

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Ranby

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

24–25 August, 1–4 and 7–11 September 2015

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



Crown copyright 2016

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

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

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

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

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

Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	43
Section 4. Resettlement	51
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	59
Section 6. Appendices	65
Appendix I: Inspection team	65
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	67
Appendix III: Prison population profile	75
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	79

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 Ranby in Nottinghamshire is a large category C working and resettlement prison on an extensive site that holds just over 1,000 adult men. The accommodation is arranged in two distinct parts: house blocks 1 to 3, known locally as the ‘closed prison’, were older and generally delivered much poorer outcomes than the newer house blocks 4 to 7. A third of the staff on house blocks 1 to 3 had been employed for less than 12 months. We last inspected the prison in March 2014 and reported significant concerns about the prison as a whole and about safety in particular. While there had been improvement in some areas, this inspection 17 months later found inadequate progress overall and safety remained a significant concern.

A number of factors had combined to undermine progress. The role of the prison had become more complex. In addition to its function as a working prison that should have kept men fully occupied in education, training, work and offending behaviour courses, it now had a new role as a resettlement prison which received men in the last three months of their sentence and prepared them for release in the local area. Many of the men held were serving long sentences for serious offences. Fifteen per cent of the population were receiving support from the prison’s mental health services. A lack of work for some of the industrial workshops and staff absences meant that many prisoners had too little to do and were bored. There were problems resolving simple domestic issues, and delays in offender management processes which prisoners needed to happen to progress their sentences, and this caused high levels of frustration.

On top of this already dangerous mix, the prison was attempting to combat a surge in the availability of new psychoactive substances (NPS); 58% of prisoners told us it was easy to get drugs in the prison. Health services were at risk of being overwhelmed by the need to treat the most seriously affected and as we walked round the prison, we saw a number of prisoners who were clearly under the influence of NPS; some had been left with other prisoners to check they did not deteriorate because there were no available health care services or other staff to do so. In addition to the health consequences, the trade in NPS was leading to high levels of debt and associated violence.

Safety, therefore, remained the major concern. While we had few concerns about the safety of prisoners on house blocks 4 to 7, too many of those held on the large house blocks 1 to 3, and staff working on the units, told us that they felt unsafe. This was reflected in the number of violent incidents, which was much higher than in similar establishments. In one incident, a group of prisoners muscled into a wing office to take back a ‘throw-over’ package of drugs that had just been intercepted by staff. Assaults on staff had increased significantly and a number of very serious incidents had occurred. In the 17 months between inspections there had been a dreadful six self-inflicted deaths and there had been four since April 2015 alone. A further death this year is being treated as a homicide. NPS and the associated debt and bullying had been cited as a significant factor in some of these events.

The prison was attempting to respond to these challenges and there were signs of improvement in some areas. Despite the concerns that remained, fewer prisoners than at the last inspection told us they felt unsafe at the time of the inspection or that they had been victimised, although this was still significantly higher than comparable prisons. Early days support was much better, and the newly opened first night centre was providing some good support on arrival and through the early days at the prison. There were effective systems in place to collect and utilise intelligence, although only the highest priority searches were carried out. There were good links with the local police. Security measures generally struck a sensible balance between the need to get men to activities and provide adequate supervision, but supervision of free-flow movement did need to be increased. Although good support was offered to vulnerable prisoners, including victims of bullying and those on open ACCTs (suicide and self-harm case management processes), the quality of ACCT processes still required improvement, despite the number of self inflicted deaths that had occurred.

The environment on house blocks 4 to 7 varied from reasonable to good. Some good efforts were also being made to keep the environment on house blocks 1 to 3 decent, and broken or missing items of cell equipment and furniture were being replaced. However, prisoners in these house blocks reported difficulty obtaining cleaning materials, clean clothes and clean bedding; staff appeared very busy with little time to talk to prisoners and this was compounded by the long time many of these prisoners spent locked behind their doors. The prisoner information desk worker scheme and the drop-in facility 'One Ranby', had improved the handling of day-to-day issues, but the applications process still did not work effectively and added to prisoners' frustrations. The food was better than we usually see. A recent re-focus on equality and diversity work had produced some positive and tangible benefits for some of the protected characteristics groups. While black and minority ethnic prisoners were particularly negative in responses to our survey, it was good to see the prison management respond during the inspection by organising the first of a planned series of consultation forums with this group. Faith provision was very good and the management of complaints much improved. Health care provision was clinically sound and provided an appropriate range of services, although these were stretched as a result of NPS.

Far too many men were locked in their cells during the working day because of a shortage of workshop instructors and delays in materials arriving; this was unacceptable in a working prison. Ofsted assessed that learning and skills provision required improvement, and they were particularly concerned about the quality of some OLASS (offenders' learning and skills service) provision, especially teaching and learning. Even when activity places were available, attendance and punctuality were often poor and there was sometimes too much tolerance of a poor work ethic which left prisoners badly prepared for employment after release and did them no favours. There was some good vocational training where achievements were high, but more was needed.

There was a developing understanding of the strategic priorities for resettlement and reasonably good provision of practical resettlement services, but this was undermined by poor offender management support which should have addressed prisoners' risks and behaviours and helped them progress through their sentence. The backlog of OASys assessments that were required to assess prisoners' risks, and on which sentence plans should have been based, remained extensive (albeit improved), and was increased every day by men arriving from other establishments who did not have an up-to-date OASys or were already in the period when they should have been eligible for release under a home detention curfew. Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was minimal and a real source of frustration for many men.

HMP Ranby has not made sufficient progress since the previous inspection. We remain seriously concerned about the stability of the prison, the safety of prisoners and staff and the inadequate measures being taken to prepare prisoners for release and reduce the risk they will reoffend.

The prison has already been provided with some additional staff above the normal bench-marked level and there is more to be done by prison managers to improve outcomes. However, the prison also faces external challenges, notably a destabilising supply of NPS, which threatens to overwhelm the prison. NOMS needs to take action to stabilise the prison if any longer term and more in depth improvements are to be made. The harm caused by NPS in prisons requires a national policy. There should be an immediate temporary reduction in the Ranby prison population to give staff the opportunity to regroup. The prison is struggling to cope with its dual working and resettlement prison roles. The resettlement role involves a very high throughput of challenging prisoners, some of whom have little investment in the opportunities the prison offers because they are so near to their release. The prison should return to being a working prison if only so that it is able to concentrate fully on that task. These measures should help provide the stability the prison needs to create a consistent focus on improving the quality of activities and help men to better prepare for release.

Martin Lomas
HM Deputy Chief Inspector of Prisons

December 2015

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Ranby is a large complex category C training prison for adult male prisoners. It has two distinct designated roles:

- a working prison with a clear expectation that prisoners engage in purposeful activity and offending behaviour programmes;
- a resettlement prison preparing men in the last three months of their sentence for release.

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

Public

Region/Department

East Midlands

Number held

1,087

Certified normal accommodation

892

Operational capacity

1,098

Date of last full inspection

10-21 March 2014

Brief history

The prison opened in 1971 and has seen a steady expansion from 2004 with the development of modern house blocks. The most recent addition was house block 4, which opened in 2008.

Workshops, a new health care building, a new kitchen, a library and education facilities have been added as part of previous expansions.

Short description of residential units

House block 1: Induction wing with single and double cells

House block 2: North is a general wing and South a drug treatment wing

House block 3: General wing

House block 4: 30 double occupancy cells with integral sanitation and showers

House block 5: Single cells, houses 192 prisoners who are lower risk, older, disabled and night shift working prisoners

House blocks 6 and 7: Single and double cells with integral sanitation. Hold 60 prisoners each.

House block 7 has facilities for older prisoners

Name of governor

Susan Howard

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service provider

Commissioners: NHS England East Midlands

Providers: Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust

Out of hours service: Local Clinical Commissioning Group (LCCG)

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Jayne Harrison

Community rehabilitation company (CRC)

Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottingham and Rutland Community Rehabilitation Company

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.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission, 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.¹

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

Summary

Safety

- S1 The prison was still not safe for most prisoners. Most prisoners said they had been treated well by escort staff. Reception was efficient and early days support was much improved. Far too many men still felt unsafe, although fewer than at our last inspection. The level of incidents and violence remained very high, particularly on house blocks 1, 2 and 3; some of which was very serious. Some violence reduction processes were improving, but significant challenges with poor behaviour remained. A high number of prisoners had taken their own lives, and we found some poor ACCT² documents. Safeguarding arrangements were reasonable. Security was well aware of and responding to the challenges faced. The prevalence of new psychoactive substances (NPS) was very high. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was undermined by use of the 'nil pay' process. The numbers of adjudications, use of force and segregation were all high. Clinical and psychosocial substance misuse support was appropriate. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.*
- S2 At the last inspection in March 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Ranby were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved, five had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3 The majority of journeys to the prison were short and most prisoners reported that they had been well treated by escort staff. Reception was clean and functional and staff were welcoming. Effective systems helped prisoners to move quickly to the first night landing. Initial safety screening had improved since the last inspection and was now good. Most first night cells were prepared reasonably well, but a few were grubby. Induction had improved but the session on safer custody was inadequate.
- S4 Many prisoners and staff told us they did not feel safe and responses to our survey, while an improvement on the last inspection, were still very poor. The number of assaults was more than double what we find in similar prisons. Many incidents were serious. Most problems occurred on house blocks 1 to 3 or, as prisoners referred to it, the 'closed' side of the prison; in contrast, other house blocks were much safer. There were some positive initiatives such as the introduction of a weekly safeguarding meeting and the new psychoactive substances³ group, but the overall strategic management of violence reduction was not commensurate with the scale of the challenges faced. There was no effective organisation-wide violence reduction action plan. Violence reduction investigations took too long. Investigation reports that we looked at recorded the appropriate use of sanctions on perpetrators, but there were limited planning and interventions to address underlying issues and violent behaviour. Some reasonable support was provided to vulnerable prisoners, including victims of bullying, and adult safeguarding arrangements were improving, although still required further development.
- S5 There had been six self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection and another death was being treated as manslaughter. Action plans had been put in place to address Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations, but not all actions had been implemented effectively. Self-

² Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

³ 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.

harm levels were higher than similar prisons. In many of the cases we examined this was a response to threats and intimidation from other prisoners, often related to NPS, debt and poor mental health. The quality of ACCT documentation was poor. Self-harm triggers and care maps were not always sufficiently focused on the needs of the prisoner and reviews needed improvement. Nevertheless, we saw some examples of good outcomes, and most prisoners on ACCTs whom we spoke to said they had been well looked after.

- S6 More than half the prisoners in our survey said it was easy to get drugs in the prison and 15% said they had developed a problem with drugs in the prison. The main concern was the use of NPS which, despite determined efforts by the prison, was too readily available. Staff submitted a large number of intelligence reports each month and these were used effectively to respond to emerging and continuing risks. Free flow movements were sensibly cautious and generally struck a reasonable balance between the need to get men to work while reducing opportunities for incidents to occur, but supervision of main movements needed to be increased. A detailed supply reduction policy was in place and there were a number of good initiatives to reduce demand and supply many in partnership with a range of community agencies.
- S7 The application of the IEP process was reasonable, but undermined by the significant number of prisoners on the 'nil pay' process which failed to address non-compliance with the regime (prisoners were allowed to refuse activities but as a consequence were not paid).
- S8 The number of adjudications was higher than at comparator prisons and had increased since the last inspection. Procedures were satisfactory but too many charges were remanded.
- S9 The segregation unit was much cleaner than at the last inspection and relationships between staff and prisoners were good. The older cells remained poor. The regime was limited and too many segregated prisoners were transferred to other establishments rather than reintegrated into the prison.
- S10 Use of force was high and had increased since the last inspection. Too much paper work was incomplete. There was regular oversight of use of force and a good range of data were reviewed, but some quality issues were not identified. The vast majority of planned interventions were videoed but the quality of recordings was poor and showed little evidence of de-escalation. Reported use of special accommodation was very low, but we found at least one unrecorded use and could not be confident that there were not others.
- S11 The substance misuse policy was up to date and a detailed action plan addressed supply and demand reduction. Clinical management was good and the integrated health and substance misuse service offered high quality interventions and had recently introduced a dual diagnosis service. Services were very stretched because of the prevalence of NPS.

Respect

- S12 *The quality of residential accommodation varied; house blocks 1 to 3 needed constant attention to keep them decent. Recent management action had sought to address a range of prisoners' frustrations, and the focus needed to be sustained and developed. Most staff were respectful but some were extremely stretched which affected their ability to interact with prisoners. Equality and diversity work was developing but there were still some important gaps. Faith provision was good and complaints were reasonably well managed. There were few legal services. Health care provision was clinically sound but services were under pressure because of the NPS incidents. Food was good and canteen arrangements were reasonable. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S13 At the last inspection in March 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Ranby were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 30 recommendations in the area of respect.⁴ At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, six had been partially achieved, nine had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

- S14 Outside areas were pleasant. Conditions on house blocks 4 to 7 were generally good, but it presented a daily challenge to keep house blocks 1 to 3 decent. In our survey, many prisoners on house blocks 1 to 3 said they could not get enough cleaning materials or suitable clean clothes each week. We saw that efforts had been made to address some of these issues and many broken or missing items of furniture had recently been replaced. There was ongoing refurbishment of showers. The use of prisoner information desk (PID) workers had improved confidence in the application system but many prisoners remained frustrated by their inability to get answers to basic issues. One Ranby drop-in centre was a good initiative which was improving the dissemination of information and communication with prisoners.
- S15 Most prisoners in our survey said that staff treated them with respect, and our observations confirmed this. Staff on house blocks 1 to 3 were very stretched and we observed only limited contact with prisoners to address their needs and concerns; this was also reflected in our survey. This added to the frustration felt by many prisoners. There was a range of forums for consulting prisoners and the 'every contact matters' project was a positive initiative to develop the quality of interactions with prisoners.
- S16 Work to promote equality and diversity had recently been re-launched. The equality lead was developing an approach to the strategic management of equality but attendance at the equality action team meeting was not consistent. Local monitoring of equality outcomes for prisoners had not been taking place and needed to be central to equality work.
- S17 Trained equality mentors were in place and a good range of equality forums were held. The investigation of discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had improved, and now included external scrutiny.
- S18 Not enough attention had been paid to the needs of black and minority ethnic prisoners; the first group meeting with them was held during the inspection and was a positive step forward. In our survey, the perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners were poorer in many respects than those of white prisoners. A more coordinated approach was needed to ensure the needs of prisoners with disabilities were met, although good practical support was provided to some men. Support for foreign national prisoners needed development. There was a Travellers group which reflected their cultural identity and meetings had taken place to support a small number of gay prisoners. Some good support was offered to older prisoners.
- S19 Faith-based and pastoral support was delivered well by an active and integrated chaplaincy. Counselling and support for prisoners and their families were good following bereavement or for prisoners who had been abused. There was easy access to corporate worship and links with other departments to support the religious and cultural needs of prisoners were good.

⁴ 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.

- S20 The number of complaints had reduced since the last inspection. The responses that we examined were generally polite and focused. Quality assurance arrangements identified less satisfactory replies for further action.
- S21 Demand for legal services was low but only very limited support was offered. There were no legal services staff and not all legal resources were up to date.
- S22 Health services were good and effective governance and partnership arrangements were in place. A single provider delivered integrated health care services which had continued to improve since the last inspection. They were under significant pressure from the prevalence of NPS related incidents.
- S23 We observed clinically effective engagement with prisoners and there was reasonable access to a good range of clinics. The out-of-hours response was inadequate. Chronic disease management arrangements were good. Complex cases attracted multidisciplinary oversight and pain management clinics were a positive development. The quality of dentistry was good with an appropriate range of treatments. Pharmacy services were effective but supervision of medicine administration was inadequate on some house blocks. The population had a high level of complex mental health needs. Services were stretched but were delivering clinically appropriate interventions. The use of mental awareness peer support workers was innovative. There were no delays in transferring men who needed treatment in hospital.
- S24 We found that the range and standard of food were good. Distribution arrangements for canteen had improved, but there was a delay after arrival before the first canteen order could be received, with potential for bullying. Prisoners complained about the high cost of items.

Purposeful activity

S25 *Fully employed prisoners had reasonable time out of cell but far too many were locked up during the working day. Overall learning and skills provision required improvement. The range of education was appropriate but the quality of some teaching and learning was not good enough. There were some good vocational training opportunities, and success rates were high, but more were needed. In some activities, attendance, punctuality and the development of a work ethic were not good enough. Library and PE provision needed development. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S26 *At the last inspection in March 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Ranby were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 11 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that six of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*

- S27 Time out of cell was good for prisoners on house blocks 4 to 7 but poor for a significant number of others. During roll checks in the middle of the working day we found too many prisoners locked in their cells on house blocks 1 to 3, which added to the already significant control problems at the prison. We observed some slippage in the regime due to late unlocking and scheduled activities were sometimes cancelled at short notice.
- S28 Overall learning and skills provision required improvement. Action had been taken to reduce interruptions to the working day. An additional session of recreational PE was offered to motivate prisoners to attend and behave well at work. Improving English and/or mathematics was given priority as was the speedy allocation of prisoners to work. However, quality

systems had not effected sufficient improvement across all OLASS (Offenders' Learning and Skills Services) areas, including teaching, learning and providing feedback.

- S29 There were enough activity places for the population but instructor vacancies and delays in materials arriving in the engineering workshop limited the places that some workshops could offer each day. Good vocational training was provided but there were too few courses. The range of education provision was appropriate.
- S30 Practical use of English and mathematics was embedded well in most vocational training courses to help learners improve their skills. Individual coaching in education classes helped learners to improve their confidence and skills.
- S31 In the better workshops prisoners took pride in producing good quality work, poor behaviour was effectively challenged and there was mutual respect between learners and staff. In others, attendance was poor; prisoners started late, finished early and were unwilling to work to commercial standards. There was also poor attendance in some English, mathematics and employability sessions.
- S32 Success rates in vocational training qualifications were high, including levels 1 and 2 ICT and managing personal finances. Too many prisoners did not progress adequately in functional skills and there were low success rates for English and mathematics qualifications at entry level. Too many industrial workshops did not recognise or accredit work skills.
- S33 There were some limitations in library resources and use of management data needed improvement. The library closed too often for operational reasons.
- S34 An adequate range of PE activities was available, but staff redeployment affected their delivery significantly. A PE vocational course had recently been reintroduced. The outdoor sports areas were not used enough.

