

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Stanford Hill

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

29 June–9 July 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	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	47
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	55
Section 6. Appendices	61
Appendix I: Inspection team	61
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	63
Appendix III: Care Quality Commission Requirement Notice	71
Appendix IV: Prison population profile	73
Appendix V: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	77

Glossary of terms

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

Introduction

HMP Standford Hill is an open prison on the Isle of Sheppey in Kent, which was previously jointly managed as part of a 'cluster' of Isle of Sheppey prisons. While some services continue to be shared, the prison is now independent and has its own governor. At the time of this unannounced inspection the prison held 456 adult men, nearly all of whom were coming to the end of a long prison sentence, or nearing the expiry of a life sentence tariff. The number of prisoners with indeterminate sentences for public protection had increased significantly since the last inspection, and nearly all of these men were now well beyond their tariff expiry date.

At the previous inspection in December 2011 we were told by a member of staff that Standford Hill was 'not a resettlement prison but an open prison with a resettlement department'. We agreed, and despite some good work to resettle prisoners, resettlement work was fragmented and inconsistent. At this inspection we found a much improved prison where preparing men for release and resettling them back into the community was at the core of nearly everything that happened at the establishment.

Fundamental to a successful resettlement prison is that prisoners feel safe and secure. This was the case at Standford Hill, where we found that early days support on arrival at the prison was good, levels of violence were low and arrangements to manage poor behaviour, when it happened, were strong. Most problems were resolved informally without recourse to disciplinary measures, and prisoners clearly felt that they had a personal investment in following the prison's rules and something important to lose if they transgressed. Security arrangements were appropriate to an open prison and robust, while supporting resettlement work. The small number of prisoners who were vulnerable to self-harm were well supported, and substance misuse services were good. The challenges with illicit drugs and use of alcohol were well managed, which was a significant achievement given the large number of men working out of the prison each day.

The living environment was clean and decent, although some residential units were overly institutional in appearance and not particularly conducive to an 'open' prison environment. More work needed to be done to understand the concerns of some black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners, and to look at why their outcomes in some areas were consistently poorer than those of white prisoners. There also needed to be a more proactive approach in encouraging a culture where gay and bisexual men felt safe to come out. Complaints were well managed and health services were reasonably good, although the condition of the health care building was poor and needed urgent repair. The quality of relationships between staff and prisoners had improved overall, and some staff were excellent. The personal officer scheme had been re-launched and was starting to have a positive impact, but some wing-based staff remained too passive and distant in their interactions with prisoners, which wasted a valuable opportunity to provide further support for the resettlement aims of individuals and the prison as a whole. Managers had recognised this and had instituted a process to develop an accredited 'enabling environment' which aimed to further improve the quality of relationships.

Learning and skills provision was very good. All prisoners were occupied in some good education and work places within the prison, and over half of prisoners benefited from an excellent range of educational and work placements in the community. It was notable that around 10% of those prisoners temporarily released from the prison were in paid employment. There were a small number of areas within purposeful activity that needed attention – punctuality needed to improve and some opportunities to accredit work were not being utilised – but overall the picture was very positive.

Resettlement services had improved and we now felt that the focus of the prison was firmly on the successful resettlement of prisoners back into the community on release. The number of releases on temporary licence (ROTL) was very high, and the processes to risk assess these was suitably robust and reflected recent improvements to ROTL assessment rules. It was remarkable that over 23,000 ROTL events involving 3,728 prisoners had taken place in the six months prior to the inspection. Failures to return, absconds and returns to closed conditions had all decreased over the same period, which was testament to the careful risk assessment work being undertaken. Offender management work was mostly good and some reasonable support was being offered to prisoners with indeterminate sentences. While public protection arrangements generally provided reassurance, some internal processes and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) needed better coordination. Support in the resettlement pathways was good and ROTL supported some strong work to help prisoners maintain essential contact with family and friends. The new community rehabilitation company¹ (CRC) arrangements, which supported some aspects of through-the-gate work, were still bedding in and it was too early to say if they would further enhance what was already offered.

Standford Hill had made significant progress since our last inspection against all of our healthy prison tests, most notably in putting resettlement work at the heart of the prison. The prison was very well led, and we had confidence that it would continue to progress.

Nick Hardwick
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2015

¹ From May 2015 rehabilitation services, both in custody and after release, have been organised through community rehabilitation companies (CRCs) who are responsible for work with medium- and low-risk offenders. The National Probation Service (NPS) has maintained responsibility for high- and very high-risk offenders.

Fact page

Task of the establishment

A category D men's resettlement prison.

Prison status

Public

Region

Kent

Number held

455 (on 29 June 2015)

Certified normal accommodation

464

Operational capacity

464

Date of last full inspection

5–9 December 2011

Brief history

Standford Hill, a category D resettlement prison, was previously managed as part of the Sheppey cluster of prisons. During the last inspection some services, including those focused on reducing reoffending, were still managed centrally and shared with Elmley and Swaleside prisons. The governor of Standford Hill is now responsible for nearly all of its functions and the three prisons in the Sheppey group are managed separately.

Short description of residential units

There were three wings: A wing, the induction unit, held 192; B wing held 192; and C wing held 80 predominantly paid workers.

Name of governor/director

Sara Pennington

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service providers

IC 24 Primary Care Services (physical health)

Minster Medical Group (GP service)

Oxleas NHS Foundation Trust (mental health)

Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (substance misuse)

Learning and skills providers

The Manchester College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Mike Day

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 IV respectively.
- A11 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix V of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.²

² The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

S1 *Most prisoners' journeys to the prison were short. Support on arrival and during their early days at the prison was good. Most men felt safe and there were very few incidents. Arrangements to manage poor behaviour were generally good. Those at risk of self-harm received good support. Staff's awareness of adult safeguarding needed to improve. Security arrangements were appropriate and supported resettlement. Challenges around the use of illicit drugs were well managed. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was administered fairly. There was little need for formal disciplinary processes, which were generally well managed. Use of force was rare and prisoners who needed to be segregated were removed to a closed prison. Substance misuse services were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Standford Hill were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

S3 Some prisoners' journeys could last over 2.5 hours but for most they were short. Men complained that not all of their property arrived with them from the sending prison. The reception process was efficient and friendly and first night arrangements had improved; confidential interviews and assessments of men's vulnerabilities and risks took place. All new prisoners were housed together and peer supporters and Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) provided good support. A business-like induction programme was accompanied by appropriate prisoner orderly input and support.

S4 Levels of violence and antisocial behaviour were very low and both prisoners and staff were aware of the zero-tolerance policy, which had led to the effective management of poor behaviour. The survey indicated that most prisoners felt safe, although prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim men were less positive about victimisation and some aspects of safety. The social inclusion team was appropriately focused on minimising potential safety risks. Investigations into the very few incidents that occurred were thorough and victims received appropriate support.

S5 Recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman relating to deaths from natural causes at the prison had been implemented and an action plan was reviewed regularly. Some excellent work took place to ensure lessons from self-inflicted deaths in custody elsewhere were learned. The prison regime was underpinned by a purposeful, structured core day and mutual support among prisoners, which meant levels of self-harm were low and the use of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm was rare. The few ACCT documents available for review were generally reasonable; case management was consistent and there was evidence of high levels of support. Some night entries were repetitive and predictable. The prison had a comprehensive adult safeguarding policy, but few staff understood what safeguarding entailed.

- S6 Efforts were made to reduce security risks on the large open site, while at the same time enabling relevant resettlement activities to take place. Relationships between staff and prisoners had improved, which supported dynamic security, although managers needed to focus on the reasons for the substantial reduction in the number of intelligence reports submitted to ensure all issues were being captured. The mandatory drug testing positive rate was low. The use of new psychoactive substances (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life threatening effects) had been a major issue, but recent indications were that their availability had declined. These challenges were being managed well. There was evidence of some steroid use which needed greater management attention.
- S7 Most prisoners were on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme; none were on the basic regime. All prisoners received a review once a year. Most prisoners heeded informal warnings and negative entries in wing files. Downgrades were rare.
- S8 There were few adjudications and the process was well managed. An average of nine to 10 prisoners were returned to closed conditions each month, a reduction on the previous year. Most cases reviewed were for appropriate reasons but a few prisoners had been sent back because they did not have an offender assessment system (OASys) document, which was inappropriate. Force was rarely used and prisoners who needed to be segregated were removed to a closed prison.
- S9 Substance misuse services had improved and the prison was updating the drug and alcohol strategy, although it still did not have an action plan. The Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) had developed a good range of interventions to support recovery. Demand for clinical treatment was very low and appropriate arrangements were in place for when it was needed.

Respect

S10 *The environment and living conditions were generally good. The applications process needed improvement. Staff-prisoner relationships had improved and were now good overall, although some wing-based staff were still somewhat distant. Equality and diversity work was underdeveloped and prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim men were more negative than others about a range of outcomes. General complaints were very well managed. Legal provision was very limited. Health services were reasonably good. Prisoners were negative about the food and self-catering opportunities were too limited. There were reasonable interim arrangements to provide canteen items on arrival. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S11 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Standford Hill were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 33 recommendations in the area of respect.³ At this follow-up inspection we found that 16 of the recommendations had been achieved, seven had been partially achieved, eight had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

³ This included recommendations about the incentives and earned privileges scheme which, in our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012), now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

- S12 Living conditions had improved and the environment was clean and in good order. Communal and external areas were tidy and well maintained. In-room furniture had improved and all prisoners could lock their doors. A and B wings remained shabby and somewhat institutional. Access to cleaning materials and clean clothing and bedding was good. Prisoners had limited faith in the applications process and there was no tracking system.
- S13 Staff-prisoner relationships had improved and were now generally respectful. Most prisoners said they had someone to turn to if they had a problem, although they talked about a small number of staff who were less helpful. Some wing-based officers continued merely to respond to requests from prisoners, rather than initiate contact. Some positive work was being done to further improve relationships by encouraging staff to take a more proactive approach. Prisoner consultation meetings lacked focus, but the prison was attempting to make them more meaningful.
- S14 Most prisoners were aware of the work of the social inclusion team, which supported equality and diversity. Diversity monitoring had highlighted poorer outcomes for men from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim prisoners in some important areas, but they had not been effectively investigated or addressed. Few discrimination incident reporting forms were submitted. Completed investigations on which decisions were based excluded evidence from interviews with complainants or significant others.
- S15 Men from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim prisoners were more negative than white or non-Muslim prisoners respectively about a range of key outcomes, including victimisation and some aspects of safety and respect. While in our groups and during the week they mainly raised similar issues to other prisoners, they also spoke about less favourable access to some activities, notably release on temporary licence (ROTL).
- S16 Foreign nationals generally received good support, although the use of translation services needed to be better. Prisoner diversity orderlies supported Gypsies, Roma and Traveller prisoners and veterans. Older prisoners and those with disabilities were positive about their care, and staff knew the circumstances of those subject to personal emergency and evacuation plans. Some prisoners told us it was not safe to disclose their sexuality, and there was little proactive promotion or support for gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners. Prisoners and staff were familiar with the chaplaincy and men were positive about faith provision.
- S17 The complaint system was efficient and responses were focused and polite and tailored to the individual. Legal provision was extremely limited.
- S18 Prisoners had mixed views about the quality of health care although we thought it was reasonably good. Partnership working was effective but some aspects of clinical governance required attention, including clinical and managerial supervision and health care complaints, which were not always dealt with confidentially. Longstanding problems with the leaking health centre roof had affected the fabric of the building and emergency remedial action was required to ensure the environment was safe.
- S19 An appropriate range of primary care services was provided and most waiting times were acceptable, although prisoners waited too long to see the dentist. Medicines management was good. The dental decontamination room was unacceptable and neither of the dental rooms met infection control standards. Mental health services provided a good range of primary and secondary care options.

- S20 In our survey and during groups prisoners were mostly negative about the food, although there had been some improvement since the last inspection. The meals served during the inspection were adequate and portion sizes reasonable. The menus were varied and special diets were well managed. Self-catering facilities were too limited.
- S21 Immediate access to the shop was still an issue but good interim arrangements were in place. The prison was making positive efforts to consult prisoners regarding the items available.

Purposeful activity

S22 *The regime provided prisoners with very good time out of their rooms and access to outside areas. Learning and skills provision was good, building on some excellent partnerships. Sufficient work and education were available in the prison. Peer mentors were used very well. Allocations were fair but punctuality needed to improve. The amount of vocational training opportunities had increased but some were not accredited. Many prisoners benefited from the excellent range of external work opportunities which had led to good opportunities on release. Library services were limited but the gym provided reasonably good opportunities. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S23 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Standford Hill were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 16 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that nine of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, two had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S24 There were no lock-up periods and night-time movement restrictions were reasonable. Prisoners' access to outside areas was very good.
- S25 Partnerships to develop the learning and skills provision were well managed and the prison had a more effective focus on resettlement. The programme of outside work and training places for prisoners released on temporary licence was very good and led to some excellent opportunities on release. Quality assurance of the Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision was good, but processes exclusively funded and run by the prison were not well developed. Activities needed to be better sequenced.
- S26 There were sufficient places to occupy all prisoners and the range of courses available had improved substantially since the last inspection and some at level 3 were available. The development of courses in the Old Mill Training Centre had enabled more prisoners to participate in relevant training. Some training was carried out to a commercial standard and very good use was made of well-trained peer support workers. Allocation to activities was generally good.
- S27 Teaching and learning were generally good and staff were knowledgeable and skilled. Good use was made of initial assessments to develop targets tailored to the individual learner. Targets were well linked to individual learning plans in most subjects, but less so in functional skills. Relationships between staff and learners were good as was behaviour but punctuality required improvement. Feedback learners received was generally good. Some classes were less effective; for example, teachers did not focus sufficiently on developing underpinning skills or techniques in English and maths. Teaching outside of OLASS provision was very good.

- S28 There were good outcomes in most areas, but those in functional skills and some vocational courses needed to be better. Learners on the Mainstream Logistics and Canterbury College courses achieved very good results.
- S29 Access to the library was good but the facility was too small and there was insufficient space to sit and read. Links to the education department needed to improve. Library use had dropped by a quarter and reading was poorly promoted.
- S30 Physical education facilities and access to them were good. There was a good range of planned activities, including provision for those with health issues and older prisoners. Limited vocational qualifications were offered.

Resettlement

S31 *The focus of the prison was now firmly on the resettlement of prisoners. Excellent use was made of ROTL and processes were robust. Offender management arrangements provided for good risk management in preparation for release, but the quality of some work needed to improve. There were delays in the home detention curfew (HDC) process. Reintegration work led to good outcomes, but new community rehabilitation company⁴ (CRC) contract arrangements were still bedding in. Support across the resettlement pathways was accessible and good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S32 *At the last inspection in 2011 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Standford Hill were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 13 of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, seven had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S33 There was a clear focus on resettlement across the prison. The reducing reoffending strategy was supported by detailed action plans, a well-attended committee and regular data analysis. A recent needs analysis had been undertaken but it did not explore the needs of some distinct groups.
- S34 The number of prisoners released on ROTL was high and had almost doubled since our last inspection. The number of prisoners failing to return or absconding had decreased substantially over the previous two years.
- S35 Most OASys documents were up to date and in our survey more prisoners than the comparator said they had a sentence plan and felt involved in its development. Almost all prisoners knew they had an offender supervisor, contact levels were good and appropriately focused on progression. A backlog in transfer checks directly hindered progression for some prisoners. ROTL procedures were robust and the prison paid good attention to risk management. The timeliness of HDC releases had deteriorated over the last year.

⁴ 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.

- S36 Public protection processes were generally good, but they were not supported by an effective meeting. The prison did not sufficiently identify prisoners' multi-agency public protection (MAPP) levels either prior to unaccompanied ROTL or in preparation for final release. This was offset by good information exchange with offender managers which provided reassurance that any risks to the public were known about and that there would be a plan to manage them.
- S37 Categorisation arrangements were appropriate. Some additional support for indeterminate sentence prisoners was available through a forum chaired by the governor and a peer-led drop-in centre. Prisoners sentenced to indeterminate sentences for public protection from local areas had access to a mentoring project, which included support during ROTL and after release. This group would have benefited from specific family days and more opportunities to develop independent living skills.
- S38 In our survey more prisoners than in other open prisons and compared with our last inspection said they had received help to prepare for release. Outcomes in most resettlement pathway areas were good. CRC 'through-the-gate' provision had recently been introduced and was developing but it was too early to judge its effectiveness, although the short timescales for some reintegration work was a concern. If the prison could secure funding for the onsite Rolls Avenue self-contained independent accommodation, it would provide an excellent stepping stone to release for some longer-term prisoners.
- S39 Nearly all prisoners were released into settled accommodation. The advice and guidance service was good. The wide range of excellent opportunities to work outside the prison provided men with real opportunities to develop their employability skills and gain work on release. Nearly three quarters of all prisoners left the prison with either a job or a training place.
- S40 Pre-release planning for prisoners with physical and mental health problems was prompt and effective. Appropriate liaison with community services ensured continuity of care. RAPT's transitional support service for prisoners with substance use issues provided good through-the-gate support. A serving prisoner worked as an apprentice in the team, which was good practice. Good financial support was available, including the opportunity to open a bank account.
- S41 Visitors could book visits easily and said they were treated well. The visits room was bright and comfortable and had a relaxed atmosphere. It was good to see prisoners able to use the refreshment facility and an attractive outdoor area with their visitors and children. There was a strong focus on family ties and ROTL was used well for this purpose.
- S42 A small number of prisoners had undertaken offending behaviour programmes in the closed estate or on release. The establishment was working towards the Royal College of Psychiatrists enabling environment award, which aimed to better equip staff to help resettle the men held at the prison. Work the prison was developing with prisoners with personality disorders was promising and helped men make the transition from specialist units to the open estate and into the community.

