take place in conditions of confidentiality and security. (2.78)

Partially achieved

The medicines and therapeutics committee should formally review all procedures and policies to ensure that they cover all aspects of the pharmacy service, and all staff should read and sign the agreed procedures. (2.79)

Partially achieved

Patient group directions should be developed to enable nurses to supply more potent medicines. (2.80)

Achieved

The dental suite should be fully compliant with infection control guidance, which includes access to functioning decontamination equipment. (2.86)

Achieved

Record keeping should reflect the multidisciplinary team decision making and care planning should be reviewed at the meetings. (2.92)

Achieved

Mental health awareness training should be provided for all discipline staff, including information about learning disabilities and personality disorders. (2.93)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be able to dine in association. (2.99, repeated recommendation 2.122)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 2.103)

Serveries should be clean and maintained. (2.100)

Not achieved

Halal food should be separated from non-halal food on serveries. (2.101)

Partially achieved

Meals should be provided at appropriate times. Lunch and dinner should not be served before noon and 5pm, respectively, and breakfast should be served on the day of consumption. (2.102)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be routinely consulted about the shop. (2.108)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2013, too many prisoners were locked up during the core day and association was cancelled too frequently. The management of learning and skills was unsatisfactory and strategic planning was weak. There were too few activity places and poor organisation resulted in those available being underutilised. The sequencing of labour allocation was inadequate. The quality of activity provision was generally poor, although there was some good practice. Educational and vocational achievements had improved. The library offered a good service. PE facilities were adequate but underused, we were not assured that access was equitable, and opportunities to gain qualifications were limited. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The prison should increase the quantity and quality of work and training opportunities available for prisoners and maximise the use of these to increase the number of prisoners involved in substantive purposeful activity. (S47)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated S42)

Recommendations

There should be a clear strategy to significantly increase the amount of time out of cell so that first, all prisoners achieve the prison's own target of eight hours a day and then, as the amount of purposeful activity increases and association becomes more reliable, move to achieving an average of 10 hours a day. (3.5, repeated recommendation 2.6)

Not achieved

Unemployed prisoners should be allowed out of their cell each day for a shower and a telephone call. (3.6, repeated recommendation 2.86)

Partially achieved

Exercise should be timed to maximise prisoner uptake. (3.7, repeated recommendation 2.87)

Partially achieved

Staff should interact with prisoners during exercise and association sessions. (3.8, repeated recommendation 2.89)

Partially achieved

The prison should set clear targets and expectations for the quality of education and learning and skills, monitor these through the quality improvement group and take appropriate actions to meet them. (3.15)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated 3.14)

The prison should implement effective quality assurance arrangements, to improve the quality of teaching and learning, particularly in the education department. (3.16)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 3.15)

Teachers and trainers should be provided with effective support and professional development. (3.17)

Partially achieved

There should be a review of the pay system, to provide an incentive for prisoners to gain the skills that will improve their employment prospects and improve their English and mathematics. (3.18)

No longer relevant

Prisoners should be allocated to activities that take appropriate account of their educational needs, are equitable and make best use of their time. (3.22)

Not achieved

The prison should rapidly improve the quality of teaching and learning in all lessons, ensuring that prisoners are sufficiently engaged. (3.28)

Partially achieved

The range and use of resources in the education department should be improved to fully support the courses available. (3.29)

Partially achieved

Success rates of prisoners on all courses should be improved. (3.34)

Not achieved

The prison should ensure that prisoners develop and understand the employability skills and attitude required by employers. (3.35)

Not achieved

The prison should ensure that lessons start on time, and attendance at lessons should be improved by minimising disruptions and cancellations. (3.36)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 3.31)

The prison should ensure that access to the library from the residential wings is promoted well and that all those wishing to visit are given the opportunity to do so. (3.41)

Achieved

The prison should collect and use data to evaluate the impact of the PE facilities, assess whether the needs of all groups of prisoners are being met and ensure fair and equitable use. (3.48)

Achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2013, strategic management arrangements were appropriate but insufficiently integrated. Offender management work met the needs of the population and the work of probation staff was impressive. Public protection arrangements were good. The role of G wing as a resettlement unit was not sufficiently clear. Resettlement pathway support was generally good, with positive outcomes in respect of accommodation, health and substance misuse, but less provision for finance and debt, and education, training and employment. Work with children and families was good but visits arrangements were poor. Offending behaviour work was good. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Visits should start at the advertised time. (S48, repeated recommendation 2.153)

Not achieved (see recommendation 4.44)

Recommendations

There should be greater clarity and lack of duplication in the work of departments responsible for delivering the prison's resettlement function. (4.5)

Achieved

The prison should develop and implement a clear offender management structure, to offer a consistent and equitable service to all prisoners. (4.6)

Partially achieved

Initial assessments of need should be undertaken consistently and without duplication. (4.17)