Resettlement

- S35 *Strategic management of resettlement was developing. Offender management was overstretched and not delivering a quality service to prisoners. Some inroads had been made to the OASys (offender assessment system) backlog but it remained considerable. Contact between offender management unit (OMU) staff and prisoners was poor, causing considerable frustration. Too much case work needed improvement. Public protection work was reasonable but multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) needed attention. Support in the resettlement pathways was reasonable overall, and children and families work had improved. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S36 *At the last inspection in March 2014, we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Ranby were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 18 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, six had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*
- S37 Management of resettlement had improved and there was now an up-to-date strategy and action plan based on a needs analysis; regular reducing reoffending meetings were well attended.

- S38 Resettlement was in transition following the introduction of the community rehabilitation company (CRC). The prison CRC team was not yet at full strength and it was too early to judge its effectiveness but some good work had taken place to prepare for the change.
- S39 OMU staff understood their roles and were well motivated, but a combination of factors hampered their ability to deliver a good service. Redeployment was extensive. The backlog of OASys⁵ had reduced, but remained significant. Almost half the prisoners arrived without an up-to-date OASys and staff were under considerable pressure to complete work that should have been done in other prisons. The quality of OASys assessments that we sampled was variable and some were poor.
- S40 The lack of regular contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was a source of significant frustration; this was a particular concern for indeterminate sentence prisoners. Home detention curfew and categorisation arrangements were generally good.
- S41 Public protection arrangements ensured that prisoners subject to restrictions were monitored appropriately. Minutes of the interdepartmental risk management team meetings were not comprehensive enough. Awareness of MAPPA needed to be heightened.
- S42 In our survey, prisoners' awareness of resettlement pathway services was significantly less than comparator prisons, but the introduction of resettlement fairs was a welcome addition. The need for help with accommodation was high. The new CRC provision was developing and outcomes for most were reasonable. National Careers Service provision required improvement. Arrangements to follow up education, training and work outcomes after release from prison were inadequate. The primary care and mental health teams supported men well before release. Prisoners received substance misuse harm reduction advice and pre-release support, and were linked to community services in a wide catchment area. Some reasonable support was provided with finance, benefit and debt and there were plans to develop this.
- S43 Helping prisoners to maintain contact with their family and friends had improved with the introduction of family days and a parenting programme. Visitors we talked to said it was easy to book visits and that they were well received. It was good to see the introduction of a new play facility and agreed funding for a play supervisor.
- S44 The range of accredited offending behaviour programmes was appropriate, although delays to OASys assessments hindered the progress of some prisoners, including planning for their release.
- S45 There were no specific services for victims of abuse and the level of need was not known.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S46 **Concern:** NOMS had provided a few additional staff above benchmarked levels, but the prison had not stabilised in the 17 months since our last inspection and urgent action was now needed to make it safer. The establishment's size, its dual role as a working and resettlement prison, and high level of mental health need added significantly to the complexity of the population, making it more difficult to create a safe environment.

Recommendation: Urgent action is needed to stabilise the prison and to make it safer. NOMS should temporarily reduce the size of the prison's population to

⁵ Assessment system for prisons and probation, providing a framework for assessing the likelihood of reoffending and the risk of harm to others.

help stabilise it, and in the medium term simplify the role of the prison as a working prison only.

- S47 **Concern:** The prison was still fundamentally unsafe and many prisoners and staff confirmed they did not feel secure. Concerns were reflected in objective data on assaults and self-harm, which showed that the establishment was much less safe than similar prisons. NPS was a significant problem. Strategic management required greater coordination and there was no action plan to reduce violence. Staff on house blocks 1, 2 and 3 were overwhelmed by the scale of violence which reduced their ability to manage the situation. Tensions were compounded by too many prisoners being left unoccupied on the wings during the day and the creation of unnecessary frustration by their frequent inability to get basic legitimate issues resolved.

Recommendation: An effective, whole prison strategy to reduce violence and its contributory causes should be put in place, based on consultation with staff and prisoners and an analysis of the causes of high levels of violence.

- S48 **Concern:** Six prisoners had taken their own lives since the last inspection. Recorded levels of self-harm were high. Prisoners on ACCT procedures felt well cared for but this was not reflected in the documentation, which was poor. Recommendations arising from the Prison and Probation Ombudsman's investigation into previous deaths were not consistently implemented.

Recommendation: The quality of assessment, planning and monitoring for prisoners subject to ACCT procedures should be improved and include effective care planning and better attendance at review meetings. (Repeated recommendation 1.35) Recommendations arising from the Prison and Probation Ombudsman's investigation into previous deaths should be consistently implemented.

- S49 **Concern:** One of the main roles of the establishment was as a working prison which aimed to provide a range of education and work opportunities to keep men fully occupied and better prepare them for release. Despite having good facilities and in theory enough activity places, men were often not sufficiently occupied. Far too many were locked up during the working day on house blocks 1 to 3 which was adding to problems with control in the prison. Punctuality and attendance were not good enough, there were too many interruptions to the working day and the importance of working consistently to industry expectations and standards was not consistently promoted. Sufficient challenging and interesting work was not always provided.

Recommendation: The prison should provide a full purposeful working day for all the men held, attendance and punctuality should be good and a good work ethic promoted.

- S50 **Concern:** There remained significant backlogs in OASys and HDC assessments. This was compounded by prisoners transferring to Ranby from other establishments with this work outstanding or overdue. OMU support was poor in many cases, resulting in significant frustration among prisoners.

Recommendation: The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) and home detention curfew assessments should be tackled and all relevant prisoners should be seen promptly by their offender supervisor to be assessed, have relevant targets set and risks addressed. Contact should be regular and meaningful.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

I.1 *Journey times to the prison were reasonably short and most prisoners said that they had been treated well by escort staff. The video link was used effectively.*

I.2 Journey times for most prisoners took less than two hours.

I.3 We observed escort staff who were polite and helpful and those we spoke to were clearly focused on the safety of prisoners. Information about prisoners was shared verbally with prison officers in reception, and written escort records were up to date and informative.

I.4 Most prisoners reported a reasonably good experience of transfers to the prison. In our survey, 80% of respondents said that they felt safe during escorts, and 77% said that they were treated well by escort staff. Thirty-two per cent said that they spent more than two hours in vans against the comparator of 45%.

I.5 There was good use of video link for courts, legal visits and probation interviews. We calculated that about 25 prisoners a month used the service.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

I.6 *Reception was clean, staff were welcoming and processing systems were effective. Initial safety screening had improved since the last inspection and was good. Induction had improved but the session on safer custody was inadequate.*

I.7 Reception was very busy with about 30 prisoner movements a day which included eight to ten new arrivals. Reception was open all day and did not close until the last prisoner had been fully processed.

I.8 The area was clean and bright and the layout provided good sight lines for staff to observe prisoners. Holding rooms were clean and free of graffiti and there was a television and reading material in each room.

- I.9** Effective processing systems helped to move prisoners quickly through reception to the first night centre on house block I. On the whole, prisoners only spent between 45 minutes and an hour in reception.
- I.10** Initial safety screening for prisoners had improved since the last inspection and was good. Immediate needs were identified and dealt with during private interviews with reception officers. There was effective collaboration between reception staff and peer support workers (induction orderlies) who greeted new arrivals.
- I.11** Reception officers' attitudes were particularly positive; they were clearly aware of the potential risks to new prisoners and created a relaxed and friendly atmosphere.
- I.12** Prisoners were asked if they understood what had happened to them before transfer and if they had any immediate needs. Searches were carried out sensitively by two officers in one of four private cubicles.
- I.13** In our survey, 72% of prisoners said that they were treated well or very well in reception.
- I.14** First night arrangements had improved significantly since the last inspection. Induction officers accompanied by peer supporters collected prisoners from reception and took them to the new dedicated first night centre on the ground floor of house block I.
- I.15** Most cells on the unit were well prepared, but some were dirty and graffiti was scratched into windows. All prisoners were seen by health care and induction officers who interviewed them again in private shortly after their arrival on the unit. First night needs were identified and addressed, and staff were clearly aware of potential anxiety and associated risks. They took time to ensure that prisoners understood how to access prison support services if they needed help during their first night and provided them with information to reinforce this. Good use was made of prisoner peer workers, including Listeners⁶.
- I.16** There were effective handovers to night staff and enhanced observations of new arrivals took place during the night.
- I.17** Prisoners received a formal induction programme which started on the morning following their arrival. Relevant information was given on accessing available services, and dealing with prison life but the sessions on safer custody were cursory.
- I.18** Inductions to education, the library and the gym were scheduled over the following week. Effective tracking systems were in place to ensure that prisoners received all elements of induction.

⁶ Prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to other prisoners.

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

Everyone feels and is safe from bullying and victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, threats of violence and assault). Prisoners at risk/subject to victimisation are protected through active and fair systems known to staff, prisoners and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime.

- I.19** *Many prisoners and staff told us they did not feel safe and responses to our survey, while improved since the last inspection, were still very poor. The number of assaults was more than double that in similar prisons. Most problems occurred on house blocks 1 and 3 and the other house blocks were much safer. Some incidents were very serious. There were some positive initiatives to manage violence, but strategic management and action planning required improvement. Violence reduction investigations took too long and there were limited planning and interventions to address violent behaviour. Some reasonable support was provided to victims.*
- I.20** While an improvement since our last inspection, almost a quarter of prisoners in our survey felt unsafe and 57% said that they had felt unsafe at some point in Ranby, much more than in similar prisons. There had been 71 assaults on prisoners and 29 on staff during the previous six months, more than double the levels we see in similar establishments. Some assaults had been very serious, including one which led to the death of a prisoner. Staff told us they did not feel safe and assaults against them had increased significantly.
- I.21** New psychoactive substances and associated debt and bullying had been cited as contributing significantly to violence. In one incident a package containing NPS being temporarily held in a wing office was forcibly taken from staff by a group of prisoners. We saw evidence of extensive use of NPS by prisoners. We also found reports of many incidents motivated by prisoners feeling unsafe and attempting to force a transfer – for example, climbing on netting, trees and roofs, putting up barricades and destroying prison property.
- I.22** Significantly more prisoners in house blocks 1, 2 and 3 felt unsafe than in other house blocks (28% compared with 16%) and data on assaults showed that almost all assaults took place in these three blocks. Staff and prisoners told us that officers were overwhelmed by the issues facing them and that many lacked enough experience to deal effectively with the challenges they faced. On one day of the inspection we found that a third of the officers in these house blocks had been employed for less than 12 months. In our survey, significantly fewer prisoners in these house blocks reported positively on questions about staff/prisoner contact and cell bell response times (see paragraphs I.32 and I.35).
- I.23** Since the previous inspection, a weekly multidisciplinary safeguarding meeting had been introduced, which focused on the needs of vulnerable prisoners. In addition to cell moves for those who felt threatened, there was evidence of further support, for example addressing mental health, bereavement and family needs.
- I.24** There was a significant problem with prisoners under threat self-isolating themselves in their cells. However, shortly before the inspection procedures had been introduced to improve the monitoring, governance and priority given to addressing this issue and we saw evidence of some improved outcomes for prisoners.
- I.25** Strategic management and action planning for violence reduction required improvement. The substance misuse and mental health teams and Listeners only attended a minority of the strategic safer custody meetings. A range of information about violent incidents was presented to the meeting but this rarely appeared to generate any discussion or action and

there was no violence reduction action plan. No information was presented or discussed on bullying. The safer custody action plan focused on suicide and self-harm and there were no actions on bullying and violence reduction.

- I.26** Other meetings performed an important strategic function, particularly the multidisciplinary NPS sub-committee (see paragraph I.70) and there was good work by the security department (see section on security). However, this work was not well coordinated and overall violence reduction planning was weak.
- I.27** Consultation arrangements were limited to a prisoner exit survey, which was inadequate, and it was unclear if the results of the survey were followed through.
- I.28** New violence reduction procedures had recently been introduced and were well understood by wing staff whom we spoke to. During the previous six months, 212 prisoners had been referred to the safer custody team for bullying which was commensurate with the high levels of violence in the prison. However, we found examples of bullying which had not been referred to the team and we were not confident that this figure was accurate. Bullying investigations took too long and, while investigation reports recorded appropriate use of sanctions on perpetrators, there were limited planning and interventions to address the underlying issues and violent behaviour.

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.29** *There had been six self-inflicted deaths since the last inspection and another death was being treated as manslaughter. Not all actions to address Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) recommendations had been implemented effectively. Self-harm levels were higher than in similar prisons and in many cases self-harm was a response to threats and intimidation from other prisoners. The quality of ACCT⁷ documentation that we reviewed was poor. Nevertheless, we saw some examples of good outcomes, and most prisoners on ACCTs we spoke to said they had been well looked after, although this was less evident on house blocks 1–3.*

- I.30** Tragically, there had been six self-inflicted deaths in custody since the last inspection. Four of these deaths, and another which was being treated as manslaughter, had taken place since April 2015. A prison review had identified mental health and drug use issues in a number of these cases. There was an action plan to address PPO recommendations. Not all recommendations had been implemented effectively – for example, we saw two recent examples of prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management (ACCTs) alleging that they were being bullied, but this information had not been referred to the safer custody team.
- I.31** The number of incidents of self-harm, 121 during the previous six months, was much higher than in comparable prisons. In many of the cases we examined, prisoners had explained the

⁷ Assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

self-harm as arising from poor mental health, or threats and intimidation from other prisoners, often associated with debt and NPS use.

- I.32** All but one of the self-inflicted deaths and the suspected manslaughter had taken place in house blocks 1 to 3 and almost all self-harm incidents also took place there. Our survey suggested a far greater concentration of vulnerable prisoners in these house blocks and that staff contact with prisoners was not as good as in the rest of the prison. Forty-one per cent of prisoners in house blocks 1 to 3 said they had mental health problems and 13% said staff normally spoke to them during association against respective comparators of 11% and 30%. Only 8% of prisoners in house blocks 1 to 3 said their cell bell was answered within five minutes compared with 36% in other blocks.
- I.33** Although levels of self-harm were high, the 160 ACCT documents opened during the previous six months was similar to comparable prisons. Sixteen prisoners on an ACCT had been held in segregation during this period. Documentation was not detailed enough to confirm that segregation had been justified.
- I.34** While prisoners on ACCTs generally said they felt well supported, too many staff had not received any training in ACCT procedures and the quality of documentation that we examined was poor. There was not enough understanding of triggers to self-harm, care maps did not always address identified need and there was inconsistent management of reviews. We saw several examples of case reviews attended by only one member of staff, which was unacceptable. While some observations showed little engagement with the prisoner, others showed very good care. We were shown evidence of recent ACCT reviews to which family members had been invited, which was good practice.
- I.35** Listeners felt well supported by the safer custody team and the Samaritans, but echoed concerns that staff support for prisoners in house blocks 1 to 3 was worse than elsewhere. Only 42% of prisoners in these house blocks said they could speak to a Listener at any time against 64% in other house blocks.

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.⁸

- I.36** *Adult safeguarding arrangements had improved since the last inspection, but required further development.*

- I.37** There was no prison-wide safeguarding policy. However, since the last inspection the prison had established links with social services, including with the local adults safeguarding board. Single points of contact had been agreed and a service specification was in place for the referral of prisoners with possible care needs to adult social services. One assessment for support had been carried out.

⁸ We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

- I.38** There was an internal procedure for staff to refer cases of possible need for consideration at the multidisciplinary safeguarding meeting. However, the failure of wing staff to refer some cases of bullying to the safer custody team (see paragraph I.28) left us concerned that not all prisoners with obvious adult safeguarding needs would be brought to the attention of safer custody staff. It was also concerning that officers in the house blocks had little knowledge of safeguarding issues. Combined with poor levels of staff/prisoner contact in house blocks 1 to 3, this did not reassure us that less obvious need would be identified.

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.39** *Most security procedures were proportionate, although some elements of dynamic security were weak and supervision in some key areas was deficient. The management of intelligence was good and the monthly security meeting was well attended. Recently introduced initiatives to tackle the threat posed by NPS were encouraging.*

- I.40** Security procedures were more restrictive than we usually see in category C establishments but they were proportionate to the threats prevailing at the prison. The ingress of NPS was having a significant impact, including unusually high degrees of violence, acts of disorder and criminal activity. We observed a number of NPS related incidents in workshops and communal areas and conversations with prisoners and staff indicated that this was the norm for Ranby. The prison was responding to this threat and had introduced a detailed supply and demand reduction action plan and a comprehensive range of supply reduction measures and had allocated a manager to focus on this area. A weekly NPS subcommittee attended by the governor, head of security, drug strategy, substance misuse/health care and residential wings met to discuss and analyse incidents, draw up individual action plans and review strategy. An adjudication tariff for NPS use had been revised and presented to staff and prisoners.
- I.41** The monthly security meeting was well attended. It considered a wide range of data collated from the high number of intelligence reports (IRs) received each month from across the prison, including a paper-based option for some contracted staff. The response to IRs was expedient and actions were formulated to address emerging threats. However, search records showed that often only the highest priority cell searches were carried out, potentially undermining the excellent work of the security analysts. During the previous six months there had been over 100 drug related finds, some of which were significant. Security objectives arising from the meetings were communicated to staff through a security bulletin and were added to email signatures, which was innovative.
- I.42** Some important elements of dynamic security remained weak. Relationships between staff and prisoners were often distant and the supervision of prisoners was poor, particularly on house blocks 1 to 3 where there were many prisoners during the core day and in the extensive prison grounds. We were particularly concerned by the lack of staff supervision during mass movement to work. Body-worn cameras were being trialled and these were allocated on a risk basis.
- I.43** There were some excellent links to community agencies in relation to gangs and other organised criminal activity and the prison security department was well supported by a full-

time police information officer. Nottinghamshire Police had recently allocated a crime investigation officer to the prison to assist in addressing the increase in criminal activity. This was an excellent initiative and so too was the proposed development of a police station outside the prison grounds which it was hoped would have a deterrent effect and mean that police staff could respond to incidents outside the prison gate more quickly.

- I.44** In our survey, 58% of prisoners said it was easy to get illegal drugs compared to 36% in similar establishments and 52% at the last inspection. Almost twice as many (15%) had developed a drug problem than at comparator prisons and a quarter of prisoners said that alcohol was easy to obtain.
- I.45** The mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate averaged 4.3% for the previous six months. Intelligence suggested that the more traditional drugs were not readily available but that NPS (not currently detectable under MDT) was by far the greatest problem. This was reflected in the relatively low numbers of suspicion tests undertaken.