Main concern and recommendation

S43 Concern: Prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds were consistently under-represented among those receiving ROTL, working as prison orderlies and living on C wing. Muslim prisoners were more likely to be subject to adjudication than others. The prison was aware of these discrepancies but had not sufficiently investigated the matter to ensure processes were equitable and fair. It was therefore not surprising that in our survey both of these groups were more negative about many key outcomes than other groups at the prison.

Recommendation: Identified discrepancies in outcomes for prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim men should be investigated and addressed effectively, as should these groups' more negative perceptions identified in our survey.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1** *Prisoners generally felt escort staff treated them well but their property did not always arrive with them.*
- 1.2** Most journeys to the prison were short although a minority took over 2.5 hours and, while prisoners told us escort staff treated them well, they said vehicles could get too hot.
- 1.3** Around 8% of escort vans arrived after 4pm and admission to the prison could still not be guaranteed after that time. While the situation had improved since the previous inspection, some prisoners had still been diverted to a closed prison for the night. Prisoners did not routinely wait long periods to leave the escort vehicles, although administrative issues could prolong the waiting time.
- 1.4** Information about Standford Hill had been circulated to sending prisons but none of the prisoners we met said they had been told about what to expect on arrival, or received sufficient notification about their transfer. Prisoners complained about property failing to arrive with them from their sending establishment.

Recommendations

- 1.5** **Escort vans should arrive at the prison in time for prisoners to be allowed entry.**
(Repeated recommendation 1.6)
- 1.6** **Prisoners should be accompanied by all their property on transfer from sending establishments.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.7** *The reception process was efficient and peer support was useful. First night arrangements and induction had improved and were now good.*

- I.8** Fewer prisoners than the comparator said they were treated well in reception but prisoners arriving during the inspection said their first impressions were positive. The reception area was clean and bright, staff were friendly and efficient and reception processes respectful. Searching was proportionate and staff patiently processed prisoners' property. Prisoners were offered a reception pack of shop items and health care staff screened all men. The process minimised stress and was efficient.
- I.9** First night arrangements were good and officers from A wing (the induction unit) met new prisoners in reception. Peer supporters accompanied new arrivals to A wing where wing officers conducted interviews in private with each prisoner, including a screening for safety and vulnerability. Peer supporters assisted new prisoners to understand and complete a range of compacts (signed agreements confirming adherence to community rules). Phone accounts were transferred electronically from sending prisons.
- I.10** All new arrivals were accommodated in single rooms in A wing and received a clean bedding pack. Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) and peer supporters were freely available and in our survey 96% of prisoners said they felt safe on their first night against a comparator of 89%.
- I.11** The induction programme was intensive and ran over one week. Each prisoner was given a programme of activities to complete and peer supporters helped them find their way around the prison so they could attend appointments in key departments. Induction also included a review at a weekly labour allocation board (see section on learning and skills and work activities, provision of activities).

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.12 *Levels of violence were very low and most prisoners felt safe. With the exception of men from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim prisoners, responses to our survey were very positive.*

- I.13** Levels of violence and antisocial behaviour were very low and there had only been two assaults in the six months prior to the inspection. Despite this, the prison took a positive approach to managing violence and there were violence reduction prisoner representatives on each wing attached to the social inclusion team (see section on equality and diversity).
- I.14** The induction process focused well on promoting positive behaviour and good use was made of wing notice boards to advertise the violence reduction and management policy. The prison continued to conduct an annual violence reduction survey to identify areas of concern. Exit surveys of prisoners on discharge were no longer carried out, potentially missing a useful opportunity to gather further information.
- I.15** Survey results were generally better than the comparator and compared with the last inspection; they indicated that most prisoners felt safe, although men from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim prisoners were less positive about victimisation and some aspects of safety (see section on equality and diversity). There was a zero-tolerance approach to violence and the social inclusion team carried out a full investigation of all

reported incidents. These incidents usually resulted in a risk board (a formal review to establish if any additional action needed to be taken and if open conditions were still suitable), which determined a prisoner's suitability for open conditions.

- 1.16** Anti-bullying procedures consisting of warnings and observations; reports were instigated against perpetrators but they were largely observational and there continued to be no behaviour-related target setting. Support for victims was good and a well thought-out support document provided staff with guidance on managing victims.

Recommendation

- 1.17 Prisoners who are being monitored on suspicion of bullying should be set behavioural targets.** (Repeated recommendation 3.9)

Housekeeping point

- 1.18** Violence reduction exit surveys for prisoners on release should be reintroduced.

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.

- 1.19** *Levels of self-harm were very low. Access to Listeners was good and the prison focused well on potential risks.*

- 1.20** There had been no self-inflicted deaths at the prison since before the last inspection in 2011. There had been five deaths from natural causes; recommendations made and issues identified as risk factors across the prison estate by the Prisons and Probations Ombudsman were included (along with a range of other data on safety) in a regularly reviewed continuous improvement plan.
- 1.21** The excellent regime and positive supportive attitude of most prisoners contributed to general feelings of wellbeing. Incidents of self-harm were very low; only eight assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had to date been opened in 2015. Most were in response to a prisoner's comments or staff's concerns about low mood.
- 1.22** The majority of ACCT documents were only open for relatively short periods and records showed that support for prisoners on ACCTs was good. No ACCT documents were open during the inspection and a review of closed documents showed they were mostly completed well: case management was good; input was multidisciplinary; and entries were made regularly during the day. Some night entries, however, were repetitive and very predictable – they were made almost always on the hour.

- I.23** Prisoners' access to Listeners was good; they were present on all wings and although call outs were rare, most of the Listeners were also peer supporters in other areas and often provided low-level support and assistance, which alleviated more serious problems. There were no Listener suites but all cells were single occupancy, which meant prisoners could speak to them in private. The Listener team met regularly with the local Samaritans and received good support from prison staff.
- I.24** We were concerned that the waiting area used to hold prisoners returning to closed conditions (see section on segregation) had many obvious ligature points; we were aware of two prisoners who had used them.

Recommendations

- I.25** **Night ACCT entries should not be predictable or repetitive.**
- I.26** **Obvious ligature points in the holding area used for prisoners before their return to closed conditions should be removed.**

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.⁵

- I.27** *Safeguarding processes were not widely understood. Prison representatives did not attend local adult safeguarding boards.*

- I.28** There was a comprehensive safeguarding policy but processes were not yet embedded, and aside from health care few staff understood what adult safeguarding entailed. The health care provider was aware of adult safeguarding processes and had well established links with local safeguarding boards but there was little integration across the prison. The prison itself was not represented at local safeguarding boards.
- I.29** No procedures were in place to ensure care was provided in accordance with the Care Act 2015 (which outlines new obligations on local authorities and looks at the way in which local authorities should carry out carers' assessments and needs assessments; how they determine who is eligible for support; and how they charge for both residential care and community care).

Recommendation

- I.30** **The safeguarding policy should be re-launched and steps taken to ensure procedures are embedded across the prison. This should include engaging in local safeguarding partnerships and ensuring health service providers are appropriately involved.**

⁵ 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).

Security

Expected outcomes:

Security and good order are maintained through an attention to physical and procedural matters, including effective security intelligence as well as positive staff-prisoner relationships. Prisoners are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- I.31** *Security arrangements were appropriate and supported resettlement. Relationships had improved and contributed to dynamic security although the prison needed to better understand the reasons for the reduced number of information reports received. Spice (a man made drug that mimics the effects of cannabis but is much stronger with no discernible odour and cannot be detected by drug tests) and steroids were a problem but the mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate was low.*
- I.32** Security was appropriate and supported the resettlement function of the prison. Security procedures enabled relevant resettlement activities to take place and many prisoners pursued opportunities outside the prison.
- I.33** Prisoners returning from outside activities were subject to a rub down search but other searching procedures were intelligence-led. No routine strip-searching took place. Some prisoners being transferred back to closed conditions and some returning from temporary release had been target-searched.
- I.34** The prison also conducted alcohol breath tests on a risk basis when prisoners returned from release on temporary licence (ROTL). A multi-agency panel reassessed risks and developed a care plan if a prisoner tested positive for either drugs or alcohol.
- I.35** Relationships between prisoners and staff had improved, which supported dynamic security. There were good links between the security department, Kent Police and staff responsible for the working out scheme. The monthly security meeting focused on relevant challenges.
- I.36** The number of information reports (IRs) submitted had declined substantially; on average 70 IRs were submitted each month from January to June 2015, compared with an average of 112 per month during the same period in 2014. This had been raised at security meetings but managers needed a better understanding of the reasons to ensure all issues were being identified.
- I.37** Forty-two per cent of IRs in the previous six months related to drugs or mobile phones, which was reflected in the monthly security objectives set. There had been delays in responding to some intelligence reports, which meant that not all targeted searches were completed promptly. Ten searches were outstanding, including one dating back to April 2015. Two officers were meant to be allocated to the security department each day but this did not happen consistently.
- I.38** We found no evidence to suggest prisoners were diverting medication or alcohol was a major problem. The MDT rate was low averaging 2.7% in the past six months but Spice, a new psychoactive substance (NPS), could not be tested for under MDT. NPSs had been a significant issue, with 16 finds during March 2015 but there were indications that their availability had declined. This was due to police action against a local 'head shop' (which sold a range of NPSs) and prisoners' increased awareness of the dangers, which were well publicised. In addition, the prison had deployed a drug dog trained to detect Spice, and security, health and substance misuse services shared information well.

- I.39** There was evidence of steroid use as needles and syringes had been found and more needed to be done to address this issue; the prison did not have a means of disposing of used needles and syringes safely, leading to the risk of needle stick injuries.
- I.40** Possession of mobile phones, along with the pressures some placed on other prisoners to 'hold' illicit items on their behalf, had been identified as key issues. However the number of prisoners absconding, one potential indicator of problems between prisoners, had declined substantially from 12 in 2013 to eight in 2014 and just one in the year to the inspection.

Recommendations

- I.41** **The reduction in the number of intelligence reports submitted should be better understood and searches should be conducted promptly where reports indicate one is required.**
- I.42** **The prison should ensure that prisoners can safely and discreetly dispose of used needles and syringes and widely publicise the dangers of anabolic steroid use.**

Incentives and earned privileges⁶

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.43 *Most prisoners were motivated to progress through their sentence and had achieved the enhanced level of the IEP scheme before they arrived at the prison. Officers applied some appropriate discretion when issuing warnings.*

- I.44** Most prisoners were serving long sentences and arrived at the prison on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme. These men were motivated to progress through the final stages of their sentence and 92% of prisoners were on the enhanced level while none were on the basic regime. Those on the standard level could apply for progression after three months. All prisoners received a review every year.
- I.45** Most verbal and written warnings were for minor issues such as being late for roll checks. Officers used their discretion before issuing a formal IEP warning. Most prisoners heeded informal warnings and negative entries in electronic wing files and downgrades were rare.
- I.46** There were very few additional incentives on the facilities list for prisoners on the enhanced level. However, the main incentives were progression to the working out scheme and, for some, to C wing, which ran a more relaxed regime and where all prisoners were required to be on the enhanced level.

⁶ In the previous report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

I.47 *The few formal disciplinary processes were generally well managed. There were a few adjudications. A considered approach was being taken to the zero-tolerance policy towards drugs and possession of mobile phones, which had a positive influence on behaviour. Force was rarely used but documentation needed to be better monitored. There was no segregation unit.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.48** There was an average of 11 adjudications per month, a substantial decrease since the last inspection. The process was managed well and officers were trained in adjudication procedures; quarterly adjudication review meetings took place and the governor oversaw quality assurance. A trend analysis of adjudications was also completed.
- I.49** Most adjudications were for returning late from ROTL or prisoners having unauthorised items in their possession. Adjudications showed sufficient inquiry, punishments were appropriate and some were appropriately dismissed.
- I.50** On average nine to 10 prisoners each month were returned to closed conditions, usually as a consequence of the prison's zero-tolerance approach to drugs, illicitly held mobile phones and violence. In most of the cases we reviewed the reasons were appropriate but a few had been returned because they did not have an offender assessment system (OASys) document, which was inappropriate. The number being returned was declining and overall the approach taken was reasonable and had a positive impact on behaviour.

The use of force

- I.51** Force was rarely used – twice in the previous six months. There were some shortcomings in our small sample of paperwork and no robust quality assurance took place. Despite this, the force used in the cases we reviewed was proportionate. There was no routine use of handcuffs and 93% of staff required to have control and restraint refresher training within the previous 12 months had received it.

Housekeeping point

- I.52** Completed use of force paperwork should be quality assured and appropriate action taken where there are shortcomings.

Segregation

- I.53** There was no segregation unit. A waiting area in reception could be secured using a barred gate; it was normally used for short periods when a prisoner was being returned to closed conditions. However, it had many obvious ligature points. (See section on self-harm and suicide prevention.)

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners with drug and/or alcohol problems are identified at reception and receive effective treatment and support throughout their stay in custody.

I.54 *Substance misuse services had improved. The drug and alcohol strategy was being updated and included new policies for compact-based drug testing (CBDT) and alcohol testing, but there was no action plan. The Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) provided good recovery-focused support and clinical treatment.*

I.55 The prison now had its own drug and alcohol strategy, which was being updated at the time of the inspection. The document included new policies for CBDT and alcohol testing, but there was no annual action plan. A health needs analysis dated December 2014 covered substance misuse but it was not sufficiently detailed. However, RAPt gathered detailed performance data and consulted service users regularly.

I.56 Prisoners could easily access psychosocial support – RAPt had more than doubled its caseload in the previous five months and a full team was now in place. At the time of the inspection, 210 prisoners were in contact with the service and 93 received regular structured support. Care plans were good and demonstrated joint working with other departments such as the offender management unit and the primary and mental health teams.

I.57 Interventions consisted of one-to-one work, a three-day Living Safely workshop focusing on relapse prevention, a weekly open support group and auricular acupuncture. There was an active peer support scheme and Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Cocaine Anonymous groups facilitated by outside speakers met every week. Prisoners also attended Narcotics Anonymous and AA groups during ROTL. Those requiring more intensive therapeutic interventions could access structured programmes at neighbouring prisons.

I.58 Demand for opiate substitution treatment was very low and only two prisoners had been prescribed methadone in the past six months. RAPt clinical staff from neighbouring prisons provided treatment based on individual needs and reviewed prisoners regularly. Controlled drug administration had moved to the health care centre's treatment room.

Recommendation

I.59 **The drug and alcohol strategy should have an up-to-date action plan.**

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 *Prisoners were generally positive about access to amenities. Conditions had improved and the prison was now much cleaner.*

2.2 In our survey prisoners were very positive about access to most amenities. There had been a drive to improve living conditions and the wings were now much better. Communal areas, including the previously poor shower areas, were clean and in good order. Cell furniture had improved and all rooms had adequate lockers, chairs and bedding. The two larger wings (A and B) formed part of a traditional Victorian-style gallery; they remained somewhat shabby and little attempt had been made to offset the fairly austere environment, which meant the wings felt very institutional.

2.3 All prisoners had room keys. Prisoners did not have to return to their rooms until 10pm which meant they had good access to wing facilities, including telephones.

2.4 Prisoners could obtain cleaning materials, prison issue clothing and bedding easily. Most prisoners wore their own clothes and could have them laundered on site. Prisoners could make a request to bring in clothing on return from periods of temporary release. Indeterminate sentence prisoners could have clothing handed in (because it took longer for them to qualify for temporary release). Prison-issue clothing and bedding was washed at HMP Swaleside and not everything that was sent came back to the prison. Access to stored property was reasonable.

2.5 Some prisoners complained that applications were not always dealt with promptly. They were not tracked and we could not determine if this perception was founded.

2.6 Mail processes were expedient. Outgoing mail was collected each morning and normally left the prison on the same day. Legal mail was managed appropriately and a log maintained of anything opened in error.

Recommendation

2.7 **Prisoners should receive a response to an application within seven days and this should be recorded.** (Repeated recommendation 3.27)

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.