Achieved

There should be a clear strategy to ensure completion of missing and out-of-date offender assessment system (OASys) documents. (4.18, repeated recommendation 2.8)

Not achieved

All offender supervisors should undergo quality assurance and casework supervision, to ensure a consistent level of service provision. (4.19)

Achieved

The prison should clarify the role of the resettlement unit and ensure that it meets the resettlement needs of the prisoners on it. (4.20)

No longer relevant

The role of personal officers in their work with the offender management unit should be clarified and applied consistently. (4.21)

Not achieved

Pre-release resettlement assessments should be coordinated effectively, to ensure that all pre-release needs are assessed and met and that work is not replicated. Community follow-on referrals and further identified needs should be clearly communicated to offender managers before release. (4.29)

Partially achieved

The National Careers Service (NCS) should develop the use of the virtual campus to help prisoners produce high-quality CVs and prepare them better for release. (4.34)

Not achieved

Specialist debt and finance support and help should be available to all prisoners. (4.40, repeated recommendation 2.144)

Not achieved

There should be sufficient staffing available on the visits booking line to ensure that visitors can get through during advertised times. (4.44)

Achieved

Closed visits facilities should be screened from the main visits room and offer privacy. (4.45, repeated recommendation 2.156)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated 4.44)

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	272	95	97.3
Recall	7	3	2.7
Total	279	98	100.0

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
12 months to less than 2 years	2		0.5
2 years to less than 4 years	30	5	9.2
4 years to less than 10 years	173	65	63.1
10 years and over (not life)	42	11	14.2
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	5	8	0.3
Life	27	9	16.7
Total	279	98	100.0

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years: <i>minimum age=18</i>	279	74.0
21 years to 29 years	98	26.0
Total	377	100.0

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	248	92	90.2
Foreign nationals	31	6	9.8
Total	279	98	100.0

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Category B	1	18	5.0
Category C	3	76	21.0
Other	275	4	74.0
Total	279	98	100.0

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White	116	47	43.5
British	98	42	37.0
Irish	3	1	1.3
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	3		1.0
Other white	12	4	4.2
Mixed	35	9	11.5
White and black Caribbean	23	6	7.6
White and black African	3	2	1.0
Other mixed	9	1	2.9
Asian or Asian British	38	9	12.4
Indian	4	2	1.6
Pakistani	15	2	4.7
Bangladeshi	8	1	2.4
Other Asian	11	3	3.7
Black or black British	85	33	31.5

Caribbean	35	20	14.4
African	40	11	13.4
Other black	9	5	3.7
Other ethnic group	4	0	1.0
Not stated	1	0	0.1
Total	279	98	100.0

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist			
Church of England	25	11	9.8
Roman Catholic	35	17	14.3
Other Christian denominations	54	18	19.3
Muslim	98	28	33.1
Sikh	1		0.1
Hindu	1		0.1
Jewish	1		0.1
Other	2	3	1.3
No religion	62	20	21.8
Total	279	98	100.0

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	12	3.2	0	
1 month to 3 months	45	11.9	2	0.5
3 months to six months	65	18.7	15	3.9
Six months to 1 year	87	22.9	28	7.3
1 year to 2 years	60	15.7	33	8.8
2 years to 4 years	5	1.3	21	5.5
Total	279	74.0	98	26.0

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	210	81	77.2
Total	210	81	77.2

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	108	43	40.1
Sexual offences	48	26	19.4
Burglary	22	5	7.1
Robbery	67	14	21.8
Theft and handling	1		0.1
Drugs offences	16	4	5.2
Other offences	17	6	6.3
Total	279	98	100.0

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment.⁸ 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 1 June 2015 the young adult population at HMYOI Aylesbury was 381. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 190 young adults.

We received a total of 188 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 99%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Two questionnaires were returned blank.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	29
B	29
C	22
D	25

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.

E	28
F	25
G	21
Segregation unit	9

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences⁹ are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMYOI Aylesbury in 2015 compared with responses from young adult training prisons surveyed. This comparator is based on all responses from surveys carried out in five young adult training prisons since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMYOI Aylesbury in 2015 compared with the responses of young adults surveyed at HMYOI Aylesbury in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between those who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of Muslim young adults and non-Muslim young adults.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of young adults who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the vulnerable prisoner wing (F) and the rest of the establishment, excluding the segregation unit.

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

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.2	How old are you?		
	<i>Under 21</i>		131 (70%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>		57 (30%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>70 and over</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?		
	<i>Yes</i>		180 (96%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>		7 (4%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>		1 (1%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	<i>Not sentenced</i>		1 (1%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>		6 (3%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>		33 (18%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>		95 (52%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>		23 (13%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>		9 (5%)
	<i>Life</i>		14 (8%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (I.e. do not have UK citizenship.)		
	<i>Yes</i>		23 (12%)
	<i>No</i>		165 (88%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		187 (100%)
	<i>No</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	<i>Yes</i>		186 (100%)
	<i>No</i>		0 (0%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	63 (34%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	4 (2%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>White - other</i>	7 (4%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 17 (9%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	26 (14%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 6 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	30 (16%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 3 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	12 (6%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 3 (2%)

Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi 6 (3%)

Q1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?