Recommendations

- I.46** All requested intelligence-led searches should be completed.
- I.47** There should be enough staff supervising to provide a safe environment during mass movement of prisoners.

Incentives and earned privileges⁹

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.48** *The application of the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was reasonable but undermined by the high number of 'nil pay' prisoners allowed to opt out of the regime.*

- I.49** The IEP scheme was reasonable and there were sufficient privilege differences between levels to encourage good behaviour by most of the population. However, fewer prisoners than at comparator prisons said that differences in levels encouraged them to change their behaviour or that the system was operated fairly.
- I.50** Reviews took place on time and prisoners transferring in were able to retain their current status at least until their first review. Electronic case notes that we examined demonstrated broad engagement in the scheme by staff, particularly workshop instructors. Prisoners on the basic level could expect to remain there for at least 28 days regardless of behaviour, and their opportunity to demonstrate improved behaviour was hampered by the lack of a progressive return of privileges to test compliance with the regime.
- I.51** The proportion of enhanced and standard level prisoners was reasonable but the whole scheme was undermined by a surprisingly high number (72) who had opted out of the

⁹ 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.

obligation to work and who remained on wings with little challenge (known as the 'nil pay' process). The vast majority of these prisoners remained on standard and a few on enhanced which was at odds with the terms of the IEP scheme.

Recommendation

- I.52 The IEP scheme should be equitably applied to ensure full compliance with the regime.**

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.53** *The number of adjudications was high. Charges appeared appropriate and hearings were conducted fairly. Use of force was very high and too many report dossiers were incomplete. The paperwork we sampled showed that force was usually reasonable but the quality of video recordings was poor. Use of segregation was high and too many prisoners transferred to other establishments from there. Relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were good but the regime remained basic.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.54** The number of adjudications remained high at almost 1,000 during the past six months. The most common charges were possession of unauthorised articles, disobeying lawful orders, threatening behaviour and, more recently, endangering health and safety through NPS incidents. A monthly adjudications meeting was held to review data and address emerging issues. The meeting had identified that many remanded adjudications were ultimately abandoned because too much time had elapsed and they were seeking to address this.
- I.55** Our observations of hearings and examination of records showed that proceedings were conducted fairly and that prisoners were fully engaged. However, many could have been dealt with through the IEP scheme.

The use of force

- I.56** Use of force was very high and had increased significantly from 70 incidents in the six months before the previous inspection to 172 in a similar period before this inspection. There was regular managerial oversight of use of force but there were too many incidents to consider each case at the review meetings.
- I.57** Batons had been drawn more frequently than previously, but not used, and we were satisfied with the proportionality of use in each of the cases we reviewed.
- I.58** The quality of completed documentation was reasonable but far too many reports remained incomplete and there was a lack of completed F213 injury to prisoner forms which should be an important safeguard providing details of any injury to a prisoner sustained during the use of force.

- I.59** Recorded use of special accommodation was low at only one in the past six months but we found at least one further use and many reviews of recorded incidents were inconclusive.
- I.60** Most planned interventions were recorded on video but the quality of recordings was very poor. Many were incomplete, did not provide a continuous recording of the incident, provided almost no intelligible audio because of shouting by staff involved in the incidents and failed to demonstrate any attempt at de-escalation. We raised concerns over several recordings which were passed to senior managers.

Recommendation

- I.61** **Oversight and recording arrangements for use of force should be robust enough to provide re-assurance that it is used proportionately and only as a last resort.**

Segregation

- I.62** The segregation unit had 15 cells. Including one for special accommodation. The unit was very clean and was continually being repainted. Despite this, most cells were grim, toilets were largely unscreened and cell furniture was very limited.
- I.63** The level of segregation was high compared with other category C prisons, although the previously high percentage of prisoners segregated for their own protection had much reduced. About 70% of prisoners still transferred out to other prisons, often as a result of poor behaviour, despite the introduction of reintegration plans for all segregated prisoners.
- I.64** A wide range of data was collated by unit staff but there was no segregation monitoring and review group to monitor the use of segregation.
- I.65** Staff/prisoner relationships were very good and this was reflected in our survey and in discussion with prisoners. Staff had a good knowledge of prisoners in their care and managed them well. This was not reflected in daily records of interactions, which were at best rudimentary, and not all visitors to the unit contributed to case notes.
- I.66** The small caged exercise yard was used daily and prisoners could exercise together subject to risk assessment.
- I.67** The regime remained poor and consisted of showers, exercise and access to telephones. The unit was almost always full, access to the limited regime was still sometimes delayed and prisoners were locked in their cells all day with no purposeful activity.

Recommendation

- I.68** **The transfer out policy should be evaluated and poor behaviour by prisoners should be managed without routinely resorting to transfers out.**

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.69 *The drug strategy now contained a detailed action plan and the growing problem of NPS was being addressed. The integrated health and substance misuse service provided good clinical management and high quality interventions to meet the needs of the population, but because of the high prevalence of NPS, teams were stretched.*

I.70 The substance misuse strategy was up to date and a comprehensive action plan covered demand and supply reduction. A needs assessment had recently been published. The drug strategy group met bimonthly, but an NPS sub-committee convened weekly to focus on this area and discuss individual action plans (see paragraph I.40).

I.71 All new arrivals received harm reduction information, including information about NPS, and a DVD warning of the dangers was shown during induction. The substance misuse team had received 629 referrals in the previous six months, which was high. In addition to an active caseload of 260 prisoners, workers had provided NPS awareness training to 113 prisoners, and the team was at full capacity.

I.72 The service offered a wide range of interventions such as shorter substance misuse awareness and relapse prevention courses and more intensive drug and alcohol programmes. Designated gym sessions and acupuncture were also available. Two peer mentors assisted the team, Alcoholics Anonymous groups met fortnightly and service users were regularly consulted.

I.73 At the time of the inspection, 114 prisoners were prescribed methadone, 70% on a reducing basis. Treatment regimes were flexible and reviewed regularly, and controlled drug administration was well supervised by designated substance misuse officers. A dual diagnosis care pathway had been developed which further improved the support for prisoners with mental health and substance related problems.

I.74 There was a designated drug treatment unit in house block 2, but throughput was a problem. Prisoners not in treatment blocked spaces while those located on other house blocks could have difficulty getting to the unit, which resulted in late methadone administration.

Recommendations

I.75 **Substance misuse services should be sufficient to meet demand.**

I.76 **All prisoners prescribed methadone should be consistently located on the drug treatment unit.**

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** *The grounds and walkways were clean. The quality of residential accommodation varied. There was no systematic monitoring of the cell call system. Some cells were too small for two prisoners. The environment in house blocks 4 to 7 ranged from reasonable to good but house blocks 1 to 3 needed constant attention. Managers had recently addressed a range of prisoners' frustrations and many broken or missing items from cells had been replaced. Showers areas were being refurbished. The applications process had improved but too many prisoners remained unable to get responses to basic issues. Access to telephones and the efficiency of the mail system had improved since our last inspection.*
- 2.2** The external environment was generally clean and pleasant with some grassed areas and trees which softened the outlook. Many prisoners and staff referred to house blocks 1 to 3 as the closed side of the prison and house blocks 4 to 7 as the open side. This reflected the time that prisoners were allowed out of their cells (see paragraphs 3.3 to 3.5) but there were other significant differences between the two sides, particularly perceptions of safety.
- 2.3** The quality of residential accommodation varied. Some of the better cellular accommodation included integral showers. The prison held 195 prisoners more than the certified normal accommodation. Some cells on house blocks 6 and 7, designed for one, held two prisoners and were cramped as were some cells on house blocks 1 to 3. Toilets in double cells had privacy curtains and wooden boards had been provided for toilets with no lid. Most cells had adequate furniture and we found fewer old and broken items than at the previous inspection. Not all cells had lockable cupboards. All cells with the exception of house block 3 had privacy locks. Many cells on house blocks 1 to 3 looked unkempt.
- 2.4** Our survey results reflected poorer perceptions than in comparator prisons across many aspects of residential life. The difference in prisoners' views between the two sides of the prison was stark. Conditions on house blocks 4 to 7 were generally good and valued by prisoners, while it was a constant challenge to keep house blocks 1 to 3 clean and decent. In our survey, 42% of prisoners on house blocks 1 to 3 said they were able to get cleaning materials weekly, 35% that they received enough clean, suitable clothes each week, and 54% that they received clean sheets weekly against respective comparators for the rest of the prison of 73%, 66% and 73%.
- 2.5** Some store rooms in house blocks 1 to 3 were overstocked with cleaning products and prisoners said that it had been easier to get cleaning materials in recent weeks. Laundries on each wing for washing personal clothes worked well but laundry orderlies complained of shortages of prison clothing. Clothing exchange took place weekly.
- 2.6** Recent management action following a cell inventory in August 2015 had sought to address a range of prisoners' frustrations. Many broken or missing items of furniture had been replaced.

- 2.7** All communal areas in residential units were satisfactory and reasonably clean with the exception of some landings and shower areas on house blocks 1 to 3 which were left in a poor state after evening association. The showers were being refurbished but some shower areas still required privacy screens. Noise from residential units was not excessive during our night inspection. There were enough telephones on most wings and in our survey fewer prisoners than at our last inspection reported problems in using a telephone or sending or receiving mail. A range of relevant information was displayed on notice boards or available through the prisoner information desk (PID) workers.
- 2.8** Staff appeared continually stretched, particularly on house blocks 1 to 3. In our survey, only 8% of prisoners in these blocks said that their cell bell was normally responded to within five minutes. There was no systematic monitoring of the cell call system to establish the frequency, locations and length of time prisoners waited for cell bells to be answered. In the small sample of cell call records that we examined, we found examples of prisoners waiting over 10 minutes for a response, particularly on house blocks 1–3.
- 2.9** Application forms were readily available. The use of PID workers had improved confidence in the application system but many prisoners remained frustrated by their inability to get answers on basic issues and responses to applications did not always go through PID workers. In our survey, fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons thought that applications were dealt with fairly or promptly. One Ranby, a drop-in facility for prisoners, was a good initiative which was improving the dissemination of information and communication with prisoners.

Recommendations

- 2.10** Recent management action to address a range of prisoners' frustrations by improving cellular accommodation, cleanliness and the applications process should be sustained and developed.
- 2.11** The cell call system should be routinely monitored by a senior manager and explanations provided for delays.

Good practice

- 2.12** One Ranby provided an accessible drop-in facility for communicating with prisoners, disseminating information and resolving issues.

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.

- 2.13** *We observed generally respectful relationships between staff and prisoners, but many officers, particularly on house blocks 1 to 3, often appeared too busy to engage with prisoners and this was clearly causing tension.*

- 2.14** Our observations suggested that relationships between staff and prisoners were, on the whole, respectful and in our survey 77% of prisoners said that most staff treated them with

respect. Many officers, particularly on house blocks 4 to 7, engaged positively with prisoners and showed an interest in their welfare and a good awareness of their needs. There was a range of forums for consultation with prisoners and the 'every contact matters' project was a positive initiative to develop the quality of interactions with prisoners.

- 2.15** Most responses by staff to demanding behaviour were not over-reactive or heavy handed and we saw residential officers dealing patiently and calmly with difficult situations. However, many officers, particularly on house blocks 1 to 3, often appeared too busy to engage with prisoners and this clearly caused tension. The personal officer scheme did not work effectively and the extent of lock-up on house blocks limited contact between staff and prisoners.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic¹⁰ are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

- 2.16** *Equality and diversity work was developing but there were still some important omissions. The equality action team required strengthening and a needs analysis of the population needed to be carried out. There was no regular monitoring of outcomes for prisoners. The investigation of discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had improved. Work to support prisoners under some protected characteristics was good but there were gaps for black and minority ethnic and foreign national prisoners.*

Strategic management

- 2.17** A senior manager had been appointed to the new role of leading on equality in June 2015 and was developing the strategic management of equality work. The post holder had administrative support but no equality officer.
- 2.18** The equality action team (EAT) met quarterly, chaired by a member of the senior management team, and the agenda was relevant. Attendance was not consistent enough and had varied between five and 13 members over the previous three meetings with many key functional areas absent.
- 2.19** There was a comprehensive equality policy which addressed how the needs of prisoners with protected characteristics would be met and there was an equality action plan. A recent equality questionnaire intended to form the basis of a needs analysis had met with a poor response of only 5%. The need for equality impact assessments had been discussed: only one on the use of body-worn cameras had been completed in the last year which had raised no significant concerns. Each house block had an equality notice board with relevant displays.

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

- 2.20** Staff and prisoner mentors for each of the nine protected characteristics had completed equality training together, delivered by an external trainer which was good practice. The mentors had a clear job description and felt well supported through One Ranby (see paragraph 2.9) where they had access to other peer supporters and equality staff. The mentors and the equality lead met monthly.
- 2.21** There were support groups for some minority groups and equality forums took place quarterly.
- 2.22** Local monitoring of equality outcomes for prisoners, including data from the national equality monitoring tool, had not been taking place. Complaints about this had been raised at equality forums and the equality lead was beginning to address this.
- 2.23** Since January 2015, 69 DIRFs had been submitted. Report forms were accessible and completed forms were collected from locked boxes by equality staff. The senior management team was now responsible for the investigation of incidents which had improved. Most of the sample that we looked at were appropriate, timely, measured and fair. They were scrutinised by the deputy governor, the equality lead and an external equality trainer who had also acted as a consultant on a range of equality work.
- 2.24** Equality work with security and safer custody departments had started to focus on prisoners with racial elements in their offence or who presented a risk when sharing a cell with a prisoner from a minority group. A few prisoners had been required to attend equality training or complete a discrimination workbook following investigation.

Recommendation

- 2.25** **Strategic management of equality needed to be strengthened by more consistent attendance by relevant functional areas at equality action team meetings, a needs analysis of the population and regular monitoring of outcomes for prisoners.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.26** An equality mentor contributed to induction to outline the help available under the protected characteristics and prisoners asked induction officers about specific needs.
- 2.27** At the time of the inspection, 22% of the population were from a black and minority ethnic background. Not enough attention had been given to their needs and the first specific consultation group for these prisoners took place during the inspection. In our survey, perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners about prison life were poorer across many parameters than white prisoners: fewer thought that most staff treated them with respect and more felt victimised by staff and prisoners. Black History Month was promoted through awareness posters and guest speakers and events were planned.
- 2.28** Three groups for Travellers had been held which had acknowledged their cultural identity through video, music and food. Arrangements had been made for them to apply for an additional £20 phone credit each week paid for from their own private money to keep in contact with relatives.
- 2.29** Support for the small number of foreign national prisoners was underdeveloped. There were 11 foreign nationals but no support groups or officer time had been allocated to them. A clerk facilitated contact with the immigration service but there was no access to independent

immigration advice. Some foreign national prisoners told us they were unsure what would happen to them after their sentence and another did not know how to apply for credit to make an international call to family members.

- 2.30** Muslim prisoners represented 10% of the population. One recent meeting to discuss access to Muslim prayers had been poorly attended. The needs of religious groups were well met by an active chaplaincy (see paragraph 2.36).
- 2.31** Coordination between safeguarding and health care departments needed strengthening to ensure that the needs of prisoners with disabilities were met through effective care plans, although good practical support was provided to some men and adaptations had been fitted in some cells. A disability questionnaire was completed at induction but the data were not analysed. In our survey, 25% of prisoners considered themselves to have a disability and their perceptions of many aspects of prison life were significantly worse than others. There was no formal peer carer scheme but prisoners with personal emergency evacuation plans had identified volunteer helpers and staff were aware of these. Health care had trained some prisoners in mental health awareness to support prisoners with mental health problems (see paragraph 2.90).
- 2.32** Good support was offered to older prisoners and there was a comprehensive policy on caring for older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities. Quarterly meetings took place for this group and they had specific gym sessions. House blocks 5 and 7 were designated for older prisoners and efforts were being made to establish a workshop for them.
- 2.33** Meetings had been held to provide mutual support for a small number of gay prisoners and Gay Pride had been celebrated. This was an early but promising development. No prisoners had been identified as transgender and there was no local policy about this protected characteristic.

Recommendation

- 2.34** **Support for all the protected groups should be adequate to understand their concerns and, where possible, meet their specific needs.**

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.

- 2.35** *Faith provision was good. The chaplaincy was well integrated and provided chaplains for most of the religions represented among prisoners. They worked well to provide pastoral care, counselling and emotional support for prisoners.*

- 2.36** Faith-based and pastoral support was provided by an active and integrated chaplaincy which met the needs of most religions represented in the population. There were two full-time chaplains, sessional chaplains and volunteers. Two Muslim chaplains provided good support for the Muslim population.

- 2.37** New prisoners were seen within 24 hours and given written information about chaplaincy services and activities.
- 2.38** There was good access to corporate worship, although this was not reflected in our survey. Prisoners did not have to apply to attend services but movement was more restricted at weekends. Islamic studies and Bible classes were held weekly. The chapel was well resourced, had wheelchair access and a group room. Facilities for Friday prayers were good and included ablution facilities.
- 2.39** There was good counselling and support for prisoners and their families following bereavement and there had been a significant demand for this in recent months. Counselling for men who had been abused was provided one day a week but this was not enough to meet the need. The chaplaincy saw men subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork case management of prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm (ACCT) procedures once a week, delivered drama therapy sessions and managed a prison visitor scheme.
- 2.40** There were good links with other departments to support the religious and cultural needs of prisoners. A chaplain visited the segregation unit daily and attended ACCT reviews when invited. There was a cooperative approach with the kitchen and workshops for the celebration of religious holy days and festivals. A chaplaincy representative attended some key meetings including safer prisons and safeguarding meetings.

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.

2.41 *The number of complaints had reduced since the last inspection. The responses that we examined were generally polite and focused. Quality assurance appropriately identified less satisfactory replies.*

- 2.42** The number of formal complaints had reduced since the last inspection. There had been 1,554 formal complaints during the previous six months. The quality of replies had improved and most showed that a full investigation had taken place to deal with the complaint.
- 2.43** A significant number of complaints concerned low-level domestic issues that could have been dealt with informally by residential officers or through a more effective applications process.
- 2.44** Governance of the managing and recording of complaints had also improved and quality assurance by a senior manager had clearly driven up the quality of responses.
- 2.45** In our survey, 31% of prisoners said that the complaints system was fair against 15% at the previous inspection.