2.8 *Staff-prisoner relationships had improved. The personal officer scheme had been re-launched and most prisoners said there was someone to turn to if they had a problem. A small number of wing staff were still distant but efforts were being made to improve this and the quality of prisoner consultation.*

2.9 Staff-prisoner relationships had improved and were now mostly respectful. In our survey, prisoners were more positive than at the last inspection about staff treating them respectfully. The personal officer scheme had been re-launched and most prisoners said they had someone to turn to if they had a problem, although they mentioned a small number of wing staff who remained less helpful. We observed mainly good interactions; specialist staff were particularly impressive. Detailed entries in case files confirmed these generally positive interactions.

2.10 A small number of wing officers continued merely to respond to prisoners' requests rather than initiate contact. It was evident that some staff underestimated their role in the resettlement of prisoners and were unclear about how to support this work. Positive work was being done to address this and the prison aimed to further improve the quality of relationships by encouraging all staff to adopt a more proactive approach. The establishment was working towards the Royal College of Psychiatrists' Enabling Environments award, which included personality disorder virtual learning awareness training for staff. This positive initiative encouraged staff to work proactively with prisoners, particularly to support key resettlement work.

2.11 Some general prisoner consultation meetings lacked focus. The prison was attempting to make some of these processes more meaningful; however, wing-based consultation meetings were not included in this development.

Recommendation

2.12 **Wing-based staff should be proactive in their interactions with prisoners and have a better understanding of their key role in supporting prisoners' resettlement.**

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 characteristic⁷ 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.

2.13 *Prisoners were aware of the work of the social inclusion team. In our survey prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim prisoners were less positive than white and non-Muslim prisoners about some key areas. Prison diversity monitoring also identified discrepancies for these prisoners; although the equality action team was aware of this, the issues had not been effectively investigated or addressed. Services for older men and those with disabilities were well developed but there were none for gay or bisexual prisoners.*

Strategic management

- 2.14** The diversity and equality policy covered all protected characteristics but was not based on a needs analysis. The social inclusion team took the lead on equality and safer custody work. Managed by a senior manager, the team consisted of two officers, one of whom was a full-time equalities officer. He was supported by wing 'link officers' and a number of equality peer workers, including foreign national, Traveller and older prisoner representatives. There was also a veterans peer worker.
- 2.15** Most prisoners were aware of the work of the social inclusion team. Prisoners could drop into the equality peer workers' office and the equality office on A wing. The prison did not promote diversity widely, although a diversity day was being planned.
- 2.16** The equality action team (EAT), responsible for strategic work, met every other month. Not all departments were regularly represented and the establishment was striving to address the lack of external representation. There was no equality action plan.
- 2.17** Diversity monitoring data were discussed at each meeting. Poorer outcomes had been identified for prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds where access to release on temporary licence (ROTL), prisoner orderly jobs and C wing were concerned. In addition, Muslim prisoners were over-represented in adjudications. Although minutes named the individuals responsible for investigating these discrepancies and reporting back, the issues had neither been effectively investigated or addressed. We reported the under-representation of men from black and minority ethnic backgrounds in ROTL and on C wing in 2011. Forums were only run for older men and those with disabilities.
- 2.18** Discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were freely available. In the six months prior to the inspection two DIRFs had been submitted; three had been submitted throughout 2014. Although all had been signed off by a senior manager, completed investigations on which decisions had been made failed to include evidence that had been gathered from detailed interviews with complainants or significant others. There was no

⁷ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

record of formal feedback to complainants and completed DIRFs were not externally quality assessed.

Recommendation

- 2.19 Completed DIRFs should include evidence of a thorough investigation, including interviews with all concerned, and feedback to the complainant should be documented.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.20** About 39% of the population were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds. In our survey, this group was less positive compared to white prisoners in some key areas, including safety and respect; 15% said they had been victimised by other prisoners and 39% by staff against comparators of 5% and 11% respectively. In groups and individually prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds raised similar issues to other prisoners, but some also spoke with some justification about less favourable access to some activities, notably ROTL (see section on strategic management).
- 2.21** Responses from Muslim men, of whom 39% were from black and minority ethnic backgrounds were similarly negative; 17% reported being victimised by other prisoners and 43% by staff against comparators of 9% and 19% respectively. The prison identified 3.2% of the population as being from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background, compared with 2% in our survey. Two prisoners from this background acted as diversity representatives. There were very limited forums where prisoners from protected characteristics such as black and minority ethnic background or Muslim men could raise any specific concerns.
- 2.22** There were eight foreign national prisoners and those we spoke to felt their needs were met well. An immigration officer visited individuals as necessary. Although telephone translation was available, other prisoners were used as translators, including, we were told, for health care interviews. Both the March and May EAT minutes recorded: 'There are a few offenders who cannot speak English and we need to find someone who can help and support them,' but no action point was set to address this.
- 2.23** In our survey, 8% of respondents considered themselves to have a disability compared with only 3.2% of the population identified by the prison which might have indicated that some needs were at risk of being missed. Most prisoners with disabilities and older men we spoke to were positive about their care and the facilities available. Wing staff were aware of prisoners subject to personal emergency and evacuation plans and their individual circumstances.
- 2.24** There were no fully adapted cells, although some men had alarms so they could call for wing staff and allocated 'buddies' (prisoners who provided practical assistance when needed). A few showers were fitted with wall mounted pull-down seats and some individual adaptations had been made, but the prison did not generally provide sufficient access for disabled prisoners.
- 2.25** Twenty-two per cent of the population were aged 50 or over, of whom 5% were 60 or over. In our survey, older prisoners were much more positive than younger men about relationships with staff. There were gym sessions for older men (see section on physical education and healthy living) and the 'lounge' in the faith complex, equipped with chairs and a television, was reserved for their use. There were occasional forums for older prisoners and those with disabilities. Those identified as veterans were seen by the veterans orderly and

referred to a charity providing support to former members of the armed forces. There was no specific focus on the needs of younger prisoners.

- 2.26** As in 2011, gay or bisexual prisoners were under-identified; the prison only identified 0.2% of prisoners to be in this group compared with 1% in our survey. There was no apparent proactive support for gay, bisexual or transgender prisoners. We met prisoners who told us it was unsafe to disclose their sexuality.

Recommendations

- 2.27** **Managers should ensure that the language needs of non-English speakers are fully addressed.**
- 2.28** **Information and support services for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners should be introduced and promoted.**

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.

- 2.29** *Prisoners were positive about support from the chaplaincy and access to services.*

- 2.30** Prisoners were aware of the chaplaincy and in our survey, groups and individually were generally positive about faith provision. Muslim men, who made up 17% of the population, were more positive than non-Muslims about having access to a chaplain in private, although they were negative about some other aspects (see section on equality and diversity).
- 2.31** There was one full-time Church of England chaplain, and one part-time Catholic chaplain; all others chaplains were sessional. A managing chaplain was soon to be appointed. A chaplain saw all prisoners on arrival and provided verbal and published information about the services and support available.
- 2.32** The faith complex met prisoners' needs and was well maintained. Funding had been obtained to improve washing facilities there, but prisoners could wash on their wings before attending prayers. Appropriate preparations had been made for Ramadan.
- 2.33** Chaplains managed the prison visitor scheme although there was little demand. They offered bereavement support and the full-time chaplain was a trained family liaison officer. Prisoners could be directed to local faith providers on release and chaplains facilitated private telephone calls where appropriate.

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.

2.34 *The complaint process was efficient with responses tailored to the individual. The governor provided effective quality assurance.*

2.35 Complaints forms were available on all wings, alongside confidential access envelopes (for complaints that are only read by the person to whom they are addressed). The system had improved and complaints were now centrally logged and the designated complaints administrator forwarded them to the appropriate governor for investigation. More prisoners than at the comparator (58% against 52%) said it was easy to make a complaint.

2.36 Around 42 complaints had been made each month in the six months up to and including May 2015. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at the comparator (32% against 44%) said their complaints were dealt with fairly. Around 27% of complaints were about the allocation of ROTL and approximately 10% concerned problems obtaining property following transfer to the prison.

2.37 In our survey, 35% of prisoners against a comparator of 46% felt complaints were dealt with quickly. Our sample found that responses were polite and addressed the complaint. With the exception of those addressed to other prisons, complaints received responses, which were tailored to the individual concerned, within seven days. Many responses were empathetic and sometimes included a face-to-face meeting to ensure the complainant understood what was being said. Apologies were made when necessary.

2.38 Quality assurance had improved and the governor audited all complaints. Trends were discussed at senior management team meetings and complaints investigators received guidance as necessary to enhance their performance.

Good practice

2.39 *Lessons learned from complaints had led to changes in the process, which had improved the promptness and focus of responses.*

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are fully aware of, and understand their sentence or remand, both on arrival and release. Prisoners are supported by the prison staff to freely exercise their legal rights.

2.40 *Legal services were no longer provided and we were not confident that sufficient support was available when the need arose.*

2.41 There was no longer any legal service. Although there appeared to be little demand for legal assistance we were not confident that sufficient support would be available should the need arise. The two legal visits booths in the visits room met the demand. Bookings were made via the general visits line and spaces were available on most days of the week during the inspection. Legal literature was available in the library but prisoners could not take out legal books and there was no facility to sit and study in the library or to make photocopies of key information.

Recommendation

2.42 **The prison should ensure sufficient legal services support is provided when required.**

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.

2.43 *Prisoners had mixed views about the quality of health care although we judged it to be reasonably good. Partnership working was effective, although some aspects of clinical governance required attention. An appropriate range of primary care services was offered and most waiting times were acceptable. The longstanding problems with the leaking roof in the health care centre required emergency action. Dental rooms were not clean and the dental decontamination room did not meet infection control standards. Medicines management and mental health services were good.*

2.44 *The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁸ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The Care Quality Commission contributed to this inspection and its requirement notices are provided in Appendix III.*

⁸ 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>.

Governance arrangements

- 2.45** The Care Quality Commission issued two ‘requirement to improve’ notices following the inspection (see Appendix III).
- 2.46** A health needs assessment had been completed in February 2015. Working relationships between the commissioner NHS England, prison and provider Integrated Care 24 (IC24) were good and partnership board meetings were well attended and covered all essential areas.
- 2.47** A core team of two nurses, a health care assistant and two administrators were based at the prison with additional managerial and strategic support available from Elmley and Swaleside prisons, where IC24 also provided health care. Mandatory training was well managed but access to professional development was limited. There was a lack of formal clinical and managerial supervision and appraisals. Clinical incidents were well managed and lessons learned were shared with the team.
- 2.48** There was no separate prisoner health service forum despite attempts to instigate one, although health issues were raised at prisoner council consultation meetings.
- 2.49** There was a separate health care complaints system, but most complaints went through the establishment’s system, which lacked confidentiality. During the six-month period from January to June 2015, there had been 12 complaints. All responses were prompt, most were respectful and all addressed the issues highlighted; a few were curt.
- 2.50** The health care centre offered a weekday service from 8am until 4.30pm. It was not suitable for those requiring 24-hour nursing care, although there was access to an inpatient facility at neighbouring HMP Elmley.
- 2.51** The longstanding leak in the roof of the health care centre had damaged ceilings and caused the door frames to swell; the floor in the pharmacy room had had to be removed. The supporting scaffold surrounding the building had alleviated some of the problems but a more permanent solution was urgently required to ensure the environment remained safe.
- 2.52** Staff used an appropriate range of policies including those on safeguarding and information sharing and effective systems were in place to manage communicable diseases.
- 2.53** Emergency equipment, including an automated external defibrillator (AED) in the health care centre was well organised and regularly checked. Custody staff we spoke to were aware of the emergency response protocol and had good access to defibrillators, which were strategically positioned across the prison. First aid and defibrillator training for prison staff was well organised and arrangements were in place to ensure defibrillator and first aid cover on each shift, including nights. We were reassured that an ambulance would be called promptly in an emergency.
- 2.54** NHS health checks for prisoners between the ages of 40 and 74 were carried out and a Senior Well Man clinic had been established; age-appropriate screening also took place. Access to mobility and health aids was available if required.
- 2.55** Health promotion was displayed in the waiting room and on the wings, but it was not in an easy-read format or available in languages other than English. Waiting times for smoking cessation services and access to immunisations and screening for blood-borne viruses was good. Barrier protection was available from health staff although it was not well advertised.

Recommendations

- 2.56** All health staff should have an annual appraisal and access to regular managerial and clinical supervision so that appropriate professional development can be provided.
- 2.57** The prison should have a well-advertised, accessible health complaints process that is confidential; responses should be consistent and respectful, as well as address the issues raised and provide prisoners with adequate explanations.
- 2.58** The health care building should be fit for purpose and urgent remedial action should be taken to ensure the leaking roof and the fabric of the building is fixed.

Housekeeping points

- 2.59** Health promotion and health care information should be available in a range of formats that are accessible to all prisoners.
- 2.60** Barrier protection should be well advertised.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.61** Fewer prisoners in our survey than at comparator prisons were satisfied with the overall quality of health services (51% against 65%) although it had improved since our last inspection (33%). Most prisoners we spoke to were positive about the care they received.
- 2.62** A registered nurse carried out a comprehensive health screening for new arrivals; it included mental health, learning disability and immunisation status. Appropriate referrals were made. Confidentiality and consent to share information were discussed.
- 2.63** Minster Medical Group provided three GP sessions a week on Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Prisoners received a routine appointment within three days of applying for one, which was good. Custody staff had access to weekend and out of hours' advice through health care staff based at HMP Elmley and out of hours' emergency cover was provided to the same level as in the community.
- 2.64** The primary care team offered a variety of nurse-led clinics including vaccinations and phlebotomy. There was an appropriate range of primary care services, including a podiatrist and an optician, and waiting times for these services were good.
- 2.65** SystemOne (the electronic clinical record system) was used and entries in patient records were generally good, but they were not audited regularly to ensure a consistent approach. Staff used assessment templates that reflected national clinical guidance, and most individuals with a long-term condition had a care plan; however, we found that some individuals with complex health issues did not have treatment plans tailored to their needs.
- 2.66** Appointments were managed on paper and electronic systems, which was an unnecessary duplication. The electronic system did not record waiting times correctly.
- 2.67** Prisoners were referred to external hospital appointments promptly and appropriately. However, too many were missed; the prison recorded that this was mainly because prisoners refused to attend or the hospital cancelled appointments.

Recommendation

- 2.68** The prison should have a single robust appointment system and SystemOne should be used effectively to produce accurate information regarding waiting times and attendance.

Housekeeping points

- 2.69** Individuals with complex needs should have a care plan and progress notes should be audited.
- 2.70** The reasons for prisoners' lack of attendance at external hospital appointments should be scrutinised more thoroughly.

Pharmacy

- 2.71** Medicines were promptly obtained from HMP Rochester via faxed prescriptions and delivered in sealed boxes directly to the health care centre. Controlled drugs were ordered as stock via wing requisition forms, or as named patient medicines through prescriptions.
- 2.72** Medicines were administered in the pharmacy room in the health care centre, where they were appropriately stored in locked cabinets. All patients received medicines weekly or monthly in possession, except for a very few who had substance misuse problems who received medication on a daily basis administered by the substance misuse team. The prison had a small amount of agreed stock. A pharmacist from HMP Rochester visited on a monthly basis to check paperwork and perform stock checks. Thermolabile medicines were appropriately stored in fridges whose temperatures were monitored.
- 2.73** Health care assistants or nursing staff gave out medicines, and clear records were made when medication was collected or administered. Patients could collect in-possession medicines at any time when the pharmacy room was open, and men reordered their medicines using a request slip similar to those used in the community. A risk assessment and a signed patient compact (an agreement confirming adherence to community rules) were completed as part of the in-possession assessment, and attached to the individual's SystemOne record. Patient information leaflets were provided with medicines.
- 2.74** Written policies were in place for special sick (immediate health treatment without an appointment), in-possession and out of hours supply. The prison had a new in-possession policy, which was awaiting sign off by the medicines management group. The British National Formulary (a reference book for prescribing, dispensing and administering medicines) in the pharmacy room was not the current version.
- 2.75** Patient group directions (PGDs), which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine, were no longer used, although patients could receive vaccinations if the GP provided a signed patient-specific direction. Access to over-the-counter remedies was appropriately recorded and a specific formulary (medications used to inform prescribing) was in place.

Housekeeping points

- 2.76** Old reference books should be discarded and only the most recent copy kept to ensure that any information used is up to date.

- 2.77** The introduction of PGDs should be considered to enable the pharmacist and/or nurse to supply more potent medication to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor.

Dentistry

- 2.78** Dental services were provided by Kent Community Health NHS Trust. A dentist delivered two sessions a week, supported by two dental nurses. The dental suite, including the decontamination room was not clean and neither dental room had sealed floors. We found no evidence to suggest infection control audits had been completed. The decontamination room was inappropriately being used for administrative work and contained excess clutter, including a completed patient prescription, which increased the risk of the spread of infection. (See Appendix III.) Action was taken to address this during the inspection.
- 2.79** A full range of treatments was provided and appointments appropriately allocated based on needs, but the first available slot for a routine appointment was seven weeks, which was too long. The equipment was well maintained and in good working order. Oral health promotion was provided during sessions.