Yes 4 (2%)
No 178 (98%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None	46 (25%)	Hindu	0 (0%)
Church of England	41 (22%)	Jewish	0 (0%)
Catholic	27 (15%)	Muslim	57 (31%)
Protestant	0 (0%)	Sikh	0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination	11 (6%)	Other	3 (2%)
Buddhist	1 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/ Straight 179 (96%)
Homosexual/Gay 0 (0%)
Bisexual 7 (4%)

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 32 (17%)
No 154 (83%)

Q1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?

Yes 4 (2%)
No 179 (98%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes 126 (67%)
No 61 (33%)

Q1.15 Do you have children under the age of 18?

Yes 31 (17%)
No 154 (83%)

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 49 (26%)
2 hours or longer 115 (61%)
Don't remember 24 (13%)

Q2.2 On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?

My journey was less than two hours 49 (26%)
Yes 90 (49%)
No 32 (17%)
Don't remember 14 (8%)

Q2.3 On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?

My journey was less than two hours 49 (26%)
Yes 16 (9%)
No 114 (61%)
Don't remember 8 (4%)

Q2.4 On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?

Yes 82 (44%)

	No	85 (45%)
	Don't remember	21 (11%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	139 (74%)
	No	34 (18%)
	Don't remember	15 (8%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	28 (15%)
	Well	87 (46%)
	Neither	52 (28%)
	Badly	9 (5%)
	Very badly	2 (1%)
	Don't remember	10 (5%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	99 (53%)
	Yes, I received written information	29 (15%)
	No, I was not told anything	59 (31%)
	Don't remember	4 (2%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	161 (86%)
	No	23 (12%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?			
	Less than 2 hours	123 (66%)		
	2 hours or longer	43 (23%)		
	Don't remember	19 (10%)		
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?			
	Yes	141 (77%)		
	No	21 (12%)		
	Don't remember	20 (11%)		
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?			
	Very well	27 (15%)		
	Well	103 (56%)		
	Neither	42 (23%)		
	Badly	8 (4%)		
	Very badly	2 (1%)		
	Don't remember	3 (2%)		
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	41 (23%)	Physical health	9 (5%)
	Housing problems	9 (5%)	Mental health	26 (14%)
	Contacting employers	1 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	18 (10%)
	Contacting family	38 (21%)	Getting phone numbers	30 (17%)
	Childcare	2 (1%)	Other	3 (2%)
	Money worries	17 (9%)	Did not have any problems	76 (42%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal	20 (11%)		

Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes	36 (20%)
	No	68 (38%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	76 (42%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco	143 (77%)
	A shower	52 (28%)
	A free telephone call	84 (45%)
	Something to eat	83 (45%)
	PIN phone credit	98 (53%)
	Toiletries/ basic items	84 (45%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>	8 (4%)
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	135 (73%)
	Someone from health services	117 (64%)
	A Listener/Samaritans	42 (23%)
	Prison shop/ canteen	35 (19%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	17 (9%)
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	74 (41%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal	59 (33%)
	How to make routine requests (applications)	58 (32%)
	Your entitlement to visits	61 (34%)
	Health services	94 (53%)
	Chaplaincy	97 (54%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>	42 (23%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	122 (66%)
	No	45 (24%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	18 (10%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	39 (21%)
	Within the first week	59 (32%)
	More than a week	69 (38%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	17 (9%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	39 (21%)
	Yes	54 (30%)
	No	53 (29%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	36 (20%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	35 (19%)
	Within the first week	29 (16%)
	More than a week	92 (50%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	28 (15%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult N/A
	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	10 (6%)	39 (22%)	43 (24%)	38 (21%)	21 (12%) 27 (15%)
	Attend legal visits?	7 (4%)	50 (29%)	39 (23%)	16 (9%)	12 (7%) 48 (28%)
	Get bail information?	2 (1%)	13 (8%)	28 (17%)	15 (9%)	18 (11%) 90 (54%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	Not had any letters					30 (16%)
	Yes					82 (44%)
	No					73 (39%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	Yes					47 (25%)
	No					20 (11%)
	Don't know					118 (64%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		Yes	No	Don't know		
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	94 (51%)	85 (46%)	5 (3%)		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91 (50%)	92 (50%)	0 (0%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	96 (52%)	82(45%)	5 (3%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	75 (41%)	106 (58%)	2 (1%)		
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	51 (28%)	118 (64%)	15 (8%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	102 (56%)	78 (43%)	2 (1%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	31 (17%)	116 (63%)	37 (20%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	Very good					4 (2%)
	Good					59 (32%)
	Neither					66 (36%)
	Bad					35 (19%)
	Very bad					20 (11%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?					
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know					1 (1%)
	Yes					74 (41%)
	No					106 (59%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?					
	Yes					69 (38%)
	No					21 (11%)
	Don't know					94 (51%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?					
	Yes					102 (55%)
	No					32 (17%)
	Don't know/ N/A					50 (27%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?					
	Yes					134 (73%)
	No					9 (5%)