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

2.46 *There were no legal services staff and not all legal resources were up to date. Legal visits were not sufficiently confidential.*

2.47 There were no legal services staff and, in our survey, prisoners responded negatively on ease of communication with their solicitor and access to legal visits. Legal visits took place in the main visits hall when social visits were not taking place. The number was capped to allow prisoners and their representatives to position themselves away from other prisoners and solicitors, but this did not guarantee confidentiality. We were told that lawyers could book a visit in one of the two closed visit booths, but this did not meet the demand for legal visits.

2.48 The library contained appropriate legal text books, but a standard reference work on sentencing, one of the most requested books, was several years out of date.

Recommendation

2.49 **Legal services should be provided and resources to assist prisoners with their legal problems should be kept up to date.**

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.

2.50 *Health services were reasonably good and continuing to develop, but were under significant pressure from the prevalence of new psychoactive substances (NPS) related incidents. Well governed integrated health care services were provided except for out-of-hours care, which was inadequate. Prisoners were treated respectfully but a number remained dissatisfied with the service. There was adequate access to most services except for physiotherapy and smoking cessation. Pharmacy services had improved but supervision of medicine administration needed strengthening. Mental health services were stretched but delivered appropriate support.*

Governance arrangements

2.51 Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust was responsible for integrated health care provision. An effective governance infrastructure was underpinned by a partnership board. Inter-agency relationships were good and the health care team worked closely with

the prison on a range of issues. A health needs assessment had recently been published capturing the current and future needs of the population.

- 2.52** The health care service had established a regular prisoner forum and had invested in a number of initiatives to engage with prisoners. Despite these efforts, in our survey fewer men than the comparator rated the overall quality of services as good or very good (33% compared to 44%). Men we spoke to expressed mixed views, but we found staff who were courteous and respectful and the quality of provision that we observed was good.
- 2.53** Nursing and operational leadership was strong; matrons had been identified for key pathways and dedicated leads for specific areas, including older adult care, were delivering service improvement. Staffing levels were appropriate and skill mix reflected patient need. Staff training, supervision and induction arrangements were good and valued by all the staff we spoke to. Health care practitioners provided a service from 8am to 8pm on weekdays and 8am to 6pm at weekends. Out-of-hours provision was inadequate to meet the health needs and challenges presented by prisoners.
- 2.54** The importance of reporting serious untoward incidents was clear and systems to share learning with staff were embedded. The complaints system had improved and was adequate, though some local responses had not addressed the concern raised.
- 2.55** Information for prisoners on access to health care services was clear, concise and accessible. Prisoners told us of concerns about the confidentiality of health care applications and we were not confident that responses to applications were delivered securely.
- 2.56** Most services were provided in the dedicated health care facilities which were clean and spacious. The waiting area had the feel of a GP waiting room but it was often full and tensions had to be managed by the supervising officers, particularly for men whose appointments had been cancelled or curtailed. Cleaning schedules were appropriate and infection prevention audits were undertaken regularly.
- 2.57** The quality of record keeping was reasonable, though there was some variation among professional groups. Clinical and other policies such as safeguarding and information governance were accessible to all staff through the Trust's intranet.
- 2.58** The service had adopted a rolling, whole-prison approach to health promotion which was informed by prisoners and promoted topics as part of an agreed programme. Barrier protection was available and discreetly promoted, but prisoners waited too long for smoking cessation support.
- 2.59** A lead had been identified to develop arrangements to meet social care needs. Mobility aids and specialist support and assessment could be provided as required. There was good access to health screening for blood-borne viruses and immunisation programmes.
- 2.60** There were protocols to deal with medical emergencies and a high volume of calls were triggered by prisoners using NPS. We observed the high calibre of the response but noted the significant impact on health care services. Health care staff had appropriate access to emergency equipment and automated external defibrillators (AEDs) which were located in strategic, secure locations and checked regularly. Custody staff had access to AEDs and staff we spoke to were trained to use defibrillators, and had received first aid training as part of their mandatory training.

Recommendations

- 2.61** Out-of-hours provision should be sufficient to meet the needs and health challenges presented by prisoners.
- 2.62** Local responses to prisoners' health care questions and concerns should be quality assured to ensure they address the issues raised before being sealed and securely sent back to the prison.
- 2.63** Waiting times for smoking cessation services should be equivalent to those in the community.

Housekeeping point

- 2.64** Local audit of record keeping should be used to support clinical supervision arrangements for all professional groups.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.65** Comprehensive reception screening was undertaken by a registered nurse who saw all new arrivals in the reception area providing a prompt response to health care needs. Medical and nursing staff visited the segregation unit each day.
- 2.66** Prisoners made a written application for access to health care which was formally acknowledged and triaged by a nurse within two to three working days. The standard waiting time to see the GP for routine appointments was about two weeks which was reasonable, but recent pressures from NPS incidents had caused interruptions in the triage pathway and further delays in accessing treatment were starting to emerge.
- 2.67** There was a range of appropriate clinics with good access apart from physiotherapy and smoking cessation where many men waited too long to be seen. There were regular clinics for men with life-long conditions, a dedicated pain management clinic and a multidisciplinary approach to supporting complex care. However, GPs were expected to re-prescribe medication for men whom they had not seen.
- 2.68** Prisoners had appropriate access to external health care appointments which were well managed with few cancellations. The did-not-attend (DNA) rates for some internal clinics were a concern and, although there was a policy to address this, there was limited appreciation of the root cause of the problem.

Recommendations

- 2.69** Waiting times should be published and waiting times for physiotherapy services should be equivalent to those found in the community.
- 2.70** Men who require routine re-prescriptions should be periodically seen and reviewed by the GP.
- 2.71** Failure-to-attend rates should be monitored for all clinics, the reasons for non-attendance explored, and the results published.

Pharmacy

- 2.72** The in-house team delivered pharmacy services and medicines were supplied by a local provider in a timely manner. Pharmacy technicians administered and supplied medicines except on Sundays and some evenings when nurses provided the service. Patients could seek advice from the pharmacy technicians and the pharmacist who held regular clinics.
- 2.73** The pharmacy team was new and governance arrangements were still developing. The drugs and therapeutics committee met regularly and was well attended. A prescribing formulary was in place, but neither prescribing data on potentially tradable medicines nor the numbers of in-possession medications were routinely captured.
- 2.74** There was an in-possession policy, but risk assessments were not always routinely reviewed in line with the policy. Only prisoners on 28 days' in-possession medication ordered their own medicines, but most received in-possession medication for seven days with routine cell checks to assess compliance. Tradable medicines such as dihydrocodeine were given in possession but many prisoners could not store medicines securely, although this had been assessed as part of the Trust's policy. Medicine queues on house block 1 operated from two hatches unsupervised by custody officers which increased the risk of diversion. Early evening administration meant that night time medication such as Zopiclone was supplied as one day in possession.
- 2.75** There was an over-the-counter medicines policy which provided a good range of medicines, but there was scope for further development of patient group directions¹¹ to provide more timely access to other treatments.
- 2.76** Records of supply and administration were made on prescription and administration charts printed off from SystmOne (electronic clinical information system). Explanations for missed doses of supervised medicines were often not recorded and records on SystmOne did not confirm that these prisoners had been routinely followed up. Prisoners did not sign the chart to show they had received in-possession medication.
- 2.77** Storage for medicines was adequate. Fridge temperatures were within range, although there were some gaps in records. In-possession and non-in-possession medicines were stored together. The quantity of medicines in cupboards did not fully reconcile with prescriptions, there were no audits of over-the-counter medicines stock and recent audits of the emergency supply cupboard showed discrepancies.
- 2.78** The management of controlled drugs was generally good, although on house block 1 controlled drugs prescriptions were signed and witnessed at the end of the session rather than at the point of administration. In house block 2 controlled drugs were taken out of the controlled drugs cupboard and left on the bench during the session and over-the-counter medicines were stored in the controlled drugs cupboard.

Recommendations

- 2.79** The drugs and therapeutics committee should ensure that all the appropriate policies, including the in-possession policy, are in place, in date and adhered to.
- 2.80** Full records of administration of medicines should be made, including a record of all refusals of medication or failure to attend, to enable follow up. Medicines should be administered at the clinically appropriate time.

¹¹ Authorise appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine.

- 2.81 Prescribing data on potentially tradable medicines and prisoners on in-possession medicines should be routinely reviewed to inform practice and prisoners should be able to store their medicines securely.**

Housekeeping points

- 2.82** The drugs and therapeutics committee should introduce a policy for recording and reviewing near misses.
- 2.83** In-possession and supervised medicines should be kept separately to reduce risk.
- 2.84** Controlled drugs should only be removed from the controlled drugs cupboard when they are going to be administered. Over-the-counter medicines should not be stored in the controlled drugs cupboard.
- 2.85** Robust stock reconciliation procedures should be introduced.

Dentistry

- 2.86** Dental services were delivered by Darnall Dental Clinic. Routine assessments and a full range of standard NHS treatments were offered. The dental suite was spacious and clean, care was good and the environment was subject to regular audit. Dental equipment was appropriately maintained and there were adequate arrangements to dispose of waste materials and a separate area for decontamination.
- 2.87** The service was busy but waiting times for treatment were reasonable at around five weeks. Urgent appointments on a needs-led basis were available at every session. Oral health promotion had featured as part of the prison's health promotion strategy.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.88** The primary and secondary mental health teams collaborated to provide an appropriate range of services seven days a week and were directly managed by a clinical matron. Both teams were extremely busy which reflected the complex needs of the population. Capacity had recently been increased to cope with demand, which included a dual diagnosis service, and caseloads were now more appropriate. It was too early to judge whether long-term need, which had been affected by the prevalence of NPS, would be met.
- 2.89** The primary mental health team offered three clear pathways: crisis, guided self-help and case management delivered individually to 76 men on the case load. The team served as the single point of contact with open access to referrals which were triaged promptly. A joint allocations meeting with secondary care facilitated full discussion and allocation to specialist nursing, psychiatry and psychology support. Substantive assessments for non-urgent cases following triage took too long, but overall waiting times for treatment were equivalent to community services. Limited counselling services were accessible through the chaplaincy.
- 2.90** The secondary mental health team's caseload consisted of 72 men of whom nine had enduring and severe mental health problems which needed the care programme approach. Custody staff had received mental health awareness training as part of their mandatory training. A highly innovative mental awareness peer support scheme (MAPS navigator programme) had been introduced which trained prisoners to provide proactive support to men with mental health concerns.

2.91 We found no delays in transferring men to hospital under the Mental Health Act.

Recommendation

2.92 Prisoners should be assessed promptly following receipt of referral.

Good practice

2.93 *The mental awareness peer support scheme (MAPS navigator programme) trained prisoners to support men with concerns about their mental health. This was an effective, innovative approach to meeting mental health needs.*

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.

2.94 *The range and standard of food were good but meals were served too early.*

2.95 The kitchen was clean and well maintained. There were adequate chilled and frozen food storage facilities, with a separate area for halal products. A kitchen journal recorded the dates, times and food temperatures from being placed on food trolleys to delivery on residential units.

2.96 Serveries on residential units were reasonably clean and prisoners were able to eat their meals together out of their cells. Lunch and dinner were selected from a four-week rolling menu which included a reasonable variety of fresh vegetables, fruit and salad every day. In our survey, about a third of respondents said that the food was good or very good.

2.97 Meals continued to be served too early. Lunch was served as early as 11:30am and dinner between 4:30 and 5pm.

2.98 Breakfast packs were issued during the evening to eat the following morning.

2.99 Consultation arrangements were good. There were food comments books on each wing and prisoners were surveyed twice a year. The catering manager attended consultation meetings with prisoners and there was evidence that their views were taken seriously and their suggestions acted on.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.100 *Prisoners could still not access canteen within 24 hours of arrival, but they could have additional reception packs. Canteen delivery had improved and appropriate consultations took place to revise the product list.*

2.101 Only 20% of prisoners said they had access to canteen on arrival against the comparator of 23%. Orders to the supplier, DHL, were submitted once a week, and there could still be a 10-day waiting period depending on the day the prisoner arrived. Prisoners' goods were now delivered to their cells, which minimised opportunities for bullying and theft.

2.102 In our survey, 45% of prisoners said that the product list met their needs against 33% at the last inspection, although black and minority ethnic prisoners were less satisfied with the choice. Consultations took place at prisoner focus groups and the prisoner council, and items on the product list could be swapped each quarter, although the overall number of products was capped. Prisoners complained about the high cost of items.

2.103 Prisoners could buy newspapers and magazines, and a range of catalogues was available which included music, arts and crafts. Orders still incurred a 50 pence administration charge. Families could send in books, and prisoners were allowed to bring in items from a previous establishment.

Recommendation

2.104 **Prisoners should be able to place a shop order on the day after they arrive to minimise bullying.**

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.¹²

- 3.1** *Time out of cell was good for prisoners on house blocks 4 to 7 but poor for a significant number on house blocks 1 to 3. We were concerned that prisoners who had been unlocked to attend an activity were regularly turned away from workshops and locked up because they were not required on that day.*
- 3.2** The activity schedule for prisoners (the core day) indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve just over 10 hours out of cell from Monday to Friday and about six at the weekend. This included short periods of association in the early evening and domestic periods every day that were rarely cancelled. On weekdays, prisoners were not locked up during lunch periods.
- 3.3** We observed that all prisoners on house blocks 4 to 7 were unlocked for most of the day and achieved about nine hours out of cell on weekdays. Prisoners who were temporarily not required for a scheduled work activity were not locked up. Roll checks throughout the week indicated that all prisoners were unlocked during the core day.
- 3.4** However, on house blocks 1 to 3, which accommodated nearly 70% of the population, time out of cell was much worse and we observed too many prisoners locked in their cells. Although fully employed prisoners could achieve about 10 hours unlocked, it was about six hours for a significant number who were temporarily not required for work or worked part time, and only about three hours for the unemployed. Activities were often cancelled at short notice and on many occasions prisoners were turned away from education classrooms and workshops when they had expected to be able to attend. Unlike other house blocks, prisoners were locked in their cells if not attending a scheduled activity. There was some slippage in the regime due to late unlocking, and scheduled activities were sometimes cancelled because of staff shortages.
- 3.5** During roll checks in the middle of the working day, between 43% and 38% of prisoners were locked up on house blocks 1, 2 and 3.

¹² Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.6 Strategic priority was given to Ranby being a working prison and to improving prisoners' English and mathematics. Too many industrial workshops did not have enough work to occupy prisoners throughout the day and in some workshops, prisoners had a poor attitude to work. An additional session of recreational PE provided an incentive for good attendance and behaviour at work. Management actions to reduce interruptions to learning, skills and work had resulted in improvements, although there were still too many interruptions during the core day. In the busier industrial workshops, prisoners took pride in producing good quality work and developed a work ethic, although there was no accreditation of work skills in most workshops. Attendance and punctuality were poor in English, mathematics and employability sessions and in most industrial workshops. Vocational training was well planned with good teaching, although not enough courses were available. The teaching of English and mathematics in education was inconsistent, progress was slow and the achievement of qualifications was poor. Achievements in vocational training and other education courses were mainly good. Progress was good for most learners. The library was welcoming and there was good planned access for prisoners. However, too many sessions were cancelled because prison staff were redeployed to other duties.

3.7 Ofsted¹³ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:	Requires improvement
---	-----------------------------

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:	Requires improvement
--	----------------------

Quality of learning and skills and work provision, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:	Requires improvement
--	----------------------

Personal development and behaviour	Requires improvement
------------------------------------	----------------------

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:	Requires improvement
--	----------------------

Management of learning and skills and work

3.8 Senior managers had developed an effective strategy to promote the ethos of a working prison to prisoners, for example they were required to spend at least the first eight weeks working in the industrial workshops, and to ensure that there were enough activity places for all prisoners to be purposefully occupied.

3.9 Prisoners with English and/or mathematics skills assessed at below level 1 were required by the governor to achieve at least a level 1 qualification as soon as possible, which improved

¹³ 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>.

these important skills for employment on release. Prisoners usually attended an education class part time and worked in the industrial workshops for the rest of the time.

- 3.10** Action had been taken since the previous inspection to reduce interruptions to learning, skills and work activities. Recreational PE during the day had ceased and the issue of medications had been moved to the wings to reduce visits to health care. Despite these improvements, there were still too many occasions when prisoners were absent from their activity areas for operational reasons, such as staff shortages and insufficient work.
- 3.11** All prisoners received detailed information during induction about the range of courses offered and the opportunities to work in different industrial workshops. The pay policy provided equity between education, vocational training and working in industries, encouraging prisoners to value education that could assist with their successful resettlement.
- 3.12** The quality of education and vocational training provided by Milton Keynes College required improvement. Quality assurance by the college was starting to effect improvements to the provision through frequent monitoring, staff development and the sharing of best practice by tutors and trainers. However, these quality checks failed to prevent inconsistencies in the use of progress monitoring documents, poor feedback to learners and poor teaching in English and mathematics which led to slow progress and low achievements by some learners.
- 3.13** The self-assessment process was informed by learners who completed questionnaires about the provision. It had started to generate improvements although the rate of progress was slow. Self-assessment grades were overstated. Managers had aligned the provision to local need and to regional priorities through cluster prison arrangements.
- 3.14** Prisoners received good, impartial careers guidance to help them make informed choices about their learning and future resettlement plans. However, information about their destination after release was not followed up effectively enough to inform improvements to the provision.
- 3.15** Equality and diversity were promoted in learning, skills and work activities and were monitored adequately.

Recommendation

- 3.16** **Quality systems should be systematically and consistently applied to ensure improvements to the quality of teaching, learning and assessment, and to provide feedback to learners on their work, particularly in English and mathematics.**

Provision of activities

- 3.17** There were enough activity places for the population. However, several workshops often did not have enough work to keep all prisoners fully engaged and the work offered in about half the industry workshops was mundane and dull. Too much time was wasted waiting for further work and the pace of production in most workshops was too slow. The engineering workshop was still waiting for materials ordered four months previously which limited their production outputs and those of another workshop where the engineering products had additional processes applied.