Recommendations

- 2.80** **The decontamination room should only be used for decontamination purposes and both the treatment and decontamination rooms be should be fully compliant with dental infection control standards and subject to effective monitoring.**
- 2.81** **Prisoners should have access to routine dental appointments within six weeks.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.82** A good level of primary and secondary mental health care was provided. The mental health team was based at HMP Elmley. It comprised a team manager, a consultant psychiatrist, a forensic social worker, mental health nurses, psychology graduates and improved access to psychological treatment (IAPT) (talking therapies) workers. The team's caseload was eight and three sessions were delivered over a two-week period at the health care centre. A stepped care model was in place providing a range of treatments from less intensive interventions for prisoners with short-term mild and moderate mental health needs to care programme approach services for prisoners with longstanding and complex problems.
- 2.83** Prisoners could self-refer or be referred by staff. Following a referral a mental health assessment was carried out within 10 working days and within two working days if it was more urgent. Care planning and progress notes on SystemOne were good.
- 2.84** There was an effective weekly multidisciplinary team meeting and staff received regular clinical and managerial supervision. A mental health awareness training package had been developed by the team but too few custody staff had received the training.
- 2.85** Staff attended assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management reviews for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm and contributed to parole hearings. There had been no transfers to secure mental health units in the previous 12 months.

Recommendation

- 2.86 All custody officers should receive regular mental health awareness training so they can recognise and take appropriate action when a prisoner has mental health problems.**

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Prisoners are offered varied meals to meet their individual requirements and food is prepared and served according to religious, cultural and prevailing food safety and hygiene regulations.

2.87 *Prisoners were mostly negative about the food. Meals were adequate and portion sizes reasonable. Self-catering facilities remained too limited.*

- 2.88** In our survey, only 17% of prisoners said the food was good against a 41% comparator, although more than the 10% in 2011. Prisoners were also negative in focus group discussions, although we received more positive responses from some individuals.
- 2.89** Food was prepared at nearby HMP Swaleside and delivered in heated trolleys by van. Temperature checks and control had improved since the last inspection. Sergeries were clean and well maintained although some food trolleys were insufficiently cleaned. Servery workers were appropriately dressed and staff supervised the food service effectively.
- 2.90** Meals were ordered on a pre-select, four-week menu cycle; there was a reasonable variety of food, catering for all diets. The food, including portion sizes, was reasonable and prisoners could eat together. Facilities were available to keep meals hot for those returning from work later in the evening. Food was prepared and stored appropriately and suitable preparations had been made for Ramadan.
- 2.91** Prisoners were consulted about food at the prisoner consultation council and wing meetings; food comment books were available.
- 2.92** Wing catering facilities remained limited, consisting mainly of toasters and microwave ovens. Prisoners did not have the opportunity to learn basic catering skills in preparation for release.

Recommendation

- 2.93 Adequate self-catering facilities should be provided on all wings to enable prisoners to cook for themselves.**

Housekeeping point

- 2.94** All food trolleys should be cleaned to an acceptable standard.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.95 *Immediate access to the shop was still an issue but good interim arrangements were in place and the prison was making efforts to consult prisoners regarding the choice of goods available.*

2.96 In our survey 24% of prisoners, more than at the previous inspection (8%) reported having access to the prison shop when they first arrived. However, since deliveries took place on set days, delays still occurred, although prisoners could bring in items from other establishments and additional reception packs of shop items could be authorised.

2.97 Prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim prisoners were less satisfied with the range of goods sold at the shop than white and non-Muslim prisoners respectively. The list appeared to provide an adequate variety of items for minority ethnic groups, and changes had been made following consultation. The prison was seeking volunteers to join an ongoing canteen subcommittee, and meetings with the supplier DHL took place regularly to look at cheaper options.

2.98 Prisoners had access to a range of catalogues, could purchase items when they were on home leave, and families could send in items ordered from Amazon. The local newsagent delivered a wide range of daily newspapers every morning.

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.⁹

3.1 *Prisoners spent a good amount of time out of their rooms and had excellent access to association and outside areas.*

3.2 Survey results and our observations demonstrated that prisoners had a very good amount of time out of their rooms and excellent access to outside areas. There were appropriate periods of association. Prisoners working onsite in workshops or at education were usually in activities for around six and a half hours. Previous restrictions on movement around the prison perimeter had been relaxed and prisoners had relatively free access. There were no lock-up periods on any of the wings, although men were expected to return to their rooms by 10pm.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.3 *Learning and skills provision was good. The senior team provided a clear strategic focus on the resettlement of prisoners. Very good partnership working had enabled the prison to enhance its training and work provision. Attendance was good in most but not all areas. There was sufficient work and education for the population. Vocational training was good, although not all prison workplaces offered accredited training. The programme of external work opportunities was outstanding. Allocation to activities was well managed. The quality of teaching in education was generally good, but teaching and success rates on functional skills courses required improvement. Punctuality was poor. The use of peer mentors was very good. Access to the library was good, but its facilities were limited.*

3.4 *Ofsted¹⁰ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:

Good

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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>.

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

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.5** Leadership and management of learning and skills were good. The strategic focus, set by the prison's senior management, promoted the resettlement of prisoners well, and staff and partner organisations were well aware of the approach. Very good partnership working had created new job-focused training programmes (see section on provision of activities).
- 3.6** The programme of outside work and training places for prisoners released on temporary licence was outstanding. The prison had developed a strong network of employers, community groups, and training providers, to provide high quality paid and unpaid work placements. At the time of the inspection over 230 prisoners were undertaking these placements on either a full- or part-time basis. Placements were monitored regularly to ensure that prisoners' and employers' needs were met; in some cases prisoners had gone on to permanent employment with their placement provider after release.
- 3.7** The educational and vocational training provision provided by The Manchester College (TMC) was good. Quality assurance procedures were also good. Observation of teaching and learning was robust and had led to improvements; weaker curriculum areas were identified and more staff development and better learning resources were provided. However, observation outcomes were not linked to performance management, and appraisals due in February 2015 had still not taken place in July 2015. Quality assurance processes in prison training were not well developed. Some of the partner organisations had their own quality assurance procedures but their outcomes were not monitored by the prison's quality improvement group or included in the prison self-assessment report.
- 3.8** A lack of effective sequencing meant that the retention of learners on the small number of English and mathematics courses was poor. In the current year a fifth of learners had left before completion – most to start work placements. The prison was now taking action to improve retention. Attendance at some classes was poor particularly in English, mathematics, and information and communications technology (ICT). While procedures for following-up absent learners were in place, they were not sufficiently robust and needed more support from other prison departments to be effective.

Recommendations

- 3.9** **Quality assurance measures should be applied across all areas of provision and outcomes relating to partner agencies should be reported to the quality improvement group and included in the self-assessment report.**
- 3.10** **Procedures to encourage attendance at scheduled activities should be strengthened through cooperative working across all prison functions.**

Provision of activities

- 3.11** The range of courses available had improved substantially since the last inspection. There were sufficient activity places for the whole population and there were no unemployed prisoners. The range of courses provided by TMC had been reviewed and was now well focused on the subjects prisoners required in their first three months at the prison, such as functional skills and employability courses. New partnerships had led to an increase in the amount of level 2 provision and the introduction of some at level 3. Some of the new courses such as goods vehicle and fork lift truck driving, provided through the Mainstream Logistics company led directly to job outcomes (see section on reintegration planning, education, training and employment).
- 3.12** A partnership with Canterbury College had led to the creation of the Old Mill Training Centre just outside the main prison, where prisoners could join an extended range of construction and ICT courses, including some at level 3. However, the range of higher level construction courses was limited and prisoners said they wanted more training opportunities to prepare them for work in this area. A large number of prisoners were employed as cleaners but there was insufficient work to keep them fully occupied and most did not receive training.
- 3.13** The range of work and training available through release on temporary licence (ROTL) placements was outstanding. Eligible prisoners could access these placements after their first three months at the prison and about half were employed in this way, including all those who were approaching the end of their sentence. Prisoners received good support to find paid employment during the final stage of their sentence. Some had progressed to supervisory roles, increasing their chances of employment on release.
- 3.14** Some vocational training provided by the prison was good. Courses such as catering and oil recycling had been developed in association with local charities, providing accreditation and work to commercial deadlines and standards. The motor vehicle workshop was well managed and used industry-standard procedures.
- 3.15** Peer support workers were very well trained and deployed. The job description and qualification requirement for these posts were well defined and most performed the role to a high standard. Their tasks included providing learning support in class, assisting with course administration and offering prisoners guidance on outside work or community placements through a weekly job club.
- 3.16** The process for allocating prisoners to work was good. A well-planned induction gave prisoners a clear view of the options open to them. The allocation board received details of each learner's English and mathematics attainment level and a report with recommendations from the National Careers Service. Each prisoner attended the allocation board and their preferences were discussed thoroughly before allocations were agreed.

Recommendation

- 3.17** **The range of vocational training should be developed to include a greater range of courses, particularly in construction trades, to help more prisoners prepare for employment.**

Good practice

- 3.18** *ROTL provided a large number of men with the opportunity to develop real work skills that would help them reintegrate into the community.*

Quality of provision

- 3.19** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was good on most education courses. Prisoners enjoyed their lessons and made good progress, resulting in high success rates in most qualifications. Most teachers used a range of strategies to maintain interest and provided particularly effective one-to-one coaching. They used the assessment of learners' prior knowledge and skills well to set appropriate targets in individual learning plans (ILPs).
- 3.20** Learners' behaviour in lessons was very good; they collaborated well with each other, engaged confidently in discussions and worked with tolerance and respect. However, in many lessons, teachers were too tolerant of poor punctuality.
- 3.21** Tutors' assessment of learners' work was thorough and in most cases their feedback helped them improve, although a minority of teachers failed to identify errors in learners' written work. Arrangements for identifying learners in need of extra help were appropriate and support effective in ensuring their achievements were as good as those of their peers.
- 3.22** The quality of teaching on functional skills qualifications in English and mathematics required improvement. Some teachers set targets that focused too much on completing worksheet tasks and did not help learners sufficiently to gain the underpinning knowledge required. In these lessons learners were not sure about the purpose of the activities they were asked to complete and their progress was slow. Success rates in these subjects, while improving, were still too low.
- 3.23** The quality of vocational training was very good. In motor mechanics teachers made good use of the industry-standard equipment to ensure that learners completed tasks such as cam belt changes and steering rack repairs to a commercial level. Prisoners learning how to operate fork-lift trucks benefited from well-planned classroom and practical activities, which ensured that all those completing this new course were successful. Many of them had also secured post-release employment.
- 3.24** Work placements were very good. Prisoners undertook exactly the same work as other volunteers and were treated as an integrated part of the workforce.

Recommendations

- 3.25** **All teachers should provide better guidance to learners on improving their written English skills.**
- 3.26** **Managers should increase the pace of improvement in English and mathematics.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.27** Success rates were high in most TMC courses but not as good in functional skills and some vocational courses at level 2. However, learners on the recently-introduced fast track functional skills course were achieving good success rates. Results in work-based learning were good and were very good in the Canterbury College and Mainstream Logistics courses.

- 3.28** Success rates in vocational training were high. Learners gained good practical skills, and in some areas, such as motor mechanics and art and design, standards were very high. In creative crafts, learners developed excellent skills in a range of media, including sculpting with clay and painting with watercolours, and created artefacts of a very high standard. Work within the prison such as garden maintenance and painting and decorating was also of a high standard but not accredited. Prisoners employed as peer mentors were fully qualified and developed very good interpersonal and administrative skills.
- 3.29** Prisoners developed good employment-related skills during their vocational training and work placements outside the prison. They demonstrated a positive attitude toward work and improved their verbal communication and team-working skills. However, these employability skills were not formally recognised or recorded.

Recommendation

- 3.30** **Managers should ensure that the employment-related skills prisoners develop in vocational training and work placements are recorded and recognised.**

Library

- 3.31** The library had been relocated within the past year to new, smaller premises, which had led to a reduction in stock, although the number of books, audio books and foreign language titles remained adequate. Prisoners had suitable access to legal texts, although this was somewhat restricted (see paragraph 2.41) and Prison Service instructions. Prisoners could make a request for books to Kent County Council, which ran the service; they usually arrived within two weeks.
- 3.32** Staff worked closely with the education department to increase the stock of books to support prisoners with their courses, but more work was required to ensure books were available for all subjects. Stock losses were very low and sufficient resources available to ensure an appropriate supply of new titles.
- 3.33** Access to the library was very good and four library orderlies, working alongside two part-time members of staff, ensured that the library was open seven days a week and on weekday evenings. However, the smaller space meant that there was not enough room for reading or working at tables, so learners' opportunities to make best use of the resources were limited. Room for any displays or notices to promote library services or related to broader topics, such as equality and diversity, was also limited.
- 3.34** Men received suitable information about library services during induction, and around 75% of prisoners were members, which was high. However, since the move to the smaller location, the number of library visits and loans had decreased by about a quarter.
- 3.35** The library collected data to monitor the use of its services but did not do enough to promote reading, which was confined to the Six Book Challenge reading scheme, although plans to introduce Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children) were in place.

Recommendation

- 3.36** **The library should increase its efforts to promote reading among prisoners.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

3.37 *Physical education (PE) facilities were good and all prisoners had good access to recreational PE. Participation rates were good as was the variety of activities. The range of accredited course was too narrow, although achievements were high. Links with the health care department and activities to promote healthy living were good. Quality assurance of PE accredited course was underdeveloped.*

3.38 PE facilities were good and well maintained. The prison had a reasonably sized sports hall, well-equipped weights and cardiovascular (CV) suites and an outdoor football pitch.

3.39 Three PE staff supported by three orderlies and 13 peer support workers ran the department. They held appropriate PE qualifications and nine of the peer support workers were qualified and worked as lifeguards.

3.40 All prisoners had good access to recreational PE and sessions were available seven days a week and on three midweek evenings. Links with the health care department and activities to promote healthy living were good. Prisoners aged 50 and over and those referred for health reasons were allocated to a suitable number of sessions. Three-quarters of prisoners participated in some PE activity. The range of activities on offer included team sports, racquet sports and cross-country walking.

3.41 Induction to PE was timely and prisoners were appropriately assessed to ensure they were fit enough to participate. They received suitable training in the use of weights and CV equipment.

3.42 The range of accredited courses on offer was too narrow. Reductions in staff had led to qualifications in gym and fitness instruction being withdrawn. Qualifications were now limited to first aid and lifeguard training. Success rates on these programmes were very good. However, the provision was not sufficiently monitored and it was not included in the prison's self-assessment report.

Recommendation

3.43 **The prison should introduce accredited vocational training in PE.**

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 *There was a clear focus on resettlement as the main priority for the prison. Detailed action plans were in place and progress was monitored at the well-attended committee meeting; however, more needed to be done to identify the resettlement needs of specific groups of prisoners. Release on temporary licence (ROTL) was extremely well used. Some 'through-the-gate' provision led by Kent Surrey and Sussex community rehabilitation company¹¹ (CRC) was very new and it was too early to gauge its effectiveness.*

4.2 Since our last inspection the prison had become a resettlement prison; this new role was being developed and promoted. Staff and prisoners were now clear that the focus on resettlement was the prison's main priority and services were well advertised on wings. Most prisoners were near their home area, which enhanced their resettlement opportunities.

4.3 The reducing reoffending strategy had been reviewed and developed but offender management was not a central part of it. Good, clear action plans were in place and the well-attended bimonthly committee meeting provided adequate oversight of progress.

4.4 The prison regularly analysed prisoners' profiles, such as their sentence length, ethnicity and age, which provided useful additional information and a needs analysis had been undertaken using data from prisoner surveys and offender assessment system (OASys) documents. However, the specific needs of men from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and indeterminate sentence prisoners had not been explored (see section on offender management and planning, indeterminate sentence prisoners).

4.5 There had been 23,000 separate ROTL events in support of work, family ties and other resettlement activities in the six months before the inspection, which was high and had almost doubled since our last inspection. At the time of the inspection over half of the population were involved in ROTL. Despite this increase, the number of prisoners failing to return or absconding had decreased substantially over the previous two years.

4.6 In our survey, more prisoners than in other open prisons (40% against 33%) and at our last inspection (15%) said they had received help to prepare for release.

¹¹ 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.

- 4.7** Kent Surrey and Sussex CRC had replaced the previous resettlement team in May 2015. These new through-the-gate processes were developing and it was too early to gauge the effectiveness of these new arrangements. Accommodation and finance, benefit and debt provision was only offered during the last 12 weeks of a prisoner's sentence, which potentially had a negative impact on the effectiveness of the work. Links between the offender management unit (OMU) and the CRC's through-the-gate workers was not yet fully developed, which affected information exchange and joint working. Few prisoners and staff we spoke to were aware of the new provision.

Housekeeping point

- 4.8** Links between the OMU and the 'through-the-gate' team should be developed to improve regular and meaningful information exchange.

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.