Don't know/ N/A 41 (22%)

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

I don't want to attend 35 (19%)
 Very easy 35 (19%)
 Easy 52 (28%)
 Neither 19 (10%)
 Difficult 14 (8%)
 Very difficult 12 (7%)
 Don't know 16 (9%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?

Yes 142 (78%)
 No 37 (20%)
 Don't know 3 (2%)

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are applications dealt with fairly?	10 (6%)	85 (48%)	81 (46%)
Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	10 (6%)	31 (17%)	138 (77%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?

Yes 76 (42%)
 No 54 (30%)
 Don't know 51 (28%)

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

	Not made one	Yes	No
Are complaints dealt with fairly?	70 (40%)	26 (15%)	81 (46%)
Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	70 (40%)	19 (11%)	88 (50%)

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

Yes 49 (28%)
 No 123 (72%)

Q5.6 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?

Don't know who they are 43 (24%)
 Very easy 10 (6%)
 Easy 22 (12%)
 Neither 49 (27%)
 Difficult 38 (21%)
 Very difficult 17 (9%)

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)

Don't know what the IEP scheme is 1 (1%)
 Yes 68 (37%)
 No 101 (55%)
 Don't know 12 (7%)

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>	1 (1%)
	Yes	69 (38%)
	No	101 (56%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (6%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	58 (32%)
	No	121 (68%)
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>	110 (63%)
	Very well	4 (2%)
	Well	15 (9%)
	Neither	22 (13%)
	Badly	11 (6%)
	Very badly	13 (7%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	114 (64%)
	No	63 (36%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	107 (61%)
	No	69 (39%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	39 (22%)
	No	141 (78%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	7 (4%)
	Never	33 (18%)
	Rarely	65 (36%)
	Some of the time	51 (28%)
	Most of the time	22 (12%)
	All of the time	3 (2%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	60 (33%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	53 (29%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	42 (23%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	60 (35%)
	Very helpful	24 (14%)
	Helpful	22 (13%)
	Neither	27 (16%)
	Not very helpful	16 (9%)
	Not at all helpful	24 (14%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?		
	Yes		94 (52%)
	No		88 (48%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?		
	Yes		41 (23%)
	No		138 (77%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe	88 (49%)	At meal times 15 (8%)
	Everywhere	26 (15%)	At health services 34 (19%)
	Segregation unit	13 (7%)	Visits area 44 (25%)
	Association areas	27 (15%)	In wing showers 19 (11%)
	Reception area	12 (7%)	In gym showers 7 (4%)
	At the gym	17 (9%)	In corridors/stairwells 24 (13%)
	In an exercise yard	26 (15%)	On your landing/wing 23 (13%)
	At work	18 (10%)	In your cell 9 (5%)
	During movement	51 (28%)	At religious services 15 (8%)
	At education	30 (17%)	
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?		
	Yes		57 (31%)
	No		125 (69%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)		28 (15%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)		34 (19%)
	Sexual abuse		2 (1%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated		33 (18%)
	Having your canteen/property taken		20 (11%)
	Medication		4 (2%)
	Debt		14 (8%)
	Drugs		13 (7%)
	Your race or ethnic origin		9 (5%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs		5 (3%)
	Your nationality		9 (5%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others		11 (6%)
	You are from a traveller community		1 (1%)
	Your sexual orientation		5 (3%)
	Your age		2 (1%)
	You have a disability		5 (3%)
	You were new here		20 (11%)
	Your offence/ crime		19 (10%)
	Gang related issues		16 (9%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?		
	Yes		61 (34%)
	No		118 (66%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)		31 (17%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)		23 (13%)
	Sexual abuse		2 (1%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated		26 (15%)
	Medication		2 (1%)

Debt	6 (3%)
Drugs	5 (3%)
Your race or ethnic origin	16 (9%)
Your religion/religious beliefs	14 (8%)
Your nationality	12 (7%)
You are from a different part of the country than others	6 (3%)
You are from a traveller community	0 (0%)
Your sexual orientation	2 (1%)
Your age	4 (2%)
You have a disability	3 (2%)
You were new here	12 (7%)
Your offence/ crime	12 (7%)
Gang related issues	8 (4%)

Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	94 (57%)
	Yes	25 (15%)
	No	46 (28%)