- 3.18** When there was a shortage of work, prisoners were sent back to their cells or sat in workshops talking, reading or playing games. Staff in the workshops had no contingency plans to keep prisoners purposefully occupied during these periods.
- 3.19** The range and levels of education courses were appropriate and included courses to develop prisoners' functional skills in English and mathematics from entry level to level 2. The college also offered courses at levels 1 and 2 in employability, money management, business, creative arts, information and communication technology and music technology.
- 3.20** Good vocational training was offered, mainly at level 2, but there were too few courses and the plumbing course was only at level 1 which would limit prisoners' employment options on release. Vocational courses included catering, plumbing, painting and decorating, rail track work and industrial cleaning.
- 3.21** A good range of employment opportunities were offered in prison industries, kitchens and on the wings. Laundry, engineering, sand bag production, waste management and wood machining provided realistic working environments where prisoners developed good work skills. Workshops were well equipped and tidy.

Recommendation

- 3.22** **More vocational training courses and a level 2 plumbing course should be provided.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.23** The ordering and delivery of essential materials for production workshops should be expedited in a timely way.

Quality of provision

- 3.24** There was too much variation in the quality of teaching and learning in education classes. In the best sessions, tutors used the results of a detailed initial assessment to plan well for individual learning and learners' progress was monitored and recorded well. Prisoners' knowledge and skills were developed well through good questioning techniques and building on their interests. Tutors maintained learners' interests by using well-chosen and relevant topics, such as how to reduce debt.
- 3.25** In less successful sessions, principally in English and mathematics, inadequate planning for individual learning and poor monitoring and recording of learning meant that little learning took place. Plans for individual learning were not complete and communication between tutors and cover tutors was ineffective, so that different learning methods were used before learners had been able to grasp the basic concepts. This led to confusion and slowed their progress. Tutors used poor quality hand-outs and work sheets and failed to support and encourage learners to keep their work well organised. As a result, learners' work was disorganised and too often poor. Not all tutors provided enough feedback to enable learners to improve grammatical and spelling errors.
- 3.26** On vocational training courses instructors planned good practical use of English and mathematics in a vocational context to help learners practise and develop their skills. In painting and decorating, instructors had developed very good workbooks to help prisoners prepare for tests, and to provide good examples of contextualised functional skills activities

to improve prisoners' abilities in English and mathematics. In catering, a 'word-wall' and individual spelling lists were used to help learners progress with their English.

- 3.27** Prisoners with additional learning needs received good individual support from specialist support staff who produced a detailed individual learning plan for each learner. However, these plans were not integral to the individual's overall learning plan and were not included in learners' progress reviews or linked effectively to sentence plans. There were limited formal arrangements for prisoners to receive specialist additional support in English and mathematics in vocational workshops.
- 3.28** Most tutors challenged confidently any inappropriate views of learners on equality and diversity issues, linking the experience of learners to argue against prejudice. However, other tutors did not feel confident enough to challenge stereotypical views and improve learners' understanding of equality and diversity.
- 3.29** Instructors and peer mentors worked well together in plumbing and painting and decorating, providing good personal support and helping prisoners to develop appropriate vocational and personal skills. In the painting and decorating workshop prisoners used their skills well to produce excellent decorative paint finishes such as marbling. Most intended to use these skills to set up their own businesses on release.
- 3.30** The quality of target-setting in individual learning plans remained variable. Well-structured individual learning plans were used particularly well in catering, to set challenging targets for learners and to provide useful feedback on the quality of their work. There were frequent checks on learning in the staff mess kitchen and demonstrations by the instructor and by prisoners helped to promote learning and understanding. In contrast, prisoners' skills in wood machining were assessed infrequently resulting in missed targets and slow progress for prisoners.
- 3.31** Equipment and work in the laundry and the wood machining workshops were of a particularly high standard commensurate with industry. The engineering workshop and kitchens mirrored many industrial facilities.

Recommendations

- 3.32** **English and mathematics teachers should plan adequately for individual learning and should monitor and record learning to provide clear information about learners' progression. They should ensure that good quality lesson resources are used and provide detailed feedback to help learners to improve.**
- 3.33** **Tutors' knowledge of equality and diversity issues should be developed to improve their confidence in challenging stereotypical views and to provide more frequent assessment of progress in all workshops.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.34** Poor attendance was common in some industry workshops. Work and the start of vocational training sessions were too often delayed because of poor attendance and punctuality. As a result, levels of productivity in workshops and the pace of progress in vocational training were slow. A poor work ethic from prisoners was tolerated by staff in too many industrial workshops. Many prisoners had a poor attitude to working which would not be tolerated by most employers. There were some exceptions where prisoners did develop good work skills. For example, in one textiles workshop prisoners producing

sandbags often worked extra time over lunch to meet production targets. In a few workshops such as engineering, powder-coating and in the staff mess kitchen, prisoners worked well in teams to produce good quality work. On the rail track work course, prisoners displayed good team-working and team-leading skills.

- 3.35** The proportion of learners attending education regularly had improved since the previous inspection and was now mainly satisfactory. However, the proportion who attended English, mathematics and employability sessions regularly was poor. A significant number of learners on English and mathematics courses were not motivated to learn and did not develop their skills well enough.
- 3.36** In a minority of education sessions tutors focused well on developing learners' employability skills. They included activities to help learners develop their personal skills such as team work. However, most sessions failed to identify and develop any employability skills.
- 3.37** Prisoners took pride in producing high quality work in painting and decorating, engineering, wood machining, and in the kitchens. They demonstrated a good standard of behaviour in vocational and education sessions and respected each other's views. The confidence of most prisoners improved and they were motivated to learn. The prison did not have an established system to identify and monitor the wider personal, social and employability skills that prisoners developed.

Recommendation

- 3.38 Teachers and instructors should focus on developing and accrediting prisoners' employability skills and should recognise and record the valuable personal and social skills that are developed.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.39** Many learners made good progress in employability, money management, business, creative arts, information and communications technology and music technology courses. A good proportion of learners on levels 1 and 2 information computer technology and managing personal finance courses completed qualifications successfully. However, the progress of too many learners on English and mathematics courses was slow relative to their starting points. The proportion of English and mathematics learners who had completed a course successfully was low, although the completion of entry level qualifications had improved. While most learners produced work of a good standard, work in English and mathematics was often poor.
- 3.40** There were high success rates in vocational training qualifications but too few industrial workshops offered accreditation to recognise the employment skills that prisoners had developed. In painting and decorating learners did not have the opportunity to photograph their work to show prospective employers the skills that they had developed.

Recommendation

- 3.41 The progress and achievements of English and mathematics learners should be improved so that they are at least good.**

Library

- 3.42** The library service had been managed by the Lincolnshire Library and Information Service since April 2015. One full-time and two part-time staff and two qualified orderlies managed the library, which was a welcoming facility.
- 3.43** Prisoners had good planned access to the library and its resources. It was open during weekdays and all day and early evening on Saturdays. However, the library had closed too many times for operational reasons. The proportion of prisoners who used the library was satisfactory.
- 3.44** The library management information system was limited and staff were not able to monitor library use fully to generate management data on, for example, which groups of prisoners used the library less than others.
- 3.45** The library had appropriate resources: an adequate range of DVDs, a good range of fiction, non-fiction, easy-reads, audio books, legal texts, books on vocational topics, and relevant Prison Service Instructions clearly displayed. A good range of daily newspapers was available.
- 3.46** Prisoners' views were gathered through a survey to plan the operation of the library and the range of books and displays. For example, there was a dedicated section of books for gay prisoners.
- 3.47** Staff promoted reading well through a number of initiatives such as the Shannon Trust reading scheme and the Six Book Challenge, for which the library had received a gold award.

Recommendation

- 3.48** **The use of the library by different groups should be monitored and the number of library closures for operational reasons should be reduced.**

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.

- 3.49** *PE facilities were adequate. A suitable range of cardiovascular equipment and free weights were available, but a small amount of equipment was in need of repair or replacement. Facilities were clean and well organised but the showers still lacked privacy screens. An adequate range of sports and leisure activities were provided, including specific sessions for older men and those with health care referrals. PE staff were well qualified and experienced. Five gym orderlies and one trained peer mentor helped to promote physical health and wellbeing to other prisoners. Access was good but too many sessions were cancelled because of redeployment of PE staff.*

- 3.50** PE facilities were adequate and consisted of two separate, similarly equipped gyms. Facilities included a large sports hall, weights areas, cardiovascular suites, spinning classes and small classroom areas. There was an outdoor sports area with a football pitch and rugby pitch but this was seldom used. A suitable range of cardiovascular equipment and free weights were available, but a small amount of equipment was in need of repair or replacement. Facilities

were clean and well organised, including the shower and changing areas. The showers still lacked privacy screens.

- 3.51** An adequate range of sports and leisure activities were provided including circuit training, soccer, racquet sports and weight training. Five gym orderlies and one trained peer mentor helped to promote physical health and wellbeing and facilitated gym sessions. Gym orderlies had completed PE qualifications while in the establishment.
- 3.52** PE staff had very good relationships with prisoners and offered a safe and welcoming environment. Staff were well qualified and experienced. Most had gained teaching or assessment qualifications since the last inspection. A well-planned and varied range of courses were offered and sports qualifications for prisoners had recently been reintroduced.
- 3.53** Planned opening hours for PE were good and prisoners on each wing had three scheduled times to use the facilities over lunchtime and at evenings and weekends. Prisoners engaged in full-time work or education were now accommodated at times which did not interfere with their other core day commitments. However, too many sessions were cancelled because PE staff were redeployed in the prison.
- 3.54** The working relationship between the PE department and health care was appropriate. PE staff offered specific sessions for older prisoners and for those referred by health care to improve their health and wellbeing, for example, weight management sessions or sessions for prisoners with mental health issues.
- 3.55** All prisoners received an appropriate induction before using the gym and exercise equipment, but a few prisoners had to wait too long for their induction.

Recommendations

- 3.56** **Privacy screens should be provided in the gym showers.** (Repeat of previous housekeeping point)
- 3.57** **The number of gym closures for operational reasons should be reduced and better use should be made of the outside sports field.**

Housekeeping point

- 3.58** Repairs to equipment should be carried out in a timely fashion.

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 *Resettlement was in transition following the introduction of the community rehabilitation company (CRC), which was not yet at full capacity. There was an up-to-date reducing reoffending strategy and action plan informed by a needs analysis, although this was based on a low number of prisoner responses. The reducing reoffending team meetings were held regularly and were well attended. There was no use of release on temporary licence (ROTL).*

4.2 Ranby was designated as both a working and resettlement prison. Following reconfiguration of the prison estate, 46% of the population had been there for less than six months.

4.3 Resettlement was in transition following the introduction in May 2015 of the Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottingham and Rutland Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC), one of the national scheme of CRCs providing through-the-gate resettlement services to all prisoners in designated resettlement prisons (see paragraph 4.34).

4.4 There had been good preparation for the arrival of the CRC, but the team was not yet at full capacity and it was too early to judge its effectiveness. The work of the CRC was not well understood across the prison and effective links had yet to be developed between the offender management unit (OMU) and CRC staff.

4.5 Strategic management of resettlement had improved and there was now a reducing reoffending strategy and action plan informed by a needs analysis. Based only on a prisoner survey, the analysis excluded data such as the Measuring the Quality of Prison Life survey or OASys (offender assessment system). A new survey had been carried out in the last six weeks which was awaiting analysis but, with responses from only 155 prisoners, 14% of the population, there was a risk that the analysis would be too subjective.

4.6 In addition to the seven reintegration pathways, the strategy included three cross-cutting themes of offender management and public protection, gang culture and work with indeterminate sentenced prisoners. OMU staff were under considerable pressure to complete work that had not been done by sending prisons (see paragraph 4.13) and the action plan included targets to address identified shortfalls.

4.7 The reducing reoffending team met every two months. Meetings were well attended and pathway and action plan progress was monitored at each meeting.

4.8 No use was made of release on temporary licence.

Recommendation

4.9 **OASys data should be used to inform the needs analysis.**

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

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

4.10 *OMU staff understood their role but several factors prevented them from delivering an effective service. Offender supervisors were regularly redeployed, there was a significant backlog of OASys and planned contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was extremely poor. The quality of OASys and sentence planning was inadequate and MAPPA management levels were not always reviewed far enough ahead of release. Provision for indeterminate sentence prisoners was developing.*

4.11 OMU staff were motivated, understood their role and recognised the scale of the challenges they faced. However, a range of factors was preventing the OMU from delivering an effective service.

4.12 The unit was understaffed with only 16 of 20 planned offender supervisors. Offender supervisors were frequently redeployed to cover the work of absent colleagues and about 600 hours had been lost from the unit each month during the period February to August 2015.

4.13 Although it had reduced since the last inspection, there remained a significant backlog of 281 OASys assessments and too many prisoners arrived without one: 46% of all new receptions during May to July 2015.

4.14 In our survey, responses to questions about preparation for release were very poor: 64% of prisoners said they had an offender manager in the community against the comparator of 83%; only 30% said they had a named offender supervisor against the comparator of 74% and 49% at the previous inspection; only 9% of prisoners said their supervisor was working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets, and 77% of prisoners said that nobody was doing so. During the inspection prisoners expressed significant frustration about delays in offender management work and the impact this had on their progression, and this contributed to the general instability of the prison.

4.15 The quality of OASys assessments varied in the 12 cases that we sampled. Two cases had no current OASys assessment and half the remainder did not have an adequate and timely assessment of the likelihood of reoffending. Most assessments had been completed by community offender managers but those prepared by offender supervisors were of poorer quality.

4.16 Risk of serious harm screenings were not accurate in half the cases we examined and only one of five assessments for in-scope prisoners¹⁴ had a full analysis of risk of harm to others. Less than half the cases had a current and adequate risk management plan. Most assessments contained a completed self assessment.

4.17 The quality of sentence plans varied, and 60% addressed offending or risk of harm fully. Four of six out-of-scope cases (those not subject to offender management) with an impending

¹⁴ Prisoners serving 12 months or more and classified as posing a high risk to the public.

release date had no substantive plans for prisoners' return to the community, despite outstanding needs such as accommodation or substance misuse. In our survey, only 32% of prisoners said they had a sentence plan against the comparator of 66% and 56% at the last inspection.

- 4.18** There was evidence of delivery of offending behaviour work in only a quarter of cases and of victim awareness work in a third of cases. In half the relevant cases victim protection work was inadequate, for example in domestic abuse cases. Good use was made of the video link to facilitate some sessions.
- 4.19** Some offender supervisors had large case loads of about 100 prisoners. Unlike their probation colleagues, uniformed supervisors received no formal casework supervision in spite of managing high risk of harm prisoners and child protection cases.
- 4.20** In most cases that we sampled, offender supervisor contact was not regular or meaningful and we found only one case in which a supervisor was supporting the delivery of planned work. In groups and individually prisoners complained vociferously about lack of contact with their supervisors, and this was the case for all indeterminate sentence prisoners we met. Weekly surgeries had been run since May 2015 to try to address this but these were largely managed by unit administrators and offender supervisors rarely attended.
- 4.21** Home detention curfew procedures were generally good. Delays caused by sending establishments or late submission of reports by community offender managers were often outside the prison's control.

Recommendation

- 4.22 All offender supervisors should receive feedback on the quality of their work and appropriate support to improve the quality of risk assessment, contingency and pre-release planning.**

Public protection

- 4.23** Contact restrictions were identified and applied on arrival and appropriate monitoring arrangements and restrictions were agreed and reviewed at weekly public protection meetings. A senior officer informed prisoners of restrictions and the process for applying for contact with named children.
- 4.24** The violent and sex offender register was used as required and MAPPA (multi-agency public protection arrangements) forms were of reasonable quality. However, MAPPA management levels were not always reviewed far enough ahead of release by the inter-departmental risk management team (IRMT), which potentially limited multi-agency planning. IRMT minutes did not always record the follow up of agreed actions.

Recommendation

- 4.25 Confirmation of MAPPA management levels should be sought six months before release.**

Housekeeping point

- 4.26** Minutes of IRMT meetings should fully record responses to agreed actions.

Categorisation

- 4.27** Categorisation reviews were up to date and were carried out as a paper exercise by two dedicated offender supervisors.
- 4.28** Prisoners were invited to provide a supporting statement for re-categorisation. The security department was formally approached for information and information was sourced from NOMIS, but offender supervisors, wing staff and other staff involved with the prisoner did not contribute formally.
- 4.29** Prisoners received notification in writing, including the reasons for refusal of re-categorisation.
- 4.30** There were 38 category D prisoners, 16 of whom had failed open conditions and were held awaiting the parole process or to attend a programme. Moves to open prisons were quickly put in place for other prisoners. There had been difficulties transferring prisoners to their home area 12 weeks before release, particularly to prisons in the south.

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.31** The 91 indeterminate sentence prisoners (ISPs, 49 of whom were serving life sentences), continued to be managed by two probation offender supervisors and were located across the prison. They had no dedicated facilities but ISP forums had recently been introduced to identify and support their needs.
- 4.32** Parole dossiers were completed on time and ISPs had improved access to psychological services (see paragraph 4.59). Every ISP we met complained about lack of contact with their offender supervisor (see paragraph 4.20).

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.

4.33 *New CRC provision was not yet fully embedded and the team was not at full strength. Quarterly resettlement fairs had been introduced. Accommodation services had been maintained during the recent transition and most prisoners were released into stable accommodation. The quality of the National Careers Service required improvement and more needed to be done to track outcomes. The primary care team provided good support and there were effective links with community mental health teams. The substance misuse service made appropriate arrangements for continuation of treatment after release. Reasonable support was provided with finance, benefit and debt problems and work in this pathway was developing. Visitors said it was easy to book visits. Children and family pathway services had improved but there was no family support worker. The accredited programmes were suitable for most of the population. A restorative justice service had been introduced. There were no specific services for victims of abuse and the level of need was not known.*

4.34 The CRC was not yet fully embedded and the team was not at full strength (see paragraph 4.4).

4.35 Demand for resettlement services was high and an average of 103 prisoners were released each month. No prisoners and few staff appeared to understand the work of the CRC. Fewer prisoners than at similar establishments said they knew who to turn to for help or said they had received help with resettlement. During the inspection, prisoners due for release in the next 12 weeks were invited to attend a resettlement fair organised by the CRC to talk to agency representatives from across all pathways. There were plans for these fairs to run each quarter which would be of benefit to prisoners.