- 4.9** *OASys documents were largely up to date, but some lacked sufficient detail or analysis. Contact with offender supervisors was good. The new ROTL procedures had been implemented well and risks were assessed robustly. Public protection processes were adequate. Mentoring for prisoners on indeterminate sentences for public protection was an excellent initiative but other support for indeterminate sentence prisoners was more limited.*

- 4.10** The previous backlog of prison OASys documents had largely been cleared; only 24 were overdue at the time of the inspection. In our survey more prisoners than in the comparator and compared with our last inspection said they had a sentence plan. Of those who had one, more than the comparator and than previously said they were involved in its development.
- 4.11** Most assessments were adequate but the poorer ones lacked sufficient detail or analysis. We saw evidence to suggest that management oversight had not led to a sufficient number of OASys documents being returned so that further work could be carried out.
- 4.12** The dual role of band 4 supervising officers/offender supervisors had been implemented successfully and was working well. In our survey, 98% of prisoners knew they had an offender supervisor, more than the comparator of 82%. More prisoners than the comparator also said they were receiving support from their offender supervisor (61% against 51%).
- 4.13** Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was good and appropriately focused on progression. New arrivals were interviewed within seven days. Prisoners said they could contact their offender supervisor easily, including during wing surgeries in the evenings and at weekends. The use of OMU peer workers was very good.
- 4.14** There was a backlog in transfer checks that should have been completed on arrival to ensure prisoners were eligible and suitable for open conditions, which hindered some prisoners' progression, for example, delaying the start of the home detention curfew (HDC) application process.

- 4.15** A total of 61 HDC applications had been considered and 55 approved in the previous six months. The timeliness of HDC assessments had deteriorated; in the previous four months 23 of the 34 HDC assessments were completed late (after the earliest eligibility date). In most cases this was due to reports from the community-based offender manager being submitted late or because the prisoner arrived at HMP Standford Hill with only a few weeks left to serve. In a few cases it was due to administrative delays in the OMU, which could have been avoided.
- 4.16** Two hundred and twelve prisoners (those on indeterminate sentences and subject to MAPPA arrangements) were restricted ROTL cases, which meant that for these more dangerous offenders there were a range of additional restrictions on their eligibility and access to ROTL. They should have been managed by a custody probation officer (CPO). However, only 180 of them had been allocated to a CPO, while others were still being managed by uniformed offender supervisors, which was inappropriate.
- 4.17** The new ROTL procedures which required a greater level of management scrutiny and accountability had been implemented well. Assessments were thorough and a clearly set out five-stage process enabled prisoners to progress one step at a time, a process that was in line with the new requirements. Plans for ROTL were detailed and checks were undertaken on compliance and engagement. Restricted ROTL cases went through a more thorough assessment process, which included seeking the views of the offender manager in the community. While we observed two very well managed ROTL boards, ROTL boards for restricted cases did not routinely involve a probation officer or senior probation officer, which meant there was a limited focus on assessing a prisoner's risk of harm. All the boards' recommendations were appropriately checked by the governor and where appropriate agreed, and overall we felt the process was being well managed.

Recommendations

- 4.18** **HDC releases should be timely and delays due to late reports or administrative issues should be eliminated.**
- 4.19** **All restricted ROTL cases should be managed by a CPO and a member of the probation team should always attend ROTL boards for restricted cases.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.20** Transfer checks should always be completed without delay and within a couple of days of arrival.

Public protection

- 4.21** The OASys risk of harm screening was accurate and up to date in most cases but some risk management plans completed by offender supervisors were not carried out to a sufficient standard.
- 4.22** A public protection officer checked the status of all new arrivals and relevant risks were identified and addressed. At the time of the inspection no prisoners were subject to mail and telephone monitoring. A public protection meeting was held every month but attendance was very poor, its purpose was unclear and staff we spoke to were confused about its role.

- 4.23** Thirty prisoners subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were due to be released in the following two months but their management level was clear in only five cases. All others were recorded as being MAPPA nominals (potentially subject to MAPPA arrangements on release) despite many having frequently had ROTL. However, this was offset by good information exchange with offender managers in the community about prisoners' plans for ROTL and final release which provided reassurance that any risks to the public were known, and a plan was in place to manage them. MAPPA reports were submitted as requested and were of a reasonable standard.

Recommendations

- 4.24** The role of the public protection meeting should be reviewed and multidisciplinary attendance should be improved to ensure it is fully effective.
- 4.25** MAPPA levels should be confirmed well ahead of a prisoner's release, including on ROTL.

Categorisation

- 4.26** Categorisation arrangements were appropriate. Where necessary prisoners considered unsuitable for open conditions were returned to a closed prison following a re-categorisation review (see section on security).

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.27** The number of indeterminate sentence prisoners held at HMP Standford Hill had doubled since our last inspection to 103; they consisted of 49 indeterminate sentences for public protection prisoners and 54 life sentenced prisoners.
- 4.28** Additional support was available from a regular forum chaired by the governor. A peer-led drop-in centre provided indeterminate sentence prisoners with advice and information and directed them to services. Family days were not available and there was a lack of self-catering facilities and few opportunities for prisoners to develop independent living skills outside ROTL. Indeterminate sentence prisoners had mixed views about the support provided: some said there was not enough specific provision for them.
- 4.29** Prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection who were from local areas could participate in a mentoring project provided by charity Catch 22, which included support during ROTL and after release to help prisoners keep appointments, access resettlement services and develop self-confidence.

Recommendation

- 4.30** More should be done to ensure that indeterminate sentence prisoners build contact with families and friends prior to release.

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.

4.31 *Outcomes across the resettlement pathways were good. Resettlement services provided by the new CRC provider were developing but it was too early to judge their effectiveness. Plans to develop independent living accommodation had been put on hold. Most prisoners were released with settled accommodation. Education, training and employment outcomes for prisoners were very good. Pre-release planning for prisoners' physical and mental health needs was timely and effective. Good substance misuse support services were available and the Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) apprentice scheme was a positive initiative. A range of financial support was offered. There was a strong focus on contact with family and friends; prisoners and their visitors enjoyed the relaxed environment of the visits room. Prisoners could access accredited programmes in the community or at HMP Swaleside; they could build problem-solving skills through ROTL and contact with offender supervisors. The development of the pathways enhanced resettlement service appeared very promising.*

4.32 In our survey more prisoners than in other open prisons and compared with our last inspection said they had received help to prepare for release. Outcomes in most resettlement areas were good but in our survey far fewer than the comparator knew where they could get help with accommodation and finances.

4.33 The 12-week pre-release review of prisoners' resettlement plans was developing well and about 40% had been carried out at the time of the inspection. They led to appropriate referrals for help.

4.34 In our survey, more prisoners than the comparator said they intended to complete some of their sentence plan targets in the community, and more than at our last inspection said that they had been on a preparation for release course. The resettlement support package available from the CRC was promising but it was too early to judge its effectiveness, although the short timescale for some reintegration work was a concern (see section on strategic management of resettlement, paragraph 4.7).

4.35 The prison had planned to provide accommodation on site to promote valuable practical living skills ahead of release. Known as Rolls Avenue, it consisted of a row of houses offering pre-release semi-independent living opportunities. The initiative had been put on hold but, if funding could be secured, it would provide an excellent stepping stone to release for longer-term prisoners.

Recommendation

4.36 **More should be done to enable prisoners to develop independent living skills, including those with indeterminate sentences.**

Accommodation

4.37 Accommodation outcomes for prisoners were good. Prisoners undertook a minimum of three (and up to 12) modules from the 'home routeway', which was part of the new My

Solution Rehabilitation Programme (MSRP), designed to help prisoners understand, access and manage housing options. Prisoners could complete each 20-minute module on their own supported by a CRC resettlement officer, or in a group.

- 4.38** In addition to the CRC, offender supervisors and two resettlement peer workers continued to provide housing advice. Offender managers met the accommodation needs of high risk prisoners.
- 4.39** From January 2015 to May 2015, all 179 prisoners released went into accommodation; one man had been released without accommodation in June 2015. Throughout 2014, only two prisoners had been released without accommodation; they had refused the accommodation offered to them.

Education, training and employment

- 4.40** Outcomes for prisoners were good. Work experience during their time at the prison led directly to employment in many cases and more than 60% of prisoners were employed on release. A further 8% were enrolled on further education and training courses.
- 4.41** The provision of careers advice by the National Careers Service (NCS) provider CXK was good. All prisoners received an individual interview on induction and skills action plans were well developed and used effectively to inform the allocation process. All prisoners were also seen at the end of their sentence. At this stage many no longer required advice because employment was in place: however individual assistance was available. CXK could not provide data on the outcomes achieved by prisoners once they were released, which reduced their ability to review the success of their work.
- 4.42** Prisoners could access information about job vacancies through a job club (see provision of activities).

Recommendation

- 4.43** **The NCS provider should record prisoner outcomes post-release so that it can better evaluate the effectiveness of the service.**

Health care

- 4.44** Pre-release planning for prisoners with physical and mental health needs was timely and effective. Appropriate liaison with community services ensured continuity of care and a week's supply of medication was provided on discharge. There was a palliative care policy in place and good links with local palliative care services.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.45** The RAPt team contributed to risk boards and release planning. The team, which included a full-time apprentice who was a serving prisoner, as well as a group of volunteers, delivered a through-the-gate service to those with substance use problems. The team worked with prisoners six to eight weeks prior to release, offered a 'meet and greet' service at the gate and provided up to six months of mentoring support in the community. Strong links had been developed with local community rehabilitation trusts and recovery networks.

Good practice

- 4.46** *The RAPt apprentice scheme enabled a serving prisoner to undertake training and become a paid, full-time member of the transitional support through-the-gate team. He worked both in the prison and in the community, and was due to continue working for RAPt post-release.*

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.47** Outcomes for prisoners were good. Prisoners could undertake a minimum of three (and up to 12) modules from the MSRP 'money routeway' (see section on accommodation) through the CRC.
- 4.48** Prisoners could speak to a representative from Citizens Advice at a weekly drop-in session and obtain information and advice from a representative from Medway and Swale Advocacy Partnership, a local independent service. The latter service had not run for approximately five months but weekly attendance was reinstated during the inspection.
- 4.49** A money management course was available through the education department and a separate employability course included budgeting skills training. A representative from Jobcentre Plus, who was available three days a week, offered benefit advice and set up benefit claims pre-release. Prisoners could open bank accounts in preparation for working out.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.50** Visits were available on Wednesdays and weekend afternoons for two hours. Approximately seven children's days were held annually during school holidays; grandchildren were included.
- 4.51** Visits could be booked easily and visitors we spoke to were complimentary about their treatment. There was no visitors' centre but the visits room was open approximately 45 minutes before visits were due to start; visitors arriving earlier could use the visitors' centres at neighbouring Swaleside and Elmley prisons, or the local Old Mill café on Wednesdays and Saturdays.
- 4.52** A private bus company ran a service for visitors to and from London for all three of the Isle of Sheppey prisons.
- 4.53** Officers were friendly and respectful and the visits room was bright and comfortable and had a relaxed atmosphere. Prisoners could use the refreshment facility, play with children in the play area and sit with visitors in an attractive outdoor area. The well-equipped play area was not supervised at all times.
- 4.54** A family support worker had been appointed but was not yet in place. The chaplaincy organised volunteer prison visitors. Prisoners who did not receive visits were not identified so that contact with family and friends could be promoted.
- 4.55** There was a strong focus on maintaining family ties and ROTL was used well for this purpose. Some individual prisoners managing specific challenges received some very good support to maintain relationships.

Housekeeping point

- 4.56** Action should be taken to identify prisoners who do not receive any visits so that all men have the opportunity to stay in contact with family and friends.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.57** Most prisoners had completed all necessary offending behaviour courses before arrival at Stanford Hill, however a few had completed programmes in the community while on ROTL or by accessing courses in neighbouring HMP Swaleside.
- 4.58** Much prisoner contact with offender supervisors focused on progression to ROTL and plans and problem solving skills were developed. Working out on ROTL placements helped prisoners put into practice skills they had learnt on offending behaviour programmes.
- 4.59** The pathways enhanced resettlement service, a progression service and the first of its kind in an open establishment, was being developed; it would link into the personality disorder pathway provision at Swaleside and Belmarsh prisons. It would ultimately support prisoners who had progressed from these specialist units during their transition into the open prison environment and the community.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendation

To the governor

- 5.1** Identified discrepancies in outcomes for prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds and Muslim men should be investigated and addressed effectively, as should these groups' more negative perceptions identified in our survey. (S43)

Recommendations

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.2** Escort vans should arrive at the prison in time for prisoners to be allowed entry. (1.5, repeated recommendation 1.6)
- 5.3** Prisoners should be accompanied by all their property on transfer from sending establishments. (1.6)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.4** Prisoners who are being monitored on suspicion of bullying should be set behavioural targets. (1.17, repeated recommendation 3.9)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.5** Night ACCT entries should not be predictable or repetitive. (1.25)
- 5.6** Obvious ligature points in the holding area used for prisoners before their return to closed conditions should be removed. (1.26)

Safeguarding

- 5.7** The safeguarding policy should be re-launched and steps taken to ensure procedures are embedded across the prison. This should include engaging in local safeguarding partnerships and ensuring health service providers are appropriately involved. (1.30)

Security

- 5.8** The reduction in the number of intelligence reports submitted should be better understood and searches should be conducted promptly where reports indicate one is required. (1.41)

- 5.9** The prison should ensure that prisoners can safely and discreetly dispose of used needles and syringes and widely publicise the dangers of anabolic steroid use. (1.42)

Substance misuse

- 5.10** The drug and alcohol strategy should have an up-to-date action plan. (1.59)

Residential units

- 5.11** Prisoners should receive a response to an application within seven days and this should be recorded. (2.7, repeated recommendation 3.27)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.12** Wing-based staff should be proactive in their interactions with prisoners and have a better understanding of their key role in supporting prisoners' resettlement. (2.12)

Equality and diversity

- 5.13** Completed DIRFs should include evidence of a thorough investigation, including interviews with all concerned, and feedback to the complainant should be documented. (2.19)
- 5.14** Managers should ensure that the language needs of non-English speakers are fully addressed. (2.27)
- 5.15** Information and support services for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners should be introduced and promoted. (2.28)

Legal rights

- 5.16** The prison should ensure sufficient legal services support is provided when required. (2.42)

Health services

- 5.17** All health staff should have an annual appraisal and access to regular managerial and clinical supervision so that appropriate professional development can be provided. (2.56)
- 5.18** The prison should have a well-advertised, accessible health complaints process that is confidential; responses should be consistent and respectful, as well as address the issues raised and provide prisoners with adequate explanations. (2.57)
- 5.19** The health care building should be fit for purpose and urgent remedial action should be taken to ensure the leaking roof and the fabric of the building is fixed. (2.58)
- 5.20** The prison should have a single robust appointment system and SystemOne should be used effectively to produce accurate information regarding waiting times and attendance. (2.68)
- 5.21** The decontamination room should only be used for decontamination purposes and both the treatment and decontamination rooms should be fully compliant with dental infection control standards and subject to effective monitoring. (2.80)
- 5.22** Prisoners should have access to routine dental appointments within six weeks. (2.81)

- 5.23** All custody officers should receive regular mental health awareness training so they can recognise and take appropriate action when a prisoner has mental health problems. (2.86)

Catering

- 5.24** Adequate self-catering facilities should be provided on all wings to enable prisoners to cook for themselves. (2.93)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.25** Quality assurance measures should be applied across all areas of provision and outcomes relating to partner agencies should be reported to the quality improvement group and included in the self-assessment report. (3.9)
- 5.26** Procedures to encourage attendance at scheduled activities should be strengthened through cooperative working across all prison functions. (3.10)
- 5.27** The range of vocational training should be developed to include a greater range of courses, particularly in construction trades, to help more prisoners prepare for employment. (3.17)
- 5.28** All teachers should provide better guidance to learners on improving their written English skills. (3.25)
- 5.29** Managers should increase the pace of improvement in English and mathematics. (3.26)
- 5.30** Managers should ensure that the employment-related skills prisoners develop in vocational training and work placements are recorded and recognised. (3.30)
- 5.31** The library should increase its efforts to promote reading among prisoners. (3.36)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.32** The prison should introduce accredited vocational training in PE. (3.43)

Offender management and planning

- 5.33** HDC releases should be timely and delays due to late reports or administrative issues should be eliminated. (4.18)
- 5.34** All restricted ROTL cases should be managed by a CPO and a member of the probation team should always attend ROTL boards for restricted cases. (4.19)
- 5.35** The role of the public protection meeting should be reviewed and multidisciplinary attendance should be improved to ensure it is fully effective. (4.24)
- 5.36** MAPPA levels should be confirmed well ahead of a prisoner's release, including on ROTL. (4.25)
- 5.37** More should be done to ensure that indeterminate sentence prisoners build contact with families and friends prior to release. (4.30)

Reintegration planning

- 5.38** More should be done to enable prisoners to develop independent living skills, including those with indeterminate sentences. (4.36)
- 5.39** The NCS provider should record prisoner outcomes post-release so that it can better evaluate the effectiveness of the service. (4.43)