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	20 (11%)	16 (9%)	52 (29%)	37 (21%)	38 (21%)	17 (9%)
	The nurse	17 (10%)	33 (19%)	81 (46%)	24 (14%)	16 (9%)	6 (3%)
	The dentist	35 (20%)	10 (6%)	26 (15%)	16 (9%)	46 (26%)	44 (25%)

Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	29 (16%)	18 (10%)	56 (32%)	36 (20%)	27 (15%)	11 (6%)
	The nurse	15 (9%)	41 (23%)	75 (43%)	27 (15%)	13 (7%)	5 (3%)
	The dentist	60 (34%)	12 (7%)	40 (23%)	30 (17%)	21 (12%)	12 (7%)

Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?	
	<i>Not been</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Very good</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>Good</i>	69 (39%)
	<i>Neither</i>	48 (27%)
	<i>Bad</i>	25 (14%)
	<i>Very bad</i>	7 (4%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	34 (19%)
	No	146 (81%)

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>	146 (81%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	15 (8%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>No</i>	13 (7%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	46 (26%)
	No	131 (74%)

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>	131 (74%)
	Yes	30 (17%)
	No	16 (9%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	38 (21%)
	No	143 (79%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	21 (12%)
	No	160 (88%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	41 (23%)
	Easy	28 (16%)
	Neither	16 (9%)
	Difficult	1 (1%)
	Very difficult	22 (13%)
	Don't know	68 (39%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	9 (5%)
	Easy	13 (7%)
	Neither	13 (7%)
	Difficult	10 (6%)
	Very difficult	27 (15%)
	Don't know	105 (59%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	17 (9%)
	No	163 (91%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	4 (2%)
	No	176 (98%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	136 (76%)
	Yes	33 (18%)
	No	11 (6%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	160 (89%)
	Yes	16 (9%)
	No	4 (2%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	144 (81%)
	Yes	30 (17%)
	No	4 (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	10 (6%)	3 (2%)	24 (13%)	27 (15%)	69 (39%)	46 (26%)
	Vocational or skills training	39 (22%)	4 (2%)	32 (18%)	37 (21%)	40 (23%)	25 (14%)
	Education (including basic skills)	22 (13%)	8 (5%)	59 (34%)	45 (26%)	25 (14%)	17 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	29 (16%)	10 (6%)	41 (23%)	41 (23%)	35 (20%)	21 (12%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						59 (34%)
	Prison job						70 (40%)
	Vocational or skills training						23 (13%)
	Education (including basic skills)						37 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes						36 (21%)
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	50 (30%)	65 (38%)	43 (25%)	11 (7%)		
	Vocational or skills training	55 (40%)	48 (35%)	25 (18%)	11 (8%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	42 (29%)	65 (45%)	27 (19%)	10 (7%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	47 (31%)	74 (49%)	20 (13%)	11 (7%)		
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						17 (9%)
	<i>Never</i>						46 (26%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>						50 (28%)
	<i>About once a week</i>						60 (33%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>						7 (4%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>						36 (20%)
	<i>Yes</i>						74 (42%)
	<i>No</i>						66 (38%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						25 (14%)
	<i>0</i>						56 (31%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						81 (45%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						16 (9%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						2 (1%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						6 (3%)
	<i>0</i>						8 (4%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						28 (16%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						34 (19%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						103 (58%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						0 (0%)
	<i>0</i>						11 (6%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>						39 (22%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>						60 (34%)
	<i>More than 5</i>						69 (39%)

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>	90 (50%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	35 (20%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	22 (12%)
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	18 (10%)
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	2 (1%)
<i>10 hours or more</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Don't know</i>	7 (4%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends**Q12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?**

Yes	52 (29%)
No	125 (71%)

Q12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?

Yes	87 (49%)
No	92 (51%)

Q12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?

Yes	69 (38%)
No	111 (62%)

Q12.4 How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?

<i>I don't get visits</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Very easy</i>	12 (7%)
<i>Easy</i>	30 (17%)
<i>Neither</i>	27 (15%)
<i>Difficult</i>	38 (21%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	52 (29%)
<i>Don't know</i>	3 (2%)

Section 13: Preparation for release**Q13.1 Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?**

<i>Not sentenced</i>	1 (1%)
Yes	147 (83%)
No	29 (16%)

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>	30 (17%)
<i>No contact</i>	65 (37%)
<i>Letter</i>	33 (19%)
<i>Phone</i>	23 (13%)
<i>Visit</i>	44 (25%)

Q13.3 Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?

Yes	134 (77%)
No	41 (23%)

Q13.4 Do you have a sentence plan?