4.36 Basic custody screening identifying prisoners' resettlement needs was completed and used to develop resettlement plans. CRC caseworkers completed between 80 and 90 resettlement plans each month for prisoners sentenced before May 2015. CRC caseworkers were not involved in induction, although this was planned, and 'meet-at-the-gate' volunteers were not yet in place.

Recommendation

4.37 **The CRC team should be fully staffed, including 'meet-at-the-gate' volunteers, and all prisoners and staff should understand their role.**

Accommodation

4.38 Accommodation services had been maintained during the recent transition and the CRC team had recruited a temporary member of staff to provide housing assistance while more permanent staff were being recruited. Although there had been a small increase in the no-fixed-abode rate (3% to 5%) since the previous year, most of the 623 prisoners released in the past six months had gone into stable accommodation.

- 4.39** Out-of-area referrals were made to community services wherever possible and the quarterly resettlement event gave prisoners due for release in the next 12 weeks the opportunity to meet advisers.

Education, training and employment

- 4.40** The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Futures Advice Skills and Employment required improvement. Prisoners received good information, guidance and support from advisers and detailed skills action plans were well monitored and followed up, often well beyond the contract requirements. Advisers focused on agreeing and arranging prisoners' resettlement priorities and objectives and provided good information and guidance before their release to help with prisoners' education and employment resettlement needs.
- 4.41** Attempts by the National Careers Service to follow up prisoners' education, training and employment outcomes three months after release were poor and outcomes were well below targets. Processes to collect the information were underdeveloped and failed to link effectively with other partners working with offenders following their release.
- 4.42** Self-employment courses were provided for prisoners interested in starting their own business. Job-search training courses were offered, but the virtual campus¹⁵ was rarely used as a job-search resource because of slow computer access and use of the room for other purposes such as on-line exams and tutorials. Links with employers mainly occurred through the rail track work course; learners who completed the course and gained the qualification could apply for a job in rail track maintenance. A significant number had secured employment in rail track maintenance when released.

Recommendation

- 4.43** **The National Careers Service should develop suitable arrangements to track prisoners' education, work or training outcomes systematically following their release.**

Health care

- 4.44** The primary care team supported men before they were released, providing them with information about registering with a GP and supplying take home medication if required.
- 4.45** There were effective links with community mental health teams to plan for the release of men with severe and enduring mental health needs.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.46** The substance misuse service linked with the OMU to provide prisoners with harm reduction information as part of release planning. Community services had recently been re-commissioned, and appropriate arrangements were in place to ensure that treatment continued after release. The prison had a wide catchment area and the service was in contact with a large number of drug intervention programme teams.

¹⁵ Internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.47** Reasonable support was provided with finance, benefit and debt issues. Work in this pathway was developing and key stakeholders had been identified. CRC case workers were trained and experienced in using a 'debt advice toolkit' to respond to routine queries, including outstanding court fines and housing debt. Benefit advisers from the CRC offered support on more complex issues. Contact had been made with partner agencies to help deliver a service. Job Centre Plus provided a full-time worker. A local bank had been approached to enable prisoners to open accounts. Milton Keynes College offered an accredited personal budgeting and money management course.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.48** The visitors' centre continued to offer good support and facilities. Most visitors were happy with the way they were treated and found it easy to book visits. Only enhanced prisoners could have a weekly visit, as we had found at the previous inspection.
- 4.49** The visits hall was cramped but there were plans to take away some of the tables and chairs. Refreshments were only available from vending machines. The limited choice and the requirement for visitors to take only coins into the visits room was a source of frustration to them and to prisoners. There was no provision to give change for notes.
- 4.50** Prisoners were required to wear a fluorescent bib marked with the number of the table they were sitting at.
- 4.51** The design of the closed visit facilities did not allow privacy when more than one was in use.
- 4.52** The previously poor play area was now equipped as a soft play area and funding was received during the inspection to employ a play worker. Not all officers knew which prisoners were subject to child contact restrictions. A Sure Start parenting course and regular children's days had been introduced. ROTL was not used to maintain contact with families (see paragraph 4.8).

Recommendations

- 4.53** **Methods of identifying prisoners during visits should be respectful and proportionate to the risks presented.**
- 4.54** **All officers supervising the visits room should be aware of prisoners subject to child contact restrictions.**
- 4.55** **A family support worker should be employed to help prisoners maintain contact with their family and support those subject to child protection procedures.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.56** Accredited programmes comprised the thinking skills programme (TSP), RESOLVE and the self-change programme (SCP). TSP and RESOLVE delivered 80 and 40 places annually and SCP 20 places on a six-month rolling programme. Targets were met and prisoners were suitably prioritised but delays to OASys assessments affected some prisoners.

- 4.57** The SCP, managed by a psychologist, was a national resource for high-risk violent offenders. Targets were met, but it was difficult to facilitate the transfer in of individual prisoners from out of the area.
- 4.58** Programmes delivered were appropriate for most of the population but some staff felt there was a need to address violence in relationships.
- 4.59** A lead psychologist managed a prison-based team of psychologists and trainees. Requests by prisons in the area for psychology services, such as one-to-one work or parole directives, were now referred to a regional base and prioritised according to need. This ensured a more timely and equitable response. A member of the psychology team attended the OMU each week to discuss individual cases with offender supervisors and advise on programme suitability.
- 4.60** Remedi, a restorative justice and mediation service introduced into the prison in May 2015, had enabled two prisoners to meet the victims of their offence.
- 4.61** A Kainos 'challenge to change' accredited therapeutic community was due to open on house block 5 in October 2015. Prisoners would live in the community during the six-month programme, identifying offending behaviour risk factors and developing effective skills to manage them.

Recommendation

- 4.62 The need to address violence in relationships should be assessed and a programme provided if necessary.**

Additional resettlement services

- 4.63** There were no specific services for victims of abuse and the level of need was not known. However, a qualified counsellor provided individual counselling and bereavement counselling was offered by a chaplain.

Recommendation

- 4.64 The extent of historic abuse among the population should be identified and specific services introduced to meet need.**

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.1** Urgent action is needed to stabilise the prison and to make it safer. NOMS should temporarily reduce the size of the prison's population to help stabilise it, and in the medium term simplify the role of the prison as a working prison only. (S46)

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.2** An effective, whole prison strategy to reduce violence and its contributory causes should be put in place, based on consultation with staff and prisoners and an analysis of the causes of high levels of violence. (S47)
- 5.3** The quality of assessment, planning and monitoring for prisoners subject to ACCT procedures should be improved and include effective care planning and better attendance at review meetings. (S48)
- 5.4** The prison should provide a full purposeful working day for all the men held, attendance and punctuality should be good and a good work ethic promoted. (S49)
- 5.5** The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) and home detention curfew assessments should be tackled and all relevant prisoners should be seen promptly by their offender supervisor to be assessed, have relevant targets set and risks addressed. Contact should be regular and meaningful. (S50)

Recommendations

To the governor

Security

- 5.6** All requested intelligence-led searches should be completed. (I.46)
- 5.7** There should be enough staff supervising to provide a safe environment during mass movement of prisoners. (I.47)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.8** The IEP scheme should be equitably applied to ensure full compliance with the regime. (I.52)

Discipline

- 5.9** Oversight and recording arrangements for use of force should be robust enough to provide re-assurance that it is used proportionately and only as a last resort. (1.61)
- 5.10** The transfer out policy should be evaluated and poor behaviour by prisoners should be managed without routinely resorting to transfers out. (1.68)

Substance misuse

- 5.11** Substance misuse services should be sufficient to meet demand. (1.75)
- 5.12** All prisoners prescribed methadone should be consistently located on the drug treatment unit. (1.76)

Residential units

- 5.13** Recent management action to address a range of prisoners' frustrations by improving cellular accommodation, cleanliness and the applications process should be sustained and developed. (2.10)
- 5.14** The cell call system should be routinely monitored by a senior manager and explanations provided for delays. (2.11)

Equality and diversity

- 5.15** Strategic management of equality needed to be strengthened by more consistent attendance by relevant functional areas at equality action team meetings, a needs analysis of the population and regular monitoring of outcomes for prisoners. (2.25)
- 5.16** Support for all the protected groups should be adequate to understand their concerns and, where possible, meet their specific needs. (2.34)

Legal rights

- 5.17** Legal services should be provided and resources to assist prisoners with their legal problems should be kept up to date. (2.49)

Health services

- 5.18** Out-of-hours provision should be sufficient to meet the needs and health challenges presented by prisoners. (2.61)
- 5.19** Local responses to prisoners' health care questions and concerns should be quality assured to ensure they address the issues raised before being sealed and securely sent back to the prison. (2.62)
- 5.20** Waiting times for smoking cessation services should be equivalent to those in the community. (2.63)
- 5.21** Waiting times should be published and waiting times for physiotherapy services should be equivalent to those found in the community. (2.69)

- 5.22** Men who require routine re-prescriptions should be periodically seen and reviewed by the GP. (2.70)
- 5.23** Failure-to-attend rates should be monitored for all clinics, the reasons for non-attendance explored, and the results published. (2.71)
- 5.24** The drugs and therapeutics committee should ensure that all the appropriate policies, including the in-possession policy, are in place, in date and adhered to. (2.78)
- 5.25** Full records of administration of medicines should be made, including a record of all refusals of medication or failure to attend, to enable follow up. Medicines should be administered at the clinically appropriate time. (2.80)
- 5.26** Prescribing data on potentially tradable medicines and prisoners on in-possession medicines should be routinely reviewed to inform practice and prisoners should be able to store their medicines securely. (2.81)
- 5.27** Prisoners should be assessed promptly following receipt of referral. (2.92)

Purchases

- 5.28** Prisoners should be able to place a shop order on the day after they arrive to minimise bullying. (2.104)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.29** Quality systems should be systematically and consistently applied to ensure improvements to the quality of teaching, learning and assessment, and to provide feedback to learners on their work, particularly in English and mathematics. (3.16)
- 5.30** More vocational training courses and a level 2 plumbing course should be provided. (3.22)
- 5.31** English and mathematics teachers should plan adequately for individual learning and should monitor and record learning to provide clear information about learners' progression. They should ensure that good quality lesson resources are used and provide detailed feedback to help learners to improve. (3.32)
- 5.32** Tutors' knowledge of equality and diversity issues should be developed to improve their confidence in challenging stereotypical views and to provide more frequent assessment of progress in all workshops. (3.33)
- 5.33** Teachers and instructors should focus on developing and accrediting prisoners' employability skills and should recognise and record the valuable personal and social skills that are developed. (3.38)
- 5.34** The progress and achievements of English and mathematics learners should be improved so that they are at least good. (3.41)
- 5.35** The use of the library by different groups should be monitored and the number of library closures for operational reasons should be reduced. (3.48)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.36** Privacy screens should be provided in the gym showers. (3.56)

- 5.37** The number of gym closures for operational reasons should be reduced and better use should be made of the outside sports field. (3.57)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.38** OASys data should be used to inform the needs analysis. (4.9)

Offender management and planning

- 5.39** All offender supervisors should receive feedback on the quality of their work and appropriate support to improve the quality of risk assessment, contingency and pre-release planning. (4.22)
- 5.40** Confirmation of MAPPA management levels should be sought six months before release. (4.25)

Reintegration planning

- 5.41** The CRC team should be fully staffed, including 'meet-at-the-gate' volunteers, and all prisoners and staff should understand their role. (4.37)
- 5.42** The National Careers Service should develop suitable arrangements to track prisoners' education, work or training outcomes systematically following their release. (4.43)
- 5.43** Methods of identifying prisoners during visits should be respectful and proportionate to the risks presented. (4.53)
- 5.44** All officers supervising the visits room should be aware of prisoners subject to child contact restrictions. (4.54)
- 5.45** A family support worker should be employed to help prisoners maintain contact with their family and support those subject to child protection procedures. (4.55)
- 5.46** The need to address violence in relationships should be assessed and a programme provided if necessary. (4.62)
- 5.47** The extent of historic abuse among the population should be identified and specific services introduced to meet need. (4.64)

Housekeeping points

Health services

- 5.48** Local audit of record keeping should be used to support clinical supervision arrangements for all professional groups. (2.64)
- 5.49** The drugs and therapeutics committee should introduce a policy for recording and reviewing near misses. (2.82)
- 5.50** In-possession and supervised medicines should be kept separately to reduce risk. (2.83)

5.51 Controlled drugs should only be removed from the controlled drugs cupboard when they are going to be administered. Over-the-counter medicines should not be stored in the controlled drugs cupboard.(2.84)

5.52 Robust stock reconciliation procedures should be introduced. (2.85)

Learning and skills and work activities

5.53 The ordering and delivery of essential materials for production workshops should be expedited in a timely way. (3.23)

Physical education and healthy living

5.54 Repairs to equipment should be carried out in a timely fashion. (3.58)

Offender management and planning

5.55 Minutes of IRMT meetings should fully record responses to agreed actions. (4.26)

Examples of good practice

5.56 One Ranby provided an accessible drop-in facility for communicating with prisoners, disseminating information and resolving issues. (2.12)

5.57 The mental awareness peer support scheme (MAPS navigator programme) trained prisoners to support men with concerns about their mental health. This was an effective, innovative approach to meeting mental health needs. (2.93)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Nick Hardwick	Chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Joss Crosbie	Inspector
Paul Fenning	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Deri Hughes Roberts	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Michelle Bellham	Researcher
Collette Daoud	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Steve Eley	Health services inspector
Richard Chapman	Pharmacist
John Grimmer	Ofsted inspector
Bob Busby	Ofsted inspector
Shahram Safavi	Ofsted inspector
Colin Barnes	Offender management inspector
Jo Dowling	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 2014, reception processes were welcoming. First night accommodation was disgraceful and there was a lack of support for new arrivals. Induction was comprehensive. Far too many prisoners felt unsafe and levels of victimisation, intimidation, violence and unrest were high. Levels of self-harm had risen recently and we were not confident that case management was always effective. Illicit drugs were easily available. Security was generally well managed but insufficiently strategic in addressing the threat of drugs. Levels of use of force were similar to those at other prisons but quality assurance was weak. Many prisoners sought sanctuary in segregation, which was used almost exclusively to hold prisoners awaiting transfer out of the prison. Substance misuse services were generally good. **Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.**

Main recommendations

Prisoners' views on safety should be sought and analysed alongside all other safety data. This should inform an action plan to make the prison safer. (S46)

Not achieved

The quality of assessment, planning and monitoring for prisoners subject to ACCT procedures should be improved and include effective care planning and improved attendance at review meetings. Prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures should not be segregated without an exceptional review and authorisation. (S49)

Not achieved

An action plan to address drug and alcohol supply reduction and demand should be implemented and should address the specific issue of new psychoactive substances and diverted medication. (S50)

Achieved

Recommendations

Prisoners should be able to take all their property when transferred. (I.5)

Achieved

Prisoners should not have to wait for long periods in reception. (I.14)

Achieved

Prisoners should be fully supported during their early days at the establishment, and their cells should be clean and fully prepared with essential equipment. (I.15)

Partially achieved

The first night and induction wing should not be used as a place of refuge for prisoners who refuse to move, or are under threat or struggling to cope on other wings. (I.16)

Achieved

The 'zero-tolerance management strategy' should be properly used to support prisoners at risk from others and to set behaviour targets to reduce antisocial behaviour. (I.27)

Not achieved

Prisoners with a role in promoting safer custody should be adequately trained and supported. (I.28)

No longer relevant

The quality of assessment, planning and monitoring for prisoners subject to ACCT procedures should be improved and include effective care planning and improved attendance at review meetings. (I.35)

Not achieved (Recommendation repeated, S48)

Action plans in response to recommendations following a death in custody should fully address the concerns raised and their effectiveness should be monitored. (I.36)

Partially achieved

The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (I.40)

Achieved

The incentives and earned privileges scheme should be applied consistently across the prison and processes introduced to ensure the monitoring of and management of prisoner behaviour. (I.52)

Achieved

Prisoners should not be automatically reduced to the basic level without a formal review. (I.53)

Achieved

Cells in the segregation unit should be clean, free from graffiti and properly maintained. (I.67)

Achieved

A comprehensive policy should be introduced for the management and transfer of prisoners in the segregation unit. It should include how problem or vulnerable behaviour and underlying causes will be investigated, how individual needs will be met and options for reintegration or transfer. (I.68)

Not achieved

Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous fellowship groups should be made available to prisoners. (I.75)

Partially achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection in 2014, the prison was generally clean and litter free. The quality of accommodation varied widely but most cells were shabby and poorly maintained. Some showers were in an appalling condition but access to them, and to telephones, was good. There was a lack of meaningful engagement between staff and prisoners. The management of equality and diversity had deteriorated and the needs of some minority groups were not being met. Faith provision was reasonable. Prisoners had little confidence in complaints processes. Health services had improved overall. The food provided was reasonably good. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

Main recommendation

The needs of prisoners with protected characteristics should be promptly identified and met through individual assessment, regular direct consultation with minority groups, effective care planning and monitoring. (S51)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Single cells should not be used to accommodate two prisoners. (2.9)

Not achieved

Cells should be equipped with sufficient serviceable furniture (including lockable cupboards) and adequate toilet screens, and cell cleaning materials should be freely available. (2.10)

Partially achieved

Showers should be refurbished where necessary and provide adequate privacy. (2.11)

Partially achieved

Night workers should be able to sleep without disruption. (2.12)

No longer relevant

Staff supervision during association should be improved. (2.13)

Not achieved

The personal officer scheme should be effective in providing regular support and motivation to prisoners. (2.21)

Not achieved

There should be regular and meaningful consultation with prisoners in order to improve communication. (2.22)

Achieved

Provision for foreign national prisoners should be improved, including independent immigration advice. (2.40)

Not achieved

Multidisciplinary care plans should be developed for prisoners with social care needs and made available to wing staff. (2.41)

Achieved

Complaints should be responded to appropriately and systems developed to ensure that prisoners receive a prompt and full response. (2.53)

Achieved

Legal services should be provided. (2.59)

Not achieved

Legal visits should take place out of the hearing of others. (2.60)

Not achieved

Prisoners should receive timely responses to health care complaints that adequately address all the issues raised. (2.72)

Achieved

All clinical areas should be fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.73)

Achieved

There should be systematic health promotion throughout the prison, including easily accessible barrier protection, overseen by a prison health promotion action group and which includes prisoner representation. (2.74)

Achieved

A designated senior health lead should develop health services for older prisoners and those with disabilities. (2.75)

Achieved

Prisoners requiring emergency first aid out of hours should have prompt access to appropriately trained staff and sufficient well-maintained equipment, including defibrillators, which receives regular documented checks. (2.76)

Achieved

Prisoners with cardiac conditions should receive regular reviews which generate an evidence-based care plan from staff who are appropriately trained and supervised. (2.82)

Achieved

Prisoners should have timely access to external hospital appointments. (2.83)

Achieved

Prisoners should have access to pharmacist-led clinics. (2.91)

Achieved

The prescribing and administration of potentially tradable medication should reflect current best practice guidelines. (2.92)

Partially achieved

Medication administration should be adequately supervised, to ensure privacy and compliance and reduce the risk of bullying and diversion. (2.93)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should have prompt access to appropriate medication through patient group directions and 'special sick' supplies, and their use should be consistently recorded and monitored. (2.94)

Partially achieved

The dental surgery should fully comply with dental infection control regulations. (2.105)

Achieved

Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training. (2.111)

Achieved

Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm. Breakfast packs should be issued on the day they are to be eaten. (2.118)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be able to place a shop order on the day after reception. (2.125)

Not achieved

There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders. (2.126)

Not achieved

Purchases should be delivered to prisoners in a way that minimises the risks of bullying and theft. (2.127)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection in 2014, the amount of time unlocked had improved and was good for most, but too many prisoners were locked up during the working day. There was no clear strategy for the implementation of the working prison model. Most work provision was poor and there was too little work to keep prisoners adequately occupied. There were sufficient activity places for most but they were not fully used and the number of high-quality places was too limited. There were high levels of unemployment. The quality and range of education and vocational training were good, with a focus on employability. Teaching and coaching were good. Achievement of qualifications was good in most areas but not in English and mathematics, and opportunities to accredit some work skills were missed. Library services were very good and recreational PE was good but too often disrupted.

Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

All activity places should be filled, interruptions to the working day should be reduced and prisoners should not be able to opt out of activities. All work areas should encourage a good work ethos and have sufficient work to keep prisoners occupied. (S52)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

All prisoners should have association and one hour of exercise every day. (3.4)

Achieved

The prison should have a clear strategy for implementing its role as a designated working prison. (3.12)

Achieved

The quality of the teaching and training should be monitored effectively and focused on improvement, especially in English and mathematics. (3.13)

Not achieved

Prisoners should have opportunities for gaining accredited vocational qualifications in all work activities. (3.19)

Not achieved

All prisoners with low levels of English and mathematics should be able to develop these skills in education classes, vocational training and work activities. (3.20)

Partially achieved

Prisoners should have appropriate opportunities to develop their practical skills in English and mathematics in meaningful contexts, including work-related and vocational settings. (3.25)

Achieved

Teaching and assessment in English and mathematics should focus more on ensuring that learners are motivated to learn and can apply their skills accurately and independently so that a greater proportion achieve qualifications, especially at levels 1 and 2. (3.30)

Not achieved

Library orderlies should be offered relevant qualifications, such as in customer service. (3.34)

Achieved

Prisoners should have equitable access to the gym as planned. (3.40)

Achieved

Specific PE sessions for those with specific needs should be offered separately from mainstream sessions. (3.41)

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 2014, the strategic management of reducing reoffending was poor. Offender management arrangements were stretched and neglected the needs of many prisoners. There was insufficient focus on risk management and progression, even for high risk of harm prisoners. Public protection arrangements were generally sound but there was insufficient attention to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) release planning. The high number of prisoners waiting for transfer hampered progression. Too few prisoners received a resettlement needs assessment on arrival and the quality of resettlement provision was variable and mostly poor. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

Main recommendations

The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments should be tackled and all relevant prisoners should be seen by their offender supervisor promptly to be assessed, have relevant targets set, risks addressed and progression and/or transfer pursued. Contact should be regular and meaningful. (S53)

Not achieved

The resettlement needs of all prisoners should be comprehensively assessed on arrival and before release, with a coordinated plan developed to support them and adequate resources to meet demand. (S54)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

A comprehensive and up-to-date reducing reoffending strategy and action plan should be developed, based on a robust needs analysis of the complex population, and clearly direct developments across offender management, public protection and resettlement work. (4.6)

Partially achieved

The profile of offender management across the prison should be improved, including developing formal links between offender management and resettlement. (4.7)

Not achieved

Risk of harm assessments and sentence plans should always be completed when needed, and should be of a good quality. (4.13)

Not achieved

Home detention curfew assessments should be completed on time, to enable prisoners to be released on their earliest eligible date. (4.14)

Not achieved

The interdepartmental risk management team should provide adequate oversight of multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) cases. (4.19)

Not achieved

The MAPPA management level should always be identified before release and offender supervisors should contribute to release plans and risk management. (4.20)

Not achieved

Progressive transfers in order to achieve sentence plan targets should be actioned quickly. (4.24)

Achieved

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs) should have timely access to psychological services. (4.29)

Achieved

Targets set by the National Careers Service should inform sentence planning and targets for learning and skills and work activities. (4.41)

Achieved

Links with employers should focus on developing work and training in the prison, as well as external work placements, to support prisoners' plans for resettlement. (4.42)

Partially achieved

The prison should further develop its use of release on temporary licence. (4.43)

Not achieved

Prisoners with complex physical health needs should have comprehensive discharge planning that starts as early as needed for adequate continuity of care. (4.47)

Achieved

Specialist finance and debt advice should be available and delivered by trained staff. (4.55)

Partially achieved

The play area should be clean and properly equipped. (4.60)

Achieved

The children and family pathway should be developed, in consultation with prisoners, to meet need. (4.61)

Partially achieved

Victim awareness work should be provided in all relevant cases. (4.65)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

Please note: the following figures were supplied by the establishment and any errors are the establishment's own.

Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	0	998	91.7
Recall	0	90	8.3
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0
Remand	0	0	0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	0	0
Total	0	1088	100.00

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	0	0
Less than six months	0	29	2.7
six months to less than 12 months	0	36	3.3
12 months to less than 2 years	0	161	14.8
2 years to less than 4 years	0	440	40.4
4 years to less than 10 years	0	307	28.2
10 years and over (not life)	0	24	2.2
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	49	4.5
Life	0	42	3.8
Total	0	1088	100.00

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 21	21	
Under 21 years	0	0
21 years to 29 years	480	44.1
30 years to 39 years	360	33.1
40 years to 49 years	165	15.2
50 years to 59 years	66	6.1
60 years to 69 years	16	1.5
70 plus years	1	0.1
Please state maximum age here: 78	71	
Total	1088	100.00

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	0	1076	98.9
Foreign nationals	0	11	1.0
Total	0	1088	100.0

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			

Category B			
Category C		1050	96.5
Category D		38	3.5
Other			
Total		1088	100.00

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White			
British	0	825	75.8
Irish	0		
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	16	1.5
Other white	0	5	0.5
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean	0	54	5.0
White and black African	0	4	0.4
White and Asian	0	6	0.6
Other mixed	0	3	0.3
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	0	29	2.7
Pakistani	0	28	2.6
Bangladeshi	0	2	0.2
Chinese	0	1	0.1
Other Asian	0	9	0.8
Black or black British			
Caribbean	0	72	6.6
African	0	14	1.3
Other black	0	16	1.5
Other ethnic group			
Arab	0	0	0
Other ethnic group	0	2	0.2
Not stated	0	2	0.2
Total	0	1088	100.00

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	21	0.2
Church of England	0	143	13.1
Roman Catholic	0	155	14.2
Other Christian denominations	0	154	14.2
Muslim	0	108	9.9
Sikh	0	13	1.2
Hindu	0	4	0.4
Buddhist	0	13	1.2
Jewish	0	2	0.2
Other	0	20	1.8
No religion	0	474	43.6
Total	0	1088	100.00

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

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	161	14.8
1 month to 3 months	0	0	337	31.0
3 months to six months	0	0	271	24.9
six months to 1 year	0	0	203	18.7
1 year to 2 years	0	0	70	6.4
2 years to 4 years	0	0	32	2.9
4 years or more	0	0	14	1.3
Total	0	0	1088	100.00

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	0	373	34.3

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

* Not currently available

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment¹⁶. 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 24 August 2015 the prisoner population at HMP Ranby was 1,082. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 232 prisoners.

We received a total of 197 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 85%. This included five questionnaires completed via interview. Eleven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire, 17 questionnaires were not returned and seven were returned blank.

¹⁶ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 3%. The formula assumes an 80% response rate (70% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
HB1	41
HB2	41
HB3	42
HB4	13
HB5	34
HB6	13
HB7	11
Segregation unit	2

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences¹⁷ 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 Ranby in 2015 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 35 category C training prisons since April 2011..
- The current survey responses from HMP Ranby in 2015 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Ranby in 2014.
- A comparison within the 2015 survey between house blocks 1, 2 and 3 and 4, 5, 6 and 7¹⁸.
- 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 prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

¹⁷ 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 house block are you currently living on?

See shortened methodology

Q1.2 How old are you?

Under 21	0 (0%)
21 - 29.....	82 (42%)
30 - 39.....	69 (35%)
40 - 49.....	28 (14%)
50 - 59.....	12 (6%)
60 - 69.....	5 (3%)
70 and over	0 (0%)

Q1.3 Are you sentenced?

Yes	176 (90%)
Yes - on recall.....	20 (10%)
No - awaiting trial.....	0 (0%)
No - awaiting sentence.....	0 (0%)
No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)

Q1.4 How long is your sentence?

Not sentenced	0 (0%)
Less than 6 months	8 (4%)
6 months to less than 1 year	20 (10%)
1 year to less than 2 years	36 (19%)
2 years to less than 4 years	71 (37%)
4 years to less than 10 years	44 (23%)
10 years or more	3 (2%)
IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	6 (3%)
Life.....	6 (3%)

Q1.5 Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?

Yes.....	6 (3%)
No.....	188 (97%)

Q1.6 Do you understand spoken English?

Yes.....	192 (99%)
No.....	1 (1%)

Q1.7 Do you understand written English?

Yes.....	194(100%)
No.....	0 (0%)

Q1.8 What is your ethnic origin?

White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	157 (81%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	0 (0%)
White - Irish	4 (2%)	Asian or Asian British - other.....	2 (1%)
White - other.....	1 (1%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean	7 (4%)
Black or black British - Caribbean.....	8 (4%)	Mixed race - white and black African ..	2 (1%)
Black or black British - African	3 (2%)	Mixed race - white and Asian	1 (1%)
Black or black British - other	2 (1%)	Mixed race - other.....	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Indian	3 (2%)	Arab.....	1 (1%)
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	4 (2%)	Other ethnic group	0 (0%)
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)		

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

Yes	10 (5%)
No.....	183 (95%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None.....	76 (39%)	Hindu	1 (1%)
Church of England	55 (28%)	Jewish.....	0 (0%)
Catholic	34 (18%)	Muslim.....	15 (8%)
Protestant.....	3 (2%)	Sikh	2 (1%)
Other Christian denomination	3 (2%)	Other.....	4 (2%)
Buddhist	1 (1%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

Heterosexual/ Straight	194 (99%)
Homosexual/Gay.....	0 (0%)
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	49 (25%)
No.....	146 (75%)

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

Yes	10 (5%)
No.....	185 (95%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	58 (30%)
No.....	136 (70%)

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

Yes	112 (57%)
No.....	84 (43%)

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.....	121 (62%)
2 hours or longer.....	63 (32%)
Don't remember.....	11 (6%)

Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours.....</i>	121 (62%)
	<i>Yes</i>	59 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	14 (7%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours.....</i>	121 (62%)
	<i>Yes</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>No.....</i>	68 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember.....</i>	3 (2%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	<i>Yes</i>	118 (61%)
	<i>No.....</i>	69 (35%)
	<i>Don't remember.....</i>	8 (4%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	<i>Yes</i>	155 (80%)
	<i>No.....</i>	36 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well.....</i>	44 (23%)
	<i>Well.....</i>	106 (54%)
	<i>Neither</i>	34 (17%)
	<i>Badly.....</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	2 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	117 (60%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	20 (10%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	57 (29%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	<i>Yes</i>	166 (86%)
	<i>No.....</i>	25 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	3 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	65 (33%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	123 (63%)
	<i>Don't remember.....</i>	8 (4%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	163 (84%)
	<i>No</i>	20 (10%)
	<i>Don't remember.....</i>	10 (5%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	40 (21%)
	Well.....	100 (51%)
	Neither.....	35 (18%)
	Badly.....	15 (8%)
	Very badly.....	4 (2%)
	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.)	
	Loss of property.....	33 (17%)
	Housing problems.....	33 (17%)
	Contacting employers.....	4 (2%)
	Physical health.....	29 (15%)
	Mental health.....	55 (29%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	12 (6%)
	Contacting family.....	31 (16%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	22 (12%)
	Childcare.....	1 (1%)
	Other.....	6 (3%)
	Money worries.....	26 (14%)
	Did not have any problems.....	69 (37%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	36 (19%)
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	40 (21%)
	No.....	82 (43%)
	Did not have any problems.....	69 (36%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Tobacco.....	168 (87%)
	A shower.....	36 (19%)
	A free telephone call.....	53 (27%)
	Something to eat.....	140 (73%)
	PIN phone credit.....	118 (61%)
	Toiletries/ basic items.....	65 (34%)
	Did not receive anything.....	2 (1%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Chaplain.....	86 (46%)
	Someone from health services.....	128 (68%)
	A Listener/Samaritans.....	41 (22%)
	Prison shop/ canteen.....	37 (20%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	42 (22%)
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	What was going to happen to you.....	74 (40%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	53 (28%)
	How to make routine requests (applications).....	68 (37%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	52 (28%)
	Health services.....	77 (41%)
	Chaplaincy.....	72 (39%)
	Not offered any information.....	65 (35%)
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes.....	127 (67%)
	No.....	55 (29%)
	Don't remember.....	7 (4%)

Q3.10 How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?

Have not been on an induction course.....	11 (6%)
Within the first week.....	124 (65%)
More than a week.....	52 (27%)
Don't remember.....	3 (2%)

Q3.11 Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?

Have not been on an induction course.....	11 (6%)
Yes.....	91 (48%)
No.....	72 (38%)
Don't remember.....	14 (7%)

Q3.12 How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?

Did not receive an assessment.....	28 (15%)
Within the first week.....	64 (34%)
More than a week.....	83 (44%)
Don't remember.....	13 (7%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody**Q4.1 How easy is it to...**

	Very easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult	N/A
Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	16 (9%)	37 (20%)	30 (16%)	38 (21%)	23 (13%)	38 (21%)
Attend legal visits?	12 (7%)	39 (23%)	27 (16%)	20 (12%)	11 (7%)	60 (36%)
Get bail information?	6 (4%)	12 (7%)	20 (12%)	25 (15%)	21 (13%)	80 (49%)

Q4.2 Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?

Not had any letters.....	59 (32%)
Yes.....	67 (37%)
No.....	57 (31%)

Q4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?

Yes.....	94 (49%)
No.....	13 (7%)
Don't know.....	84 (44%)

Q4.4 Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:

	Yes	No	Don't know
Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	87 (46%)	98 (52%)	5 (3%)
Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	175 (92%)	15 (8%)	1 (1%)
Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	116 (61%)	66 (35%)	8 (4%)
Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	102 (54%)	82 (43%)	6 (3%)
Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36 (19%)	130 (68%)	25 (13%)
Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	124 (66%)	63 (33%)	2 (1%)
If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	25 (13%)	89 (47%)	77 (40%)

Q4.5 What is the food like here?