Housekeeping points

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.40** Violence reduction exit surveys for prisoners on release should be reintroduced. (1.18)

Discipline

- 5.41** Completed use of force paperwork should be quality assured and appropriate action taken where there are shortcomings. (1.52)

Health services

- 5.42** Health promotion and health care information should be available in a range of formats that are accessible to all prisoners. (2.59)
- 5.43** Barrier protection should be well advertised. (2.60)
- 5.44** Individuals with complex needs should have a care plan and progress notes should be audited. (2.69)
- 5.45** The reasons for prisoners' lack of attendance at external hospital appointments should be scrutinised more thoroughly. (2.70)
- 5.46** Old reference books should be discarded and only the most recent copy kept to ensure that any information used is up to date. (2.76)
- 5.47** The introduction of PGDs should be considered to enable the pharmacist and/or nurse to supply more potent medication to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.77)

Catering

- 5.48** All food trolleys should be cleaned to an acceptable standard. (2.94)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.49** Links between the OMU and the 'through-the-gate' team should be developed to improve regular and meaningful information exchange. (4.8)

Offender management and planning

- 5.50** Transfer checks should always be completed without delay and within a couple of days of arrival. (4.20)

Reintegration planning

- 5.51** Action should be taken to identify prisoners who do not receive any visits so that all men have the opportunity to stay in contact with family and friends. (4.56)

Examples of good practice

- 5.52** Lessons learned from complaints had led to changes in the process, which had improved the promptness and focus of responses. (2.39)
- 5.53** ROTL provided a large number of men with the opportunity to develop real work skills that would help them reintegrate into the community. (3.18)
- 5.54** The RAPt apprentice scheme enabled a serving prisoner to undertake training and become a paid, full-time member of the transitional support through-the-gate team. He worked both in the prison and in the community, and was due to continue working for RAPt post-release. (4.46)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Inspector
Tim McSweeney	Researcher
Rachel Prime	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher

Specialist inspectors

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Andrea Crosby-Josephs	Care Quality Commission inspector
Simon Denton	Pharmacist
Rieks Drijver	Ofsted inspector
Stephen Oliver-Watts	Ofsted inspector
Mark Shakleton	Ofsted inspector
Iolo Madoc-Jones	Offender management inspector
Ian Simpkins	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2011, many prisoners reported unfavourably on treatment by escort staff. Reception was generally well organised, with good involvement of peer workers, but first night procedures were weak. The induction process worked well. Many prisoners felt unsafe; this appeared to reflect uncertainty about their position in the prison. There were few violent incidents. The Listeners were effective but staff were insufficiently competent in the processes to support prisoners at risk of self-harm. Security was generally well managed but without a clear enough focus on the gathering and use of intelligence. Discipline was administered properly but issues arising from it needed clearer analysis. Clinical drug treatment was good, and illegal use of drugs was relatively low. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Clear reception and first night procedures should ensure that new arrivals are thoroughly assessed in private for risk of harm and vulnerability, provided with all they need to help them settle in and monitored on their first night. (HP53)

Achieved

Recommendations

The prison should provide written information about Standford Hill to feeder establishments, for distribution to those allocated to the prison. (1.5)

Partially achieved

Escort vans should arrive at the prison in time for prisoners to be allowed entry. (1.6)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.5)

Prisoners should be moved promptly to residential units once reception procedures have been completed. (1.13)

Achieved

The induction programme should include individual interviews to address prisoners' concerns about the establishment and issues of vulnerability. (1.20)

Achieved

Prisoners who are being monitored on suspicion of bullying should be set behavioural targets. (3.9)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.17)

There should be a strategy to improve the quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) practice which includes robust monitoring by managers and staff training. (3.18)

Achieved

Serious incidents of self-harm should be analysed by the safer custody committee, to identify improvements in the care of such prisoners. (3.19)

Achieved

The reduction in the number of security information reports should be further investigated and appropriate action taken if necessary. (7.8)

Not achieved

All strip-searching should be based on a risk assessment. (7.9)

Achieved

The integrated drug treatment system treatment room should be subject to an infection control audit and should not be used for non-treatment purposes. (3.41)

Achieved

The range of drugs covered by mandatory drug testing should be widened to include the most commonly diverted medications, including tramadol and gabapentin. (3.45)

Partially achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2011, the environment was mainly good, and some welcome improvements had been made to facilities. The incentives and earned privileges and personal officer schemes were not working well. Staff behaviour was appropriate but they did not engage sufficiently with prisoners. Food was, with reason, the focus of much discontent. Diversity work was carried out with commitment but there was not thorough coverage of all its aspects. Black and minority ethnic prisoners continued to be underrepresented among those working in the community. Older and foreign national prisoners received good support. Complaints were well handled and answered appropriately. Chaplaincy work was well integrated into the establishment's life. Health care provision had improved but there was an unacceptably long wait to see the dentist. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

Staff, especially on residential units, should take the initiative in interacting with prisoners, and managers should ensure that uniformed staff are able to prioritise supervision of and engagement with prisoners. (HP54)

Partially achieved

The imbalances between black and minority ethnic and white prisoner representation for release on temporary licence and the working-out scheme should be investigated, and action taken promptly in response to any findings. (HP55)

Not achieved

Recommendations

All prisoners should be told how to summon staff at all times of the day. (2.9)

Achieved

There should be adequate cooking facilities on each landing of A and B wings. (2.10)

Not achieved

Residential areas should be supervised effectively and breaches of prison regulations challenged. (2.11)

Achieved

Prisoners should have access to sufficient telephones. (2.12)

Achieved

The showers and toilets on A and B wings should be kept clean and in a good state of repair. (2.22)

Achieved

The use and recording of warnings under the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should be consistent. (7.30)

Achieved

Routine IEP reviews should take place as specified in the policy. (7.31)

Achieved

Managers should systematically check compliance and quality in the use of the IEP scheme. (7.32)

Not achieved

A more effective personal officer scheme should be implemented. (2.30)

Achieved

Managers should exercise effective oversight and quality assurance of the personal officer scheme. (2.31)

Partially achieved

Catering arrangements should ensure that food is served at the right temperature and fit to eat. (8.10)

Achieved

Serveries should be managed effectively and the equipment in them maintained properly. (8.11)

Achieved

Self-cook facilities should be provided on all wings. (8.12)

Partially achieved

Breakfast packs should be of adequate quality and should be issued on the day of consumption. (8.13)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should have access to the prison shop within 24 hours of arrival at the establishment. (8.20)

Not achieved

Prisoners' dissatisfaction with the range of goods available should be explored further and appropriate action taken to make improvements. (8.21)

Achieved

Information for prisoners displayed on noticeboards should be in a range of appropriate languages. (4.15)

Not achieved

The improvements and adjustments identified in the prison disability survey should be implemented. (4.20)

No longer relevant

Prisoners over 65 should not have monies deducted for their television rental. (4.21)

Not achieved

Information on support networks for prisoners who identify as gay/bisexual or transgender should be publicised, alongside a statement declaring a zero-tolerance approach to discrimination based on sexual orientation. (4.24)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should receive a response to an application within seven days and this should be recorded. (3.27)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.7)

An analysis of complaints should be used to identify improvements to be made to the regime. (3.28)

Achieved

There should be dedicated ablution facilities for Muslim prisoners. (3.37)

Not achieved

All prisoners should be screened for learning difficulties on arrival. (5.8)

Achieved

Staff should be trained in the use of automatic external defibrillators (AEDs). AEDs should be cleaned and checked regularly, and a record should be kept of such checks. (5.20)

Achieved

The log of informally resolved prisoner issues should be linked to the formal complaints system. (5.21)

No longer relevant

The door to the pharmacy room should be kept locked at all times, unless access is required. (5.40)

Achieved

Standard operating procedures should have clear implementation and review dates, and evidence should be kept to show that staff have received training on those relevant to their roles. (5.41)

Achieved

Prescribing data should be used to demonstrate value for money, promote effective medicines management and check trends in the prescribing of divertible medications. (5.42)

Achieved

The waiting time to see the dentist should be assertively managed, to achieve equivalence to the primary care trust target (PCT) for dental services waiting time in the community. (5.49)

Partially achieved

Generic counselling services should be provided. (5.56)

Partially achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2011, there was good freedom of movement, except for most prisoners in the evening. The management of learning and skills was satisfactory, although closer links were needed with the prison industries. There were sufficient work places but not all with an appropriate resettlement function. The pay structure was confusing. Working out was well managed, although there were signs that the Prisoners' Earnings Act was having an adverse impact. There was insufficient accredited learning, and little recognition and recording of employability skills, in the industry workshops. Teaching and learning in education classes was generally satisfactory. There was insufficient motivation for prisoners to complete level 1 qualifications before working in the community. The range of qualifications available through the PE staff was good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

In individual cases, governors should have greater discretion to authorise the deduction of legitimate travel expenses from the net weekly earnings figure used for calculating the levy due under the Prisoners' Earnings Act. (HP56)

Achieved

The prison should increase the number of vocational training places and ensure that the training is linked to resettlement needs. (HP57)

Achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should be provided with more structured activity during association periods. (6.6)

Achieved

Quality improvement processes should be fully established, to ensure that the highest quality of learning and skills is available. (6.12)

Partially achieved

The prison should ensure that prisoners below level 1 for literacy and numeracy should be prioritised and supported to develop appropriate skills before engaging in employment in external work or in prison industry workshops. (6.14)

Achieved

The prison should ensure that employability skills developed in the workshops, working out and work placements are effectively recorded and formally recognised. (6.20)

Not achieved

The pay structure should be revised and ensure that those attending education are not disadvantaged. (6.21)

Achieved

The prison should improve the industrial cleaning training environment and provide sufficient training to ensure that all wing cleaners are qualified and that sufficient opportunities are available to deliver training to higher levels. (6.24)

Partially achieved

The prison should improve the quality of teaching delivered to learners and provide opportunities to share best practice and ensure that teaching and learning is of the highest quality. (6.31)

Partially achieved

Teachers should be provided with sufficient access to information technology to provide appropriate education sessions. (6.32)

Achieved

The prison should better coordinate the planning of education and training for individual prisoners, to enhance their employment opportunities while in prison. (6.33)

Achieved

The results from literacy and numeracy assessments should be used more effectively to plan individual learning. (6.34)

Achieved

The prison should broaden and embed the education provision to focus more on resettlement opportunities and should ensure that the English for speakers of other languages provision meets the needs of those requiring support. (6.35)

No longer relevant

The prison should develop further links between the library and education and training departments, to improve the promotion of learning and skills. (6.40)

Partially achieved

A budgetary and usage plan should be instigated, to ensure that items of gym equipment are replaced at appropriate intervals before they fail. (6.47)

Achieved

Additional employment qualifications should be introduced for prisoners to train as gym instructors. (6.48)

Not achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2011, there was not a prison-wide focus on resettlement. Management of the resettlement function was not coordinated; in particular, offender management was not well linked to practical resettlement work. Offender supervisors concentrated on the minority who were on indeterminate sentences or in scope for offender management. Public protection was well managed locally but omissions by offender managers were not followed up. Needs for support on housing and financial issues were well identified and met. Opportunities to prepare for work and learning after release were reasonable but not sufficiently comprehensive. Lack of internet access was a major barrier to effective resettlement. Those with drug problems were well supported by the counselling, assessment, referral, advice and throughcare (CARAT) service but there was no alcohol programme. Visits provision was reasonable but family days were the only active support given to family life. There was almost no access to offending behaviour work. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

Senior managers should draw up and implement a strategy for a whole-prison focus on resettlement, including close links between offender management and delivery of the resettlement pathways. (HP58)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

There should be a single overarching resettlement strategy, based on a recent needs analysis. (9.6)

Achieved

Information from induction passports should be used to influence resettlement service provision. (9.7)

No longer relevant

All prisoners should have an initial review of sentence plans on arrival and be supported by planned contact with offender supervisors. (9.15)

Achieved

Offender supervisor managers should be trained and supported to ensure adequate quality control of offender assessment system (OASys) reviews. (9.16)

Achieved

All relevant staff should be able to access comprehensive offender management records. (9.17)

Achieved

Prisoners should be fully involved in the timely review of their sentence plans and in setting appropriate objectives. (9.18)

Achieved

Issues with missing or inadequate assessments and plans should be immediately challenged with the relevant probation trust. (9.24)

Not achieved

Risk management plans should describe how objectives in the sentence plan will address risk of harm issues and protect actual and potential victims, taking into account the risks that the prisoner poses while in custody. (9.25)

Not achieved

Release dates for prisoners eligible for multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) should be monitored by the prison to ensure that all such prisoners are identified to the relevant MAPPAs at least six months before release. (9.26)

Not achieved

The risk of harm assessment should be thoroughly reviewed on reception and updated when required. (9.27)

Partially achieved

There should be effective management oversight of offender supervisors' contributions to public protection and child protection work. (9.28)

Partially achieved

Specific family days for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) should be introduced. (9.30)

Not achieved

The poor perception of support services for ISPs should be explored and remedial action taken. (9.31)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should be allowed regulated access to the internet for resettlement purposes. (9.38)

Achieved

The careers information and advice service provided by Tribal should ensure that all prisoners are given exit interviews before release. (9.39)

Achieved

The prison should provide better access to Jobcentre Plus support for those working out. (9.40)

Achieved

Specialist finance advice should be made available. (9.48)

Achieved

Training in budget management and general finance should be provided. (9.49)

Achieved

The drug and alcohol strategy should be reviewed to include issues specifically faced by Stanford Hill as an open prison, including the policy and procedures for alcohol breath testing. (9.58)

Achieved

A therapeutic alcohol programme should be reintroduced. (9.59)

Not achieved

The principle of weekly compact-based drug testing of prisoners on methadone should be subject to regular risk assessment and review. (9.60)

Achieved

The visitors waiting room should open at least one hour before the advertised start time of visits. (9.67)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be offered the opportunity to undertake courses to improve parental skills and relationships. (9.68)

Not achieved

An appropriate number of offending behaviour courses should be provided to meet the identified needs of prisoners. (9.73)

Achieved

Appendix III: Care Quality Commission Requirement Notice



Requirement Notices

Provider : Kent Community Health NHS Foundation Trust

Registered Location: Dental Department, HMP Sheppey Cluster, Standford Hill, Church Road, Eastchurch, Sheerness, Kent, ME12 4DZ.

Location ID: RYYY4

Regulated activities: Treatment of disease, disorder, or injury, Diagnostic and screening and Surgical procedures.

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the regulations that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action it is going to take to meet these regulations following the publication of the inspection report.

Diagnostic and screening procedures

Treatment of disease, disorder, or injury

Surgical Procedures

We found that the registered provider had not assessed the risk of, or prevented, detected or controlled the spread of infections. This was in breach of regulation 12(2)(a)(b)(d)(e)(h) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

Summary of evidence:

The dental suite including the decontamination room was not clinically clean. We found no evidence that an infection control audit had been completed; HTM05-01 guidance recommends these should be completed every 6 months. Neither room had sealed floors. The decontamination room was not being used for this sole purpose exacerbating the risk of the spread of infection. There were a number of extraneous items including a filing cabinet, coffee jar, plastic cups, old files not related to dentistry, and photocopy paper. There were also unidentified bottles and containers in both rooms and old appointment lists and a patient prescription had been left on the surface of the decontamination room.

Requirement Notices

Provider :Integrated Care 24 Limited

Registered Location : HMP Stanford Hill, Church Road, Eastchurch, Sheerness, Kent ME12 4AA.

Location ID :1-442775364

Regulated activity : Diagnostic and screening procedures

Action we have told the provider to take

The table below shows the regulations that were not being met. The provider must send CQC a report that says what action it is going to take to meet these regulations following the publication of the inspection report.

Diagnostic Screening and Procedure	We found that the registered provider had not mitigated or identified the risks relating to the health, safety and welfare of service users and others who may be at risk. This is in breach of regulation 17 (2)(b) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.
Treatment of disease, disorder or injury	

Summary of evidence:

The dentist decontamination room is being used by IC24 staff for non-dental activity as a result of this there is a risk of infection and cross contamination.