Not sentenced	1 (1%)
Yes	114 (65%)
No	60 (34%)

Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			61 (35%)
	<i>Very involved</i>			26 (15%)
	<i>Involved</i>			32 (18%)
	<i>Neither</i>			19 (11%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>			17 (10%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>			19 (11%)
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>			61 (35%)
	<i>Nobody</i>			57 (33%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>			36 (21%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>			21 (12%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>			13 (8%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>			25 (15%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			61 (35%)
	<i>Yes</i>			73 (42%)
	<i>No</i>			19 (11%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			22 (13%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			61 (35%)
	<i>Yes</i>			31 (18%)
	<i>No</i>			43 (25%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			39 (22%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			61 (35%)
	<i>Yes</i>			22 (13%)
	<i>No</i>			42 (24%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			49 (28%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	<i>Yes</i>			16 (9%)
	<i>No</i>			58 (34%)
	<i>Don't know</i>			97 (57%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	<i>Yes</i>			23 (13%)
	<i>No</i>			151 (87%)
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	32 (19%)	38 (22%)	101 (59%)
	Accommodation	38 (22%)	33 (19%)	99 (58%)
	Benefits	38 (22%)	21 (12%)	110 (65%)
	Finances	40 (24%)	21 (13%)	107 (64%)
	Education	40 (24%)	37 (22%)	92 (54%)
	Drugs and alcohol	56 (35%)	37 (23%)	69 (43%)

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

1 (1%)

Yes

103 (60%)

No

69 (40%)

Appendix V: Photographs

Exercise Yard





Main comparator and comparator to last time

Prisoner survey responses HMYOI Aylesbury 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