Appendix IV: 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	0	450	99
Recall	0	6	1
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	
Remand	0	0	
Civil prisoners	0	0	
Detainees	0	0	
Total	0	456	100%

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced			
Less than 6 months			
6 months to less than 12 months		1	0.2
12 months to less than 2 years		5	1
2 years to less than 4 years		42	9
4 years to less than 10 years		224	49
10 years and over (not life)		81	18
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)		48	11
Life		55	12
Total		456	100%

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 21		
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	96	21
30 years to 39 years	154	34
40 years to 49 years	106	23
50 years to 59 years	79	17
60 years to 69 years	18	4
70 plus years	3	1
Please state maximum age here: 85		
Total	456	100%

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British		448	98
Foreign nationals		8	2
Total		456	

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	0	0
Uncategorised sentenced	0	0	0
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	0	0
Category C	0	0	0
Category D	0	456	100
Other	0	0	0
Total		456	100%

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British		253	55.5
Irish		2	0.4
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		7	1.5
Other white		15	3.3
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean		11	2.4
White and black African		2	0.4
White and Asian		2	0.4
Other mixed		6	1.3
Asian or Asian British			
Indian		19	4.2
Pakistani		11	2.4
Bangladeshi		7	1.5
Chinese		0	0
Other Asian		14	3.1
Black or black British			
Caribbean		58	12.7
African		31	6.8
Other black		12	2.6
Other ethnic group			
Arab		1	0.2
Other ethnic group		4	0.9
Not stated		1	0.2
Total		456	100%

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		1	0.2
Church of England		113	24.8
Roman Catholic		77	16.9
Other Christian denominations		58	12.7
Muslim		77	16.9
Sikh		9	2
Hindu		7	1.5
Buddhist		12	2.6
Jewish		6	1.3
Other		8	1.8
No religion		88	19.3
Total		456	100%

Other demographics	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)		4	1
Total		4	1%

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			35	7.7
1 month to 3 months			74	16.2
3 months to 6 months			94	20.6
6 months to 1 year			144	31.6
1 year to 2 years			104	22.8
2 years to 4 years			5	1.1
4 years or more			0	0
Total			456	100%

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry		0	0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/ restrictions).		212 Restricted ROTL Prisoners	46.5
Total		212	46.5%

Unsentenced prisoners only

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

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		121	26.5
Sexual offences		0	0
Burglary		30	6.5
Robbery		59	13
Theft and handling		11	2.5
Fraud and forgery		41	9
Drugs offences		156	34
Other offences		32	7
Civil offences		0	0
Offence not recorded /holding warrant		2	0.5
Total		452	99%

Appendix V: 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.¹² 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 29 June 2015 the prisoner population at HMP Standford Hill was 455. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 223 prisoners¹³.

We received a total of 176 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 79%. No questionnaires were completed via interview. Two respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 36 questionnaires were not returned and nine were returned blank.

¹² 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.

¹³ Surveys were not distributed to three prisoners who were on ROR on the day of the survey.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
A	76
B	73
C	27

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Stanford Hill.

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 significant¹⁴ differences are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Stanford Hill in 2015 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 14 open prisons since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMP Stanford Hill in 2015 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Stanford Hill in 2011.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between the C wing and the two remaining wings (A and B wings).

¹⁴ 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

Q1.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See shortened methodology		
Q1.2	How old are you?		
	Under 21	1	(1%)
	21 - 29.....	35	(20%)
	30 - 39.....	54	(31%)
	40 - 49.....	40	(23%)
	50 - 59.....	36	(20%)
	60 - 69.....	9	(5%)
	70 and over.....	1	(1%)
Q1.3	Are you on recall?		
	Yes	2	(1%)
	No	159	(99%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?		
	Less than 6 months.....	0	(0%)
	6 months to less than 1 year	1	(1%)
	1 year to less than 2 years	4	(2%)
	2 years to less than 4 years	18	(10%)
	4 years to less than 10 years.....	87	(50%)
	10 years or more.....	29	(17%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection).....	18	(10%)
	Life.....	18	(10%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)		
	Yes	2	(1%)
	No.....	174	(99%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?		
	Yes	174	(99%)
	No.....	1	(1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?		
	Yes	176	(100%)
	No.....	0	(0%)
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	87 (51%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 2 (1%)
	White - Irish	2 (1%)	Asian or Asian British - other
	White - other.....	10 (6%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean 5 (3%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	27 (16%)	Mixed race - white and black African... 1 (1%)
	Black or black British - African.....	12 (7%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 0 (0%)
	Black or black British - other	2 (1%)	Mixed race - other
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	4 (2%)	Arab
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	5 (3%)	Other ethnic group..... 4 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	6 (4%)	

Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes	4 (2%)	
	No.....	163 (98%)	
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	42 (24%)	Hindu..... 1 (1%)
	Church of England	51 (29%)	Jewish..... 1 (1%)
	Catholic	25 (14%)	Muslim..... 30 (17%)
	Protestant.....	4 (2%)	Sikh
	Other Christian denomination	9 (5%)	Other
	Buddhist.....	5 (3%)	3 (2%)
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight	170 (99%)	
	Homosexual/Gay.....	1 (1%)	
	Bisexual.....	1 (1%)	
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	14 (8%)	
	No.....	160 (92%)	
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes	5 (3%)	
	No.....	165 (97%)	
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes	88 (50%)	
	No.....	87 (50%)	
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes	95 (54%)	
	No.....	80 (46%)	

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	80 (45%)	
	2 hours or longer	85 (48%)	
	Don't remember	11 (6%)	
Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?		
	My journey was less than two hours	80 (47%)	
	Yes	78 (45%)	
	No.....	11 (6%)	
	Don't remember	3 (2%)	
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?		
	My journey was less than two hours	80 (46%)	
	Yes	10 (6%)	
	No.....	80 (46%)	
	Don't remember	4 (2%)	

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	112 (64%)
	No.....	48 (27%)
	Don't remember	15 (9%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	147 (84%)
	No.....	20 (11%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	55 (32%)
	Well.....	73 (42%)
	Neither.....	28 (16%)
	Badly.....	5 (3%)
	Very badly	3 (2%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
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	135 (78%)
	Yes, I received written information	37 (21%)
	No, I was not told anything	7 (4%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	153 (88%)
	No.....	19 (11%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	121 (70%)
	2 hours or longer	39 (23%)
	Don't remember	13 (8%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	146 (86%)
	No	14 (8%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	48 (28%)
	Well.....	78 (45%)
	Neither.....	25 (14%)
	Badly.....	11 (6%)
	Very badly.....	10 (6%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)

Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	21 (13%)	<i>Physical health</i> 16 (10%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	14 (9%)	<i>Mental health</i> 5 (3%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	10 (6%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 25 (15%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other</i> 7 (4%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	13 (8%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> 99 (60%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	4 (2%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	<i>Yes</i>	20 (12%)	
	<i>No</i>	47 (28%)	
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>	99 (60%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>	100 (58%)	
	<i>A shower</i>	62 (36%)	
	<i>A free telephone call</i>	54 (31%)	
	<i>Something to eat</i>	97 (56%)	
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>	133 (77%)	
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	110 (64%)	
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>	13 (8%)	
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>	101 (60%)	
	<i>Someone from health services</i>	129 (77%)	
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	74 (44%)	
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>	40 (24%)	
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>	20 (12%)	
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	108 (66%)	
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	75 (46%)	
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	84 (52%)	
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	87 (53%)	
	<i>Health services</i>	107 (66%)	
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>	97 (60%)	
	<i>Not offered any information</i>	28 (17%)	
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	<i>Yes</i>	161 (96%)	
	<i>No</i>	6 (4%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)	
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?		
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	15 (9%)	
	<i>Within the first week</i>	146 (85%)	
	<i>More than a week</i>	5 (3%)	
	<i>Don't remember</i>	5 (3%)	

Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Yes</i>	106 (63%)
	<i>No</i>	39 (23%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (5%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	107 (64%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	22 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	23 (14%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	23 (14%)	37 (22%)	26 (16%)	16 (10%)	13 (8%)	50 (30%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	12 (8%)	34 (24%)	19 (13%)	8 (6%)	8 (6%)	62 (43%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	<i>Not had any letters</i>						54 (33%)
	<i>Yes</i>						45 (27%)
	<i>No</i>						67 (40%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	<i>Yes</i>						60 (36%)
	<i>No</i>						11 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>						95 (57%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	168 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	116 (70%)	30 (18%)	19 (12%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	152 (92%)	13 (8%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	122 (73%)	44 (26%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	77 (48%)	33 (20%)	51 (32%)			
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	<i>Very good</i>						2 (1%)
	<i>Good</i>						27 (16%)
	<i>Neither</i>						37 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i>						51 (31%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						50 (30%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>						3 (2%)
	<i>Yes</i>						84 (50%)
	<i>No</i>						82 (49%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?						
	<i>Yes</i>						102 (61%)
	<i>No</i>						1 (1%)
	<i>Don't know</i>						65 (39%)

Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	86 (52%)
	No.....	24 (14%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	56 (34%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	112 (67%)
	No.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	49 (29%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend	40 (24%)
	Very easy.....	60 (36%)
	Easy.....	29 (17%)
	Neither.....	9 (5%)
	Difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Don't know.....	22 (13%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	143 (85%)
	No	16 (9%)
	Don't know	10 (6%)
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?	14 (9%) 92 (57%) 56 (35%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	14 (9%) 60 (39%) 79 (52%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	97 (58%)
	No	19 (11%)
	Don't know	52 (31%)
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?	86 (52%) 25 (15%) 53 (32%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	86 (54%) 26 (16%) 47 (30%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	23 (15%)
	No.....	129 (85%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	Don't know who they are.....	27 (17%)
	Very easy.....	36 (23%)
	Easy.....	41 (26%)
	Neither.....	41 (26%)
	Difficult.....	10 (6%)
	Very difficult.....	2 (1%)

Section 6: Relationships with staff

Q6.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	126 (76%)
	No	40 (24%)
Q6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	125 (78%)
	No	35 (22%)
Q6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	69 (42%)
	No	96 (58%)
Q6.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	5 (3%)
	Never	56 (34%)
	Rarely	31 (19%)
	Some of the time	50 (30%)
	Most of the time	14 (8%)
	All of the time	9 (5%)
Q6.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	38 (23%)
	In the first week	50 (30%)
	More than a week	58 (35%)
	Don't remember	22 (13%)
Q6.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her	38 (23%)
	Very helpful	51 (30%)
	Helpful	37 (22%)
	Neither	19 (11%)
	Not very helpful	15 (9%)
	Not at all helpful	8 (5%)

Section 7: Safety

Q7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	24 (14%)
	No	143 (86%)
Q7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	9 (5%)
	No	158 (95%)
Q7.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	143 (88%)
	Everywhere	2 (1%)
	Association areas	6 (4%)
	Reception area	3 (2%)
	At the gym	3 (2%)
	In an exercise yard	2 (1%)
	At work	2 (1%)
	During movement	1 (1%)
	At education	0 (0%)
	At meal times	3 (2%)
	At health services	2 (1%)
	Visits area	1 (1%)
	In wing showers	3 (2%)
	In gym showers	1 (1%)
	In corridors/stairwells	3 (2%)
	On your landing/wing	9 (6%)
	In your cell	2 (1%)
	At religious services	1 (1%)

Q7.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	17 (10%)
	No.....	149 (90%)
Q7.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Medication</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	1 (1%)
Q7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	37 (23%)
	No.....	126 (77%)
Q7.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Medication</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Debt</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your age</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>You have a disability</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i>	0 (0%)
Q7.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	<i>Not been victimised</i>	120 (77%)
	<i>Yes</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>No</i>	28 (18%)

Section 8: Health services

Q8.1	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	10 (6%)	21 (13%)	56 (35%)	17 (10%)	38 (23%)	20 (12%)
	The nurse	7 (4%)	39 (24%)	70 (44%)	23 (14%)	15 (9%)	6 (4%)
	The dentist	36 (23%)	10 (6%)	19 (12%)	10 (6%)	40 (25%)	45 (28%)
Q8.2	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	16 (10%)	19 (12%)	53 (34%)	27 (17%)	26 (16%)	17 (11%)
	The nurse	6 (4%)	31 (20%)	64 (41%)	27 (17%)	16 (10%)	11 (7%)
	The dentist	56 (36%)	10 (6%)	24 (16%)	19 (12%)	24 (16%)	21 (14%)
Q8.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						4 (3%)
	<i>Very good</i>						18 (11%)
	<i>Good</i>						60 (38%)
	<i>Neither</i>						27 (17%)
	<i>Bad</i>						29 (18%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						20 (13%)
Q8.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes						77 (47%)
	No						86 (53%)
Q8.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?						
	<i>Not taking medication</i>						86 (53%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						70 (43%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						7 (4%)
	<i>No</i>						0 (0%)
Q8.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes						16 (10%)
	No						145 (90%)
Q8.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison? (e.g psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff).						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>						145 (91%)
	Yes						8 (5%)
	No						7 (4%)

Section 9: Drugs and alcohol

Q9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	14 (9%)
	No	150 (91%)
Q9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	8 (5%)
	No	156 (95%)

Q9.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	42 (26%)
	Easy.....	12 (7%)
	Neither.....	6 (4%)
	Difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	0 (0%)
	Don't know.....	98 (61%)
Q9.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	18 (11%)
	Easy.....	7 (4%)
	Neither.....	10 (6%)
	Difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (2%)
	Don't know.....	119 (74%)
Q9.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	3 (2%)
	No.....	161 (98%)
Q9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	2 (1%)
	No.....	161 (99%)
Q9.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem.....	147 (91%)
	Yes.....	11 (7%)
	No.....	3 (2%)
Q9.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....	156 (96%)
	Yes.....	6 (4%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
Q9.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help.....	148 (93%)
	Yes.....	10 (6%)
	No.....	2 (1%)

Section 10: Activities

Q10.1	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	12 (7%)	65 (39%)	70 (42%)	5 (3%)	12 (7%)	3 (2%)
	Vocational or skills training	25 (16%)	39 (25%)	55 (35%)	13 (8%)	17 (11%)	7 (4%)
	Education (including basic skills)	16 (10%)	57 (37%)	65 (42%)	11 (7%)	5 (3%)	2 (1%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	57 (37%)	18 (12%)	41 (26%)	19 (12%)	15 (10%)	6 (4%)
Q10.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	Not involved in any of these.....						32 (20%)
	Prison job.....						99 (62%)
	Vocational or skills training.....						32 (20%)
	Education (including basic skills).....						34 (21%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....						9 (6%)

Q10.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	7 (5%)	58 (42%)	64 (46%)	10 (7%)
	Vocational or skills training	19 (14%)	74 (56%)	24 (18%)	16 (12%)
	Education (including basic skills)	11 (9%)	72 (57%)	32 (25%)	12 (9%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	24 (21%)	42 (36%)	34 (29%)	17 (15%)
Q10.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				24 (15%)
	<i>Never</i>				23 (14%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>				50 (31%)
	<i>About once a week</i>				37 (23%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>				29 (18%)
Q10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				35 (21%)
	<i>Yes</i>				69 (42%)
	<i>No</i>				61 (37%)
Q10.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				9 (6%)
	<i>0</i>				27 (17%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				31 (19%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				53 (33%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				42 (26%)
Q10.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				6 (4%)
	<i>0</i>				8 (5%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				25 (15%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				39 (24%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				85 (52%)
Q10.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				3 (2%)
	<i>0</i>				4 (2%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				14 (9%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				9 (6%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				133 (82%)
Q10.9	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>				1 (1%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>				6 (4%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>				6 (4%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>				12 (7%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>				25 (15%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>				101 (62%)
	<i>Don't know</i>				12 (7%)

Section 11: Contact with family and friends

Q11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	83 (52%)
	<i>No</i>	78 (48%)

Q11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	32 (20%)
	No.....	132 (80%)
Q11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	16 (10%)
	No.....	148 (90%)
Q11.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	30 (19%)
	<i>Easy</i>	43 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	31 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	21 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (2%)

Section 12: Preparation for release

Q12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	Yes	155 (95%)
	No.....	9 (5%)
Q12.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have an offender manager/ NA</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>No contact</i>	24 (15%)
	<i>Letter</i>	50 (31%)
	<i>Phone</i>	83 (52%)
	<i>Visit</i>	69 (43%)
Q12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	160 (98%)
	No.....	4 (2%)
Q12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	Yes	146 (85%)
	No.....	25 (15%)
Q12.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	55 (34%)
	<i>Involved</i>	51 (32%)
	<i>Neither</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	6 (4%)
Q12.6	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</i>	25 (16%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	35 (22%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	81 (51%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	49 (31%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	23 (14%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	23 (14%)

Q12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	25	(16%)	
	Yes	110	(69%)	
	No.....	8	(5%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	17	(11%)	
Q12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	25	(16%)	
	Yes	15	(9%)	
	No.....	104	(65%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	15	(9%)	
Q12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan</i>	25	(15%)	
	Yes	75	(46%)	
	No.....	45	(28%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	17	(10%)	
Q12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes	15	(9%)	
	No.....	88	(55%)	
	<i>Don't know</i>	56	(35%)	
Q12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes	63	(40%)	
	No.....	96	(60%)	
Q12.12	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>	Yes	No
	Employment	49 (31%)	59 (37%)	50 (32%)
	Accommodation	52 (34%)	43 (28%)	56 (37%)
	Benefits	51 (34%)	48 (32%)	51 (34%)
	Finances	56 (38%)	33 (22%)	59 (40%)
	Education	57 (39%)	50 (34%)	40 (27%)
	Drugs and alcohol	67 (47%)	42 (29%)	34 (24%)
Q12.13	Have you been provided with information on the following? (please tick all that apply to you.)			
			Yes	No
	Resettlement day release		131 (80%)	32 (20%)
	Resettlement overnight release		123 (77%)	36 (23%)
Q12.14	Have you had access to the following? (please tick all that apply to you.)			
			Yes	No
	Resettlement day release		113 (72%)	45 (28%)
	Resettlement overnight release		79 (52%)	74 (48%)
	Special purpose leave		67 (47%)	77 (53%)

Q12.15 Please answer the following questions on your preparation for release?

	Yes	No
Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here	50 (30%)	114 (70%)
Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility, freedom e.t.c.)	53 (33%)	110 (67%)
Do you feel you have been given a greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions	131 (81%)	31 (19%)
Have you been on a preparation for release course	30 (18%)	133 (82%)
Is this prison near your home area or intended release address	81 (51%)	79 (49%)
Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here that will make you less likely to offend in the future	101 (64%)	56 (36%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Stanford Hill 2015

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

Key to tables

		HMP Stanford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Stanford Hill 2015	HMP Stanford Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		176	1881	176	148
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	1%	1%	1%	0%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	3%	1%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	1%	3%	1%	6%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	10%	11%	10%	8%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	1%	3%	1%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%	99%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	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.)	42%	27%	42%	44%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	4%	2%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	12%	17%	15%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	3%	1%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	8%	12%	8%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	8%	3%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	50%	53%	50%	57%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	54%	53%	54%	56%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	48%	47%	48%	54%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	85%	80%	85%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	10%	11%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	64%	68%	64%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	85%	84%	85%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	79%	74%	57%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	78%	81%	78%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	21%	13%	21%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	92%	88%	94%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	70%	71%	70%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Standford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Standford Hill 2015	HMP Standford Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	87%	86%	80%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	73%	80%	73%	64%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	40%	42%	40%	48%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	13%	9%	13%	10%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9%	8%	9%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	2%	2%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	6%	11%	6%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	1%	0%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	8%	11%	8%	13%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	2%	4%	2%	9%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	10%	8%	10%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	3%	5%	3%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	1%	1%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	15%	10%	15%	15%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	30%	44%	30%	
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	58%	56%	58%	85%
3.6	A shower?	36%	36%	36%	49%
3.6	A free telephone call?	31%	45%	31%	40%
3.6	Something to eat?	56%	50%	56%	68%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	77%	57%	77%	
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	64%	39%	64%	
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?	60%	57%	60%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	77%	73%	77%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	44%	39%	44%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	24%	30%	24%	8%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	66%	67%	66%	47%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	46%	45%	46%	37%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Standford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Standford Hill 2015	HMP Standford Hill 2011
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
3.8	How to make routine requests?	52%	56%	52%	44%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	53%	57%	53%	50%
3.8	Health services?	66%	64%	66%	58%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	60%	56%	60%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	96%	89%	96%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	95%	91%	95%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	69%	72%	69%	68%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	91%	85%	91%	
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?	36%	64%	36%	57%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	32%	51%	32%	46%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	27%	26%	27%	33%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	36%	49%	36%	
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%	100%	99%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	70%	71%	70%	84%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	92%	61%	92%	87%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	73%	77%	73%	75%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	48%	41%	48%	53%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	17%	41%	17%	10%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	50%	50%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	60%	61%	56%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	54%	52%	63%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	66%	67%	66%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	53%	54%	53%	
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	85%	86%	85%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	62%	72%	62%	71%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	43%	62%	43%	65%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	52%	58%	

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Standford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Standford Hill 2015	HMP Standford Hill 2011
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
For those who have made a complaint:					
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	32%	44%	32%	33%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	35%	46%	35%	50%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	15%	17%	15%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	49%	34%	49%	46%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff					
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	76%	76%	63%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	78%	76%	78%	58%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	42%	30%	42%	
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	18%	14%	7%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	78%	73%	78%	43%
For those with a personal officer:					
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	68%	70%	68%	59%
SECTION 7: Safety					
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	14%	20%	14%	20%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	5%	8%	5%	10%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	10%	16%	10%	6%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:					
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	2%	6%	2%	3%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	1%	1%	2%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	5%	9%	5%	
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	1%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%	0%	
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	1%	2%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	2%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	1%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	2%	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	1%	0%	1%	
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	1%	0%	1%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Standford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Standford Hill 2015	HMP Standford Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	1%	2%	1%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	3%	2%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	1%	1%	1%
SECTION 7: Safety continued					
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	23%	22%	23%	21%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	7%	8%	11%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	10%	9%	
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	1%	2%	
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	2%	6%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	2%	5%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	1%	3%	
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	1%	3%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	1%	4%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%	2%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	3%	6%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	2%	4%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%	0%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	22%	22%	22%	31%
SECTION 8: Health services					
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	48%	53%	48%	27%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	68%	72%	68%	67%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	18%	27%	18%	11%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Standford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Standford Hill 2015	HMP Standford Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
8.2	The doctor?	51%	66%	51%	58%
8.2	The nurse?	64%	76%	64%	52%
8.2	The dentist?	35%	55%	35%	31%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	51%	65%	51%	33%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	45%	47%	47%
	For those currently taking medication:				
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	98%	100%	
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	10%	14%	10%	11%
	For those who have problems:				
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	54%	55%	54%	
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol					
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	9%	11%	9%	11%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	5%	11%	5%	9%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	34%	37%	34%	19%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	16%	23%	16%	
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	2%	2%	2%	3%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	1%	2%	1%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	78%	75%	78%	
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	84%	82%	84%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
9.9	Was the support helpful?	84%	89%	84%	95%
SECTION 10: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
10.1	A prison job?	81%	78%	81%	
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	60%	58%	60%	
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	78%	72%	78%	
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	38%	33%	38%	
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
10.2	A prison job?	62%	72%	62%	77%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	20%	17%	20%	16%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	21%	22%	21%	24%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Standford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Standford Hill 2015	HMP Standford Hill 2011
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	6%	5%	6%	4%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	95%	94%	95%	91%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	44%	46%	44%	38%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	86%	81%	86%	71%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	65%	64%	65%	58%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	92%	84%	92%	81%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	62%	63%	62%	65%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	80%	69%	80%	69%
	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?	45%	49%	45%	36%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	41%	54%	41%	62%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	42%	62%	42%	
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	59%	51%	59%	64%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	76%	76%	76%	71%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	82%	77%	82%	89%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	62%	56%	62%	34%
SECTION 11: Friends and family					
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	52%	53%	52%	48%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	20%	20%	20%	35%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	10%	12%	10%	20%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	45%	37%	45%	
SECTION 12: Preparation for release					
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	95%	93%	95%	
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:				
12.2	No contact?	16%	16%	16%	
12.2	Contact by letter?	33%	41%	33%	
12.2	Contact by phone?	55%	57%	55%	
12.2	Contact by visit?	46%	41%	46%	
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	98%	82%	98%	
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	85%	76%	85%	78%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		HMP Standford Hill 2015	Open prisons comparator	HMP Standford Hill 2015	HMP Standford Hill 2011
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
For those with a sentence plan:					
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	78%	72%	78%	62%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
12.6	nobody?	26%	32%	26%	
12.6	Offender supervisor?	61%	51%	61%	
12.6	Offender manager?	37%	39%	37%	
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	17%	20%	17%	
12.6	Staff from other departments?	17%	21%	17%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	81%	71%	81%	75%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	11%	13%	11%	
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	55%	48%	55%	
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	10%	7%	10%	
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	40%	33%	40%	15%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
12.12	Employment?	54%	55%	54%	
12.12	Accommodation?	43%	52%	43%	
12.12	Benefits?	48%	51%	48%	
12.12	Finances?	36%	45%	36%	
12.12	Education?	56%	55%	56%	
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	55%	59%	55%	
Have you been provided with information on the following:					
12.13	Resettlement day release?	80%	76%	80%	
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	77%	74%	77%	
Have you had access to the following:					
12.14	Resettlement day release?	72%	65%	72%	
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	52%	57%	52%	
12.14	Special purpose leave?	47%	34%	47%	
Please answer the following about your preparation for release:					
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	31%	26%	31%	13%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	33%	30%	33%	17%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	81%	80%	81%	72%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	19%	19%	19%	11%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	51%	45%	51%	46%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	64%	62%	64%	47%

Diversity analysis



Key Question Responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Stanford Hill 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	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		72	99	30	143
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	0%	0%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	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.)			90%	31%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	2%	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	39%	3%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	6%	13%	7%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	5%	0%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	46%	54%	48%	51%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	76%	70%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	71%	82%	77%	78%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	91%	87%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	77%	64%	75%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	51%	33%	50%	37%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	79%	74%	78%	76%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	94%	98%	96%	96%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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				
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	87%	96%	87%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	34%	38%	46%	34%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%	100%	100%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	16%	19%	23%	17%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	58%	31%	54%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	55%	64%	59%	61%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	53%	53%	52%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	70%	64%	79%	64%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	73%	92%	72%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	50%	62%	59%	58%
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	68%	82%	55%	80%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	74%	80%	65%	81%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	12%	16%	17%	14%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	76%	78%	72%	79%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	20%	11%	17%	14%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	4%	4%	6%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	15%	5%	17%	9%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	6%	3%	4%	5%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	0%	4%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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				
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	5%	0%	7%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	0%	0%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	2%	0%	4%	0%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	39%	11%	43%	19%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	18%	2%	18%	7%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	14%	1%	11%	5%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	11%	1%	14%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	8%	0%	4%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	5%	0%	7%	1%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	50%	46%	39%	49%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	68%	68%	56%	71%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	45%	47%	48%	47%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	9%	10%	7%	11%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	23%	40%	19%	36%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	62%	61%	71%	60%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	24%	18%	36%	17%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	24%	20%	25%	20%
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	6%	7%	5%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White 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				
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	38%	41%	28%	43%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	71%	50%	86%	53%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	67%	81%	82%	74%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	74%	86%	86%	81%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	47%	74%	47%	65%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	22%	19%	31%	17%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	10%	10%	7%	11%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:				
12.12	Resettlement day release?	82%	80%	79%	82%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	76%	79%	73%	79%
	Have you had access to the following:				
12.13	Resettlement day release?	74%	71%	68%	73%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	52%	53%	49%	53%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	41%	51%	32%	50%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:				
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	31%	31%	28%	32%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	34%	31%	28%	34%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	74%	86%	68%	85%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	25%	14%	25%	17%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	36%	64%	36%	55%

Wing analysis



Prisoner survey responses (wing analysis) HMP Stanford Hill 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	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		27	149
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	1%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	7%	11%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
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.	27%	45%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	14%	18%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	0%	10%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	54%	50%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	41%	57%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	44%	49%
	For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:		
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	77%	86%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	11%
2.4	Was the van clean?	67%	63%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	93%	83%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	77%	73%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	81%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	19%	22%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	89%	88%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	77%	69%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	93%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	72%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	24%	43%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	4%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	4%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	4%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	4%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	4%	2%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	4%	11%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	0%	4%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	8%	17%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	33%	30%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	49%	60%
3.6	A shower?	49%	34%
3.6	A free telephone call?	30%	32%
3.6	Something to eat?	51%	57%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	70%	79%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	44%	68%
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?	61%	60%
3.7	Someone from health services?	73%	77%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	39%	45%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	19%	25%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	58%	68%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	46%	46%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.8	How to make routine requests?	54%	51%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	46%	55%
3.8	Health services?	66%	66%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	46%	62%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	96%	96%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	91%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	79%	67%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	89%	92%
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?	49%	34%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	40%	31%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	23%	28%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	37%	36%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	56%	73%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	88%	92%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	93%	70%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	50%	47%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	15%	18%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	49%	50%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	63%	60%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	67%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	51%	54%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	93%	83%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	63%	62%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	52%	42%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	58%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	47%	29%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	47%	33%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	14%	15%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	58%	47%
SECTION 6: Relationships with staff			
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	88%	74%
6.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	93%	76%
6.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	67%	37%
6.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	37%	10%
6.5	Do you have a personal officer?	86%	76%
	For those with a personal officer:		
6.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	92%	63%
SECTION 7: Safety			
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	19%	14%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	7%	5%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	14%	9%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
7.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	7%	1%
7.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	1%
7.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
7.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	3%
7.5	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	2%
7.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	0%
7.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	1%
7.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	1%
SECTION 7: Safety continued			
7.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	19%	23%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
7.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	4%	9%
7.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%
7.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
7.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	9%
7.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	1%
7.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	7%
7.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	4%
7.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
7.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	5%
7.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	2%
7.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	6%
7.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	3%
7.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
7.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	33%	21%
SECTION 8: Health services			
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	33%	50%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	67%	68%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	19%	18%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:		
8.2	The doctor?	61%	49%
8.2	The nurse?	75%	61%
8.2	The dentist?	45%	32%
8.3	The overall quality of health services?	58%	49%
8.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	47%
	For those currently taking medication:		
8.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	100%	100%
8.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	11%	10%
	For those who have problems:		
8.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	63%	50%
SECTION 9: Drugs and alcohol			
9.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	11%	8%
9.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	4%	5%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	34%	33%
9.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	27%	13%
9.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	2%
9.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	1%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
9.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	100%	72%
9.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	100%	81%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
9.9	Was the support helpful?	63%	88%
SECTION 10: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
10.1	A prison job?	89%	79%
10.1	Vocational or skills training?	70%	58%
10.1	Education (including basic skills)?	77%	78%
10.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	37%	38%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
10.2	A prison job?	42%	66%
10.2	Vocational or skills training?	31%	18%
10.2	Education (including basic skills)?	12%	23%
10.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	4%	6%
10.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	94%	95%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	45%	44%
10.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	83%	87%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	66%	65%
10.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	85%	92%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
10.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	71%	61%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	78%	80%
	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?	64%	42%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	19%	45%
10.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	30%	44%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	51%	60%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	74%	76%
10.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	74%	83%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	63%	62%
SECTION 11: Friends and family			
11.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	67%	48%
11.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	4%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	12%
11.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	41%	46%
SECTION 12: Preparation for release			
12.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	96%	94%
	For those who have an offender manager what type of contact have you had:		
12.2	No contact?	8%	18%
12.2	Contact by letter?	39%	32%
12.2	Contact by phone?	61%	54%
12.2	Contact by visit?	66%	42%
12.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	100%	97%
12.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	100%	83%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	81%	77%

Wing analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	C wing	A and B wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
12.6	nobody?	19%	28%
12.6	Offender supervisor?	61%	60%
12.6	Offender manager?	34%	37%
12.6	Named/ personal officer?	19%	17%
12.6	Staff from other departments?	15%	18%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
12.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	88%	80%
12.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	12%	11%
12.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	58%	54%
12.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	10%
12.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	50%	38%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
12.12	Employment?	50%	55%
12.12	Accommodation?	28%	46%
12.12	Benefits?	41%	50%
12.12	Finances?	10%	40%
12.12	Education?	47%	57%
12.12	Drugs and alcohol?	47%	57%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	100%	76%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	100%	73%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.14	Resettlement day release?	96%	66%
12.14	Resettlement overnight release?	88%	44%
12.14	Special purpose leave?	75%	41%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.15	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	30%	31%
12.15	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	37%	32%
12.15	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	93%	79%
12.15	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	23%	18%
12.15	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	39%	53%
12.15	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	73%	63%

Diversity analysis



Key Question Responses (over 50) HMP Stanford Hill 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	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		46	130
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	0%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
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.)	30%	47%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	9%	20%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	14%	6%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	56%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	78%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	82%	76%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	91%	84%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	76%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	43%	39%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	59%	83%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	97%	95%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	93%	90%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	34%	37%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	18%	17%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	59%	46%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	60%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	69%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	84%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	57%
6.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	84%	73%
6.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	90%	74%
6.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time (most/all of the time)	21%	11%
6.4	Do you have a personal officer?	80%	77%
7.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	18%	13%
7.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	4%	6%
7.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	12%	10%
7.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	3%	6%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	3%	1%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	3%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	3%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	0%	0%
7.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
7.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	24%	22%
7.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	3%	11%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	7%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	3%	6%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	4%
7.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	7%	3%
7.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	2%
8.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	56%	45%
8.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	70%	68%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	66%	41%
8.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	9%	10%
9.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	31%
10.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	59%	63%
10.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	17%	21%
10.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	20%	22%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
10.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	6%
10.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	42%	40%
10.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%	70%
10.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	69%	79%
10.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	72%	85%
10.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	50%	66%
11.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	9%	23%
11.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	5%	12%
	Have you been provided with information on the following:		
12.12	Resettlement day release?	72%	83%
12.12	Resettlement overnight release?	74%	79%
	Have you had access to the following:		
12.13	Resettlement day release?	74%	71%
12.13	Resettlement overnight release?	54%	51%
12.13	Special purpose leave?	59%	43%
	Please answer the following about your preparation for release:		
12.14	Were you given up to date information about this prison before you came here?	32%	30%
12.14	Were you helped to prepare for open conditions before you came here (increased responsibility etc)?	26%	35%
12.14	Do you feel you have been given greater responsibility here than when you were in closed conditions?	76%	83%
12.14	Have you been on a preparation for release course?	19%	18%
12.14	Is this prison near your home area or your intended release address?	61%	47%