Key to tables		HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		188	814	188	161
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	70%	65%	70%	72%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	4%	6%	4%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	12%	0%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	5%	6%	5%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	12%	9%	12%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	60%	36%	60%	52%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	5%	2%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	31%	17%	31%	29%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	4%	2%	4%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	17%	11%	17%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	2%	2%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	67%	56%	67%	58%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	17%	24%	17%	19%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	61%	48%	61%	54%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	66%	66%	66%	64%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	10%	11%	14%
2.4	Was the van clean?	44%	46%	44%	51%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	74%	83%	74%	88%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	61%	64%	61%	63%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	53%	63%	53%	55%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	15%	7%	15%	20%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	86%	87%	86%	89%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	67%	70%	67%	77%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	83%	78%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	67%	70%	71%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	58%	51%	58%	65%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	23%	17%	23%	21%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	5%	8%	5%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	2%	1%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	21%	18%	21%	24%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	2%	1%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	10%	14%	10%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	11%	9%	11%	12%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	5%	4%	5%	4%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	15%	9%	15%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	10%	5%	10%	13%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	17%	16%	17%	25%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	35%	31%	35%	34%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	77%	74%	77%	76%
3.6	A shower?	28%	34%	28%	45%
3.6	A free telephone call?	46%	65%	46%	33%
3.6	Something to eat?	45%	45%	45%	49%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	53%	46%	53%	53%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	46%	42%	46%	55%
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?	74%	61%	74%	79%
3.7	Someone from health services?	64%	68%	64%	67%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	23%	24%	23%	39%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	19%	26%	19%	33%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	41%	47%	41%	50%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	33%	37%	33%	46%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	32%	38%	32%	52%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	34%	41%	34%	47%
3.8	Health services?	53%	53%	53%	61%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	54%	52%	54%	66%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	66%	81%	66%	71%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	79%	82%	79%	93%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	38%	51%	38%	43%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	81%	76%	81%	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?	27%	36%	27%	33%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	33%	44%	33%	37%
4.1	Get bail information?	9%	15%	9%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	44%	37%	44%	43%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	25%	30%	25%	39%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	51%	54%	51%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	50%	90%	50%	41%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	52%	70%	52%	47%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	41%	46%	41%	39%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	34%	28%	34%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	56%	62%	56%	52%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	17%	35%	17%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	34%	16%	34%	36%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	41%	41%	47%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	38%	38%	38%	44%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	56%	48%	56%	65%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	73%	63%	73%	72%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	48%	51%	48%	62%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	78%	78%	78%	84%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	51%	59%	51%	70%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	18%	38%	18%	41%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	42%	57%	42%	53%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	24%	35%	24%	25%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	18%	36%	18%	26%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	28%	21%	28%	22%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	27%	18%	28%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	37%	43%	37%	49%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	51%	38%	48%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	32%	18%	32%	15%
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?	30%	33%	30%	43%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64%	68%	64%	69%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	61%	70%	61%	63%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	22%	30%	22%	28%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	23%	14%	18%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	67%	71%	67%	75%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	41%	58%	41%	53%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	52%	32%	52%	46%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	23%	14%	23%	18%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	31%	24%	31%	28%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	14%	15%	17%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	19%	12%	19%	14%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	15%	18%	17%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	11%	8%	11%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	2%	2%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	8%	7%	8%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	4%	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	5%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	4%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	3%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	6%	6%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	8%	11%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	11%	8%	11%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9%	5%	9%	10%
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	34%	32%	34%	35%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	15%	17%	15%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	8%	13%	7%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	13%	15%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	6%	9%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	5%	8%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	4%	7%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	5%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%	2%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	6%	7%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	4%	7%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	2%	4%	5%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	35%	36%	35%	32%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	38%	47%	38%	40%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	64%	61%	64%	62%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	20%	19%	20%	18%
	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?	50%	62%	50%	42%
9.2	The nurse?	72%	64%	72%	63%
9.2	The dentist?	45%	45%	45%	44%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	52%	54%	52%	49%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	19%	25%	19%	23%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	62%	74%	62%	49%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	26%	22%	26%	23%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	66%	50%	66%	72%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	21%	27%	21%	23%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	16%	12%	14%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	39%	25%	39%	28%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	13%	11%	13%	10%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	10%	6%	10%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	4%	2%	3%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	75%	66%	75%	65%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	80%	68%	80%	91%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	88%	77%	88%	79%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	15%	36%	15%	23%
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	20%	41%	20%	28%
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	38%	62%	38%	41%
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	29%	29%	29%	26%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	40%	42%	40%	41%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	13%	17%	13%	17%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	21%	26%	21%	26%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	21%	9%	21%	17%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	70%	75%	70%	71%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	55%	48%	55%	50%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	60%	72%	60%	70%
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?	57%	59%	57%	61%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	71%	83%	71%	75%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	64%	59%	64%	57%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	69%	67%	69%	71%
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?	70%	52%	70%	55%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	37%	37%	37%	42%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	42%	37%	42%	46%
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	10%	26%	10%	9%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	77%	47%	77%	46%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	39%	72%	39%	14%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	3%	9%	3%	6%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	29%	39%	29%	32%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	49%	48%	49%	58%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	38%	30%	38%	43%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	23%	33%	23%	27%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	Young adult training prisons comparator	HMYOI Aylesbury 2015	HMYOI Aylesbury 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 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?	84%	82%	84%	88%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	45%	39%	45%	42%
13.2	Contact by letter?	23%	30%	23%	21%
13.2	Contact by phone?	16%	17%	16%	18%
13.2	Contact by visit?	30%	34%	30%	29%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	77%	78%	77%	84%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	65%	65%	65%	71%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	51%	51%	51%	51%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	51%	50%	51%	43%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	32%	36%	32%	43%
13.6	Offender manager?	19%	25%	19%	20%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	12%	15%	12%	9%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	23%	14%	23%	20%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	64%	66%	64%	73%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	28%	19%	28%	26%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	20%	26%	20%	29%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	9%	5%	9%	5%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	13%	20%	13%	19%
	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?	27%	44%	27%	30%
13.12	Accommodation?	25%	39%	25%	28%
13.12	Benefits?	16%	34%	16%	27%
13.12	Finances?	17%	25%	17%	23%
13.12	Education?	29%	41%	29%	32%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	35%	44%	35%	36%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in the future?	60%	55%	60%	51%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMYOI Aylesbury 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				111	74	23	165	57	129
1.3	Are you sentenced?	99%	100%	96%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	13%	8%					12%	12%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			71%	59%	93%	46%		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	1%	3%	9%	1%	0%	3%		
1.1	Are you Muslim?	48%	5%	30%	31%				
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	10%	29%	13%	18%	11%	20%		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	3%	5%	2%	2%	2%		
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	63%	73%	83%	65%	61%	71%		
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59%	66%	70%	60%	46%	68%		
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	45%	48%	53%	51%	53%		
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	85%	78%	78%	65%	83%		
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60%	87%	70%	70%	56%	76%		
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	48%	72%	57%	58%	48%	62%		
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	67%	59%	64%	64%	66%	62%		
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	64%	87%	63%	61%	68%		
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	72%	75%	80%	90%	74%		
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	28%	27%	41%	26%	33%	25%		

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?	43%	64%	55%	51%	49%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	45%	57%	65%	47%	50%	50%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	26%	32%	21%	29%	27%	28%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	35%	35%	44%	33%	28%	37%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	35%	51%	44%	41%	35%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	30%	47%	35%	38%	34%	40%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	61%	47%	75%	53%	64%	51%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	75%	69%	79%	72%	86%	67%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	77%	82%	79%	78%	69%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	41%	57%	40%	40%	44%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	26%	53%	30%	38%	27%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	30%	49%	48%	37%	27%	43%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	40%	22%	32%	33%	37%	31%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	56%	80%	65%	64%	57%	68%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	53%	72%	59%	61%	50%	66%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	6%	26%	9%	15%	11%	15%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	64%	72%	65%	67%	62%	70%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	46%	58%	35%	54%	48%	54%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24%	19%	26%	22%	29%	20%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	25%	39%	21%	33%	28%	33%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	16%	22%	4%	20%	17%	19%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	6%	4%	0%	6%	6%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	4%	1%	0%	3%	7%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	4%	5%	7%	4%

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						
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	1%	6%	0%	3%	0%	4%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	28%	29%	35%	44%	30%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	15%	9%	15%	22%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	13%	3%	5%	9%	13%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	11%	3%	5%	8%	19%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	10%	1%	9%	6%	17%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	1%	3%	0%	2%	0%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	32%	45%	41%	37%	37%	38%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	60%	70%	71%	63%	65%	64%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	14%	27%	13%	20%	13%	22%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	15%	40%	18%	27%	11%	33%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	25%	59%	27%	41%	34%	42%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	29%	54%	35%	41%	31%	44%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	11%	17%	9%	14%	13%	13%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	21%	26%	20%	21%	21%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	17%	26%	26%	20%	19%	21%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	42%	39%	37%	28%	41%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	9%	11%	9%	10%	8%	11%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	82%	69%	92%	74%	83%	74%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	36%	42%	36%	39%	39%	38%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	2%	4%	0%	3%	2%	3%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	52%	43%	21%	53%	58%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	35%	42%	30%	40%	37%	40%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMYOI Aylesbury 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

	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		32	154
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	34%	65%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	19%	33%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	69%	67%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	63%	60%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	43%	55%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72%	70%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	85%	52%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	63%	63%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63%	66%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	78%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	25%

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 offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	46%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	46%	50%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	25%	28%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	35%	34%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	56%	38%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	34%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	56%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	78%	72%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	77%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	43%	41%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	40%	37%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	38%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	38%	31%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	72%	63%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	82%	56%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	9%	15%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	79%	64%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	63%	49%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	34%	20%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	50%	27%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	34%	15%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	9%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	3%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	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)	15%	0%
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	43%	32%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	25%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	6%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	9%	0%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	40%	38%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	81%	61%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	48%	13%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	75%	15%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	52%	37%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	43%	39%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	9%	14%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	15%	22%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	22%	20%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	22%	40%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	0%	12%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	62%	80%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	34%	40%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	10%	1%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	66%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	66%	33%



Prisoner survey responses (key questions) HMYOI Aylesbury 2015: F wing (vulnerable prisoners)

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

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (F wing)	All other wings (A,B,C,D,E,G)
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	25	154
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	64%	72%
1.3 Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3 Are you on recall?	0%	4%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	0%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	5%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	0%	14%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	16%	66%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	2%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	12%	34%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	24%	1%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	44%	13%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	1%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	84%	67%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	12%	17%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	69%	59%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	69%	75%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	69%	60%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	52%	53%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	92%	86%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction		
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	80%	64%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	78%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (F wing)	All other wings (A,B,C,D,E,G)
	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?	80%	70%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	80%	53%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	8%	25%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	4%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	40%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	12%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	44%	5%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%	5%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	36%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	40%	3%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%	16%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	73%	78%
3.6	A shower?	24%	29%
3.6	A free telephone call?	28%	48%
3.6	Something to eat?	56%	44%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	44%	54%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	52%	44%
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?	77%	74%
3.7	Someone from health services?	60%	63%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	28%	22%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	16%	19%
	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%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	44%	32%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	36%	33%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	36%	35%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (F wing)	All other wings (A,B,C,D,E,G)
	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?	52%	53%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	64%	54%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	31%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	63%	82%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	69%	84%
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?	16%	31%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	28%	35%
4.1	Get bail information?	8%	9%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	44%	44%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	28%	26%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	60%	51%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	64%	50%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	73%	51%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	60%	37%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	56%	25%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	44%	60%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	36%	15%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	31%	36%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	64%	38%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	35%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	31%	60%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	69%	74%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	24%	52%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	76%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	44%	42%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	48%	24%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	24%	17%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (F wing)	All other wings (A, B, C, D, E, G)
	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?	77%	33%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	64%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	33%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	63%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	88%	58%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	44%	17%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	20%	14%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	80%	65%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	92%	44%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	31%	20%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	69%	24%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	40%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	44%	14%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	8%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	56%	11%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	24%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	8%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	20%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	16%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	20%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	20%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	12%	1%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (F wing)	All other wings (A,B,C,D,E,G)
	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 were new here?	20%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	48%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	8%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	33%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	15%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	12%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	24%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	8%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	16%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	4%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	28%	38%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	73%	62%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	16%	21%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	36%	17%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	44%	23%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (F wing)	All other wings (A,B,C,D,E,G)
	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?	31%	19%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	24%	9%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	64%	34%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	24%	11%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	16%	9%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	2%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	28%	14%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	28%	20%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	50%	36%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	44%	27%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	73%	37%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	12%	14%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	12%	24%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	4%	23%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	48%	36%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	40%	44%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	12%	10%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	64%	77%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	56%	38%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	4%	3%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	52%	27%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	56%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	73%	33%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	20%	25%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	84%	75%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	16%	9%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	31%	11%