Very good.....	5 (3%)
Good.....	55 (29%)
Neither.....	50 (26%)
Bad.....	43 (23%)
Very bad.....	37 (19%)

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>	5 (3%)
	Yes	85 (45%)
	No.....	99 (52%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes	93 (49%)
	No.....	22 (12%)
	Don't know	74 (39%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	81 (43%)
	No.....	23 (12%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	85 (45%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	106 (55%)
	No.....	16 (8%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	69 (36%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	44 (23%)
	Very easy.....	28 (15%)
	Easy	46 (24%)
	Neither	9 (5%)
	Difficult.....	14 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	7 (4%)
	Don't know	42 (22%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	153 (80%)
	No	28 (15%)
	Don't know	10 (5%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)	
		<i>Not made one</i> <i>Yes</i> <i>No</i>
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	12 (7%) 81 (44%) 91 (49%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	12 (7%) 56 (32%) 108 (61%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	114 (62%)
	No	31 (17%)
	Don't know	38 (21%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints. (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)	
		<i>Not made one</i> <i>Yes</i> <i>No</i>
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	85 (45%) 32 (17%) 72 (38%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	85 (46%) 25 (13%) 76 (41%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	30 (17%)
	No.....	143 (83%)

Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are.....</i>	48 (26%)
	<i>Very easy.....</i>	10 (5%)
	<i>Easy.....</i>	36 (19%)
	<i>Neither.....</i>	42 (23%)
	<i>Difficult.....</i>	34 (18%)
	<i>Very difficult.....</i>	15 (8%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	14 (7%)
	<i>Yes</i>	77 (40%)
	<i>No</i>	77 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	23 (12%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	14 (7%)
	<i>Yes</i>	79 (42%)
	<i>No.....</i>	77 (41%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	20 (11%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (10%)
	<i>No.....</i>	170 (90%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	150 (85%)
	<i>Very well.....</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Well.....</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Neither</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Badly.....</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	6 (3%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	143 (76%)
	<i>No.....</i>	44 (24%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	126 (66%)
	<i>No.....</i>	64 (34%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	40 (21%)
	<i>No.....</i>	149 (79%)

Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Never.....</i>	36 (19%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	61 (32%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	47 (25%)
	<i>Most of the time.....</i>	19 (10%)
	<i>All of the time.....</i>	17 (9%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	162 (87%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>More than a week.....</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	11 (6%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	162 (89%)
	<i>Very helpful.....</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Neither</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Not at all helpful.....</i>	5 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	107 (57%)
	<i>No.....</i>	81 (43%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	43 (24%)
	<i>No.....</i>	137 (76%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	81 (46%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	30 (17%)
	<i>At work.....</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>During movement.....</i>	44 (25%)
	<i>At education</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>At health services.....</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	27 (15%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells.....</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	31 (18%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>At religious services.....</i>	5 (3%)
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	56 (30%)
	<i>No.....</i>	133 (70%)

- Q8.5 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) | 24 (13%) |
| Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) | 18 (10%) |
| Sexual abuse | 1 (1%) |
| Feeling threatened or intimidated | 38 (20%) |
| Having your canteen/property taken | 17 (9%) |
| Medication | 5 (3%) |
| Debt | 10 (5%) |
| Drugs | 10 (5%) |
| Your race or ethnic origin | 7 (4%) |
| Your religion/religious beliefs | 6 (3%) |
| Your nationality | 2 (1%) |
| You are from a different part of the country than others | 13 (7%) |
| You are from a traveller community | 0 (0%) |
| Your sexual orientation | 0 (0%) |
| Your age | 3 (2%) |
| You have a disability | 4 (2%) |
| You were new here | 16 (8%) |
| Your offence/ crime | 4 (2%) |
| Gang related issues | 11 (6%) |
- Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?**
- | | |
|-----------|-----------|
| Yes | 53 (28%) |
| No | 136 (72%) |
- Q8.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)**
- | | |
|--|----------|
| Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) | 16 (8%) |
| Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) | 7 (4%) |
| Sexual abuse | 0 (0%) |
| Feeling threatened or intimidated | 26 (14%) |
| Medication | 8 (4%) |
| Debt | 4 (2%) |
| Drugs | 7 (4%) |
| Your race or ethnic origin | 8 (4%) |
| Your religion/religious beliefs | 7 (4%) |
| Your nationality | 3 (2%) |
| You are from a different part of the country than others | 8 (4%) |
| You are from a traveller community | 2 (1%) |
| Your sexual orientation | 0 (0%) |
| Your age | 5 (3%) |
| You have a disability | 5 (3%) |
| You were new here | 13 (7%) |
| Your offence/ crime | 6 (3%) |
| Gang related issues | 7 (4%) |
- Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?**
- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Not been victimised | 110 (63%) |
| Yes | 29 (16%) |
| No | 37 (21%) |

Section 9: Health services

- Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?**
- | | Don't know | Very easy | Easy | Neither | Difficult | Very difficult |
|-------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------------|
| The doctor | 26 (14%) | 8 (4%) | 21 (11%) | 10 (5%) | 61 (33%) | 61 (33%) |
| The nurse | 21 (11%) | 15 (8%) | 50 (27%) | 26 (14%) | 34 (19%) | 37 (20%) |
| The dentist | 37 (20%) | 10 (6%) | 15 (8%) | 14 (8%) | 41 (23%) | 64 (35%) |

Q9.2 What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	48 (26%)	8 (4%)	39 (21%)	18 (10%)	34 (18%)	38 (21%)
The nurse	31 (17%)	19 (10%)	47 (26%)	28 (15%)	24 (13%)	34 (19%)
The dentist	63 (35%)	14 (8%)	31 (17%)	20 (11%)	16 (9%)	37 (20%)

Q9.3 What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?

<i>Not been</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Very good</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Good</i>	47 (25%)
<i>Neither</i>	25 (14%)
<i>Bad</i>	43 (23%)
<i>Very bad</i>	44 (24%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

Yes	83 (45%)
No	101 (55%)

Q9.5 If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?

<i>Not taking medication</i>	101 (55%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	40 (22%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	17 (9%)
<i>No</i>	27 (15%)

Q9.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?

Yes	83 (46%)
No	98 (54%)

Q9.7 Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?

<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	98 (53%)
Yes	55 (30%)
No	31 (17%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol**Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?**

Yes	62 (34%)
No	122 (66%)

Q10.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?

Yes	26 (14%)
No	160 (86%)

Q10.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?

<i>Very easy</i>	89 (48%)
<i>Easy</i>	19 (10%)
<i>Neither</i>	15 (8%)
<i>Difficult</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	4 (2%)
<i>Don't know</i>	57 (31%)

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?

Very easy.....	22 (12%)
Easy	22 (12%)
Neither	18 (10%)
Difficult.....	19 (10%)
Very difficult.....	13 (7%)
Don't know	91 (49%)

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?

Yes	28 (15%)
No	158 (85%)

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?

Yes	16 (9%)
No.....	169 (91%)

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?

Did not / do not have a drug problem	112 (62%)
Yes	41 (23%)
No.....	29 (16%)

Q10.8 Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?

Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....	160 (86%)
Yes	12 (6%)
No.....	14 (8%)

Q10.9 Was the support or help you received, while in this prison, helpful?

Did not have a problem/ did not receive help	136 (77%)
Yes	30 (17%)
No.....	11 (6%)

Section 11: Activities**Q11.1 How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?**

	Don't know	Very Easy	Easy	Neither	Difficult	Very difficult
Prison job	13 (7%)	36 (20%)	64 (35%)	28 (15%)	27 (15%)	16 (9%)
Vocational or skills training	39 (21%)	18 (10%)	51 (28%)	29 (16%)	27 (15%)	18 (10%)
Education (including basic skills)	29 (16%)	23 (13%)	66 (36%)	30 (17%)	19 (10%)	14 (8%)
Offending behaviour programmes	55 (31%)	7 (4%)	27 (15%)	26 (14%)	35 (19%)	30 (17%)

Q11.2 Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Not involved in any of these	43 (25%)
Prison job	118 (68%)
Vocational or skills training.....	19 (11%)
Education (including basic skills).....	30 (17%)
Offending behaviour programmes	13 (8%)

Q11.3 If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?

	<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
Prison job	27 (16%)	57 (34%)	77 (46%)	8 (5%)
Vocational or skills training	50 (35%)	47 (33%)	32 (22%)	14 (10%)
Education (including basic skills)	42 (28%)	63 (42%)	34 (23%)	11 (7%)
Offending behaviour programmes	54 (39%)	28 (20%)	39 (28%)	16 (12%)

Q11.4 How often do you usually go to the library?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	26 (14%)
<i>Never</i>	33 (18%)
<i>Less than once a week</i>	55 (30%)
<i>About once a week</i>	61 (34%)
<i>More than once a week</i>	6 (3%)

Q11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?

<i>Don't use it</i>	40 (22%)
<i>Yes</i>	74 (41%)
<i>No</i>	67 (37%)

Q11.6 How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	42 (23%)
<i>0</i>	47 (26%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	56 (31%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	29 (16%)
<i>More than 5</i>	7 (4%)

Q11.7 How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	11 (6%)
<i>0</i>	15 (8%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	37 (20%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	31 (17%)
<i>More than 5</i>	90 (49%)

Q11.8 How many times do you usually have association each week?

<i>Don't want to go</i>	8 (4%)
<i>0</i>	8 (4%)
<i>1 to 2</i>	8 (4%)
<i>3 to 5</i>	37 (20%)
<i>More than 5</i>	122 (67%)

Q11.9 How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	17 (9%)
<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	33 (18%)
<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	19 (10%)
<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	22 (12%)
<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	35 (19%)
<i>10 hours or more</i>	35 (19%)
<i>Don't know</i>	21 (12%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	Yes	52 (29%)
	No	127 (71%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	84 (46%)
	No	100 (54%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	44 (24%)
	No	140 (76%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	26 (14%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Easy</i>	34 (18%)
	<i>Neither</i>	15 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	43 (23%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	44 (24%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (4%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	112 (64%)
	No	63 (36%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	63 (36%)
	<i>No contact</i>	49 (28%)
	<i>Letter</i>	28 (16%)
	<i>Phone</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>Visit</i>	31 (18%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	51 (30%)
	No	121 (70%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	Yes	56 (32%)
	No	118 (68%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	118 (67%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Involved</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Neither</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	13 (7%)

Q13.6 Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	118 (67%)
<i>Nobody</i>	44 (25%)
<i>Offender supervisor</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Offender manager</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Staff from other departments</i>	4 (2%)

Q13.7 Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	118 (66%)
<i>Yes</i>	32 (18%)
<i>No</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Don't know</i>	10 (6%)

Q13.8 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	118 (67%)
<i>Yes</i>	14 (8%)
<i>No</i>	35 (20%)
<i>Don't know</i>	10 (6%)

Q13.9 Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?

<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	118 (66%)
<i>Yes</i>	17 (9%)
<i>No</i>	27 (15%)
<i>Don't know</i>	17 (9%)

Q13.10 Do you have a needs based custody plan?

<i>Yes</i>	13 (7%)
<i>No</i>	84 (47%)
<i>Don't know</i>	80 (45%)

Q13.11 Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?

<i>Yes</i>	16 (9%)
<i>No</i>	163 (91%)

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

	<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Employment	42 (24%)	30 (17%)	100 (58%)
Accommodation	42 (25%)	38 (22%)	91 (53%)
Benefits	36 (21%)	38 (22%)	95 (56%)
Finances	40 (24%)	24 (14%)	103 (62%)
Education	43 (26%)	35 (21%)	88 (53%)
Drugs and alcohol	52 (31%)	36 (21%)	81 (48%)

Q13.13 Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Yes</i>	80 (46%)
<i>No</i>	93 (54%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Ranby 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				
	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		197	6,166	197	164
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	3%	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	10%	9%	10%	11%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	14%	6%	14%	9%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	9%	3%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	3%	9%	3%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	99%	99%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	17%	26%	17%	29%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	4%	5%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	13%	8%	13%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	4%	1%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	25%	20%	25%	24%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	6%	5%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	30%	38%	30%	30%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	57%	50%	57%	60%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	32%	45%	32%	37%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	79%	72%	79%	78%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	3%	8%	3%	6%
2.4	Was the van clean?	61%	63%	61%	66%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	80%	80%	80%	78%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	77%	72%	77%	71%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	60%	61%	60%	63%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	10%	15%	10%	8%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	86%	87%	86%	82%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Ranby 2015	Category C Training prisons comparator	HMP Ranby 2015	HMP Ranby 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	33%	54%	33%	30%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	85%	85%	85%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	72%	75%	72%	73%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	64%	60%	64%	62%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	18%	18%	18%	16%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	18%	13%	18%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	2%	2%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	16%	18%	16%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	1%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	14%	14%	14%	15%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	19%	13%	19%	21%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	15%	12%	15%	14%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	29%	14%	29%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	6%	5%	6%	5%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	12%	16%	12%	16%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	33%	37%	33%	29%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	87%	75%	87%	88%
3.6	A shower?	19%	27%	19%	13%
3.6	A free telephone call?	28%	42%	28%	33%
3.6	Something to eat?	73%	56%	73%	66%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	61%	52%	61%	55%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	34%	46%	34%	21%
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	46%	53%	46%	41%
3.7	Someone from health services?	68%	69%	68%	65%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	22%	33%	22%	24%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	20%	23%	20%	21%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Ranby 2015	Category C Training prisons comparator	HMP Ranby 2015	HMP Ranby 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	40%	51%	40%	41%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	29%	40%	29%	33%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	37%	44%	37%	35%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	28%	41%	28%	37%
3.8	Health services?	41%	53%	41%	50%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	39%	49%	39%	39%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	67%	82%	67%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	90%	94%	96%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	51%	60%	51%	53%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	85%	83%	85%	79%
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?	29%	47%	29%	38%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	30%	49%	30%	48%
4.1	Get bail information?	11%	15%	11%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	37%	40%	37%	53%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	49%	42%	49%	44%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	46%	68%	46%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	92%	92%	92%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	61%	75%	61%	67%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	54%	66%	54%	51%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	19%	36%	19%	18%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	66%	69%	66%	60%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	13%	23%	13%	16%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	32%	28%	32%	25%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	48%	45%	33%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	49%	56%	49%	51%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	43%	53%	43%	38%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	56%	58%	56%	49%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	39%	50%	39%	47%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Ranby 2015	Category C Training prisons comparator	HMP Ranby 2015	HMP Ranby 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	82%	80%	82%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	47%	58%	47%	49%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	34%	42%	34%	33%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	62%	59%	62%	60%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	31%	33%	31%	15%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	25%	29%	25%	15%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	17%	19%	17%	26%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	25%	29%	25%	28%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	40%	51%	40%	41%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	42%	46%	42%	37%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	7%	10%	5%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	48%	38%	48%	41%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	79%	77%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	66%	74%	66%	65%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	21%	30%	21%	22%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	19%	20%	19%	16%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	13%	69%	13%	31%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	62%	63%	62%	51%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	57%	34%	57%	49%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24%	15%	24%	30%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	30%	26%	30%	39%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	11%	13%	15%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	7%	10%	12%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	20%	15%	20%	28%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	9%	6%	9%	15%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Ranby 2015	Category C Training prisons comparator	HMP Ranby 2015	HMP Ranby 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	4%	3%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	4%	5%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	3%	5%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	2%	1%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	4%	7%	13%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	4%	9%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	5%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	4%	6%	10%
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	30%	28%	34%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	11%	9%	10%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	4%	4%	7%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	12%	14%	16%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	3%	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	2%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	3%	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%	3%	3%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Ranby 2015	Category C Training prisons comparator	HMP Ranby 2015	HMP Ranby 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	4%	7%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	4%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	2%	4%	3%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	44%	39%	44%	53%
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	16%	30%	16%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	36%	52%	36%	41%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	14%	14%	14%	8%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	34%	48%	34%	34%
9.2	The nurse?	43%	58%	43%	43%
9.2	The dentist?	38%	43%	38%	30%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	33%	44%	33%	31%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	45%	49%	45%	47%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	68%	84%	68%	65%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	46%	29%	46%	40%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	64%	52%	64%	47%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	34%	24%	34%	27%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	14%	16%	14%	19%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	58%	36%	58%	52%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	24%	23%	24%	26%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	15%	8%	15%	12%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	9%	7%	9%	7%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	59%	63%	59%	48%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	46%	65%	46%	57%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	73%	78%	73%	71%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Ranby 2015	Category C Training prisons comparator	HMP Ranby 2015	HMP Ranby 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	54%	44%	54%	49%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	38%	41%	38%	38%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	49%	56%	49%	47%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	19%	23%	19%	24%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	68%	58%	68%	62%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	11%	16%	11%	9%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	17%	24%	17%	18%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	8%	12%	8%	7%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	84%	82%	84%	83%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	40%	43%	40%	28%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	65%	73%	65%	75%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	51%	56%	51%	55%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	72%	79%	72%	79%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	58%	58%	58%	57%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	61%	70%	61%	73%
	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?	34%	51%	34%	41%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	37%	44%	37%	38%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	41%	46%	41%	50%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	20%	34%	20%	24%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	66%	50%	66%	54%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	67%	67%	67%	71%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	19%	17%	19%	24%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	29%	34%	29%	25%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	46%	43%	46%	65%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	23%	24%	32%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	26%	29%	26%	23%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	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				
		HMP Ranby 2015	Category C Training prisons comparator	HMP Ranby 2015	HMP Ranby 2014
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	64%	83%	64%	69%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	44%	35%	44%	48%
13.2	Contact by letter?	25%	35%	25%	29%
13.2	Contact by phone?	18%	25%	18%	22%
13.2	Contact by visit?	28%	33%	28%	26%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	30%	74%	30%	49%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	32%	66%	32%	56%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	49%	52%	49%	47%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	77%	47%	77%	61%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	9%	36%	9%	28%
13.6	Offender manager?	12%	27%	12%	18%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	0%	12%	0%	3%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	7%	15%	7%	12%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	53%	62%	53%	58%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	24%	20%	24%	22%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	28%	29%	28%	35%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	7%	7%	5%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	9%	15%	9%	12%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:				
13.12	Employment?	23%	34%	23%	34%
13.12	Accommodation?	29%	38%	29%	29%
13.12	Benefits?	29%	40%	29%	32%
13.12	Finances?	19%	28%	19%	15%
13.12	Education?	29%	35%	29%	28%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	31%	44%	31%	33%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	46%	55%	46%	45%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Ranby 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	Houseblocks 1-3	Houseblocks 4-7
	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		124	71
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	11%	10%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	13%	17%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	3%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	0%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	19%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	11%	2%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	31%	14%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	19%	50%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	60%	51%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	32%	31%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	81%	79%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	71%	86%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	61%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81%	94%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblocks 1-3	Houseblocks 4-7
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	33%	33%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	70%	78%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	76%	42%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	23%	6%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	22%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	19%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	16%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	23%	13%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	19%	8%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	41%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	10%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	12%	10%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	91%	82%
3.6	A shower?	18%	20%
3.6	A free telephone call?	30%	24%
3.6	Something to eat?	70%	76%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	64%	56%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	28%	42%
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	52%	36%
3.7	Someone from health services?	70%	69%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	22%	23%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	22%	16%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblocks 1-3	Houseblocks 4-7
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	39%	41%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	29%	27%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	39%	32%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	30%	24%
3.8	Health services?	42%	40%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	41%	34%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	65%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	97%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	81%	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?	26%	34%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	27%	34%
4.1	Get bail information?	11%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	36%	37%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	47%	51%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	35%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	88%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	54%	73%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	42%	73%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	8%	36%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	62%	73%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	13%	13%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	31%	34%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	43%	49%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	42%	64%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	45%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	59%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	39%	39%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblocks 1-3	Houseblocks 4-7
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	75%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	59%	69%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	21%	10%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	17%	37%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	32%	54%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	34%	54%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	15%	2%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71%	84%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	57%	82%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	20%	23%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	13%	30%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	15%	11%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	64%	45%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	28%	16%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	31%	27%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	6%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	17%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	11%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	8%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	3%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblocks 1-3	Houseblocks 4-7
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	8%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	6%
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	33%	17%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	2%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	2%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblocks 1-3	Houseblocks 4-7
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	16%	15%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	39%	30%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	17%	9%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	46%	43%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	53%	33%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	44%	19%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	17%	10%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	56%	60%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	25%	20%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	19%	10%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	10%	7%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	44%	72%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	30%	52%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	45%	57%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	18%	21%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	59%	85%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	7%	17%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	15%	23%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	8%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	38%	35%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	39%	44%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	17%	25%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55%	81%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	65%	71%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	7%	38%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblocks 1-3	Houseblocks 4-7
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	25%	37%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	49%	39%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	17%	42%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	27%	33%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	8%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	10%	8%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Ranby 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	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		33	162
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	3%
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.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	44%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	28%	25%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	16%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	59%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	63%	59%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	77%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	77%	62%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	69%	68%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	69%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	96%	94%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	33%	29%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	37%	48%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	90%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	16%	20%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	16%	34%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	31%	48%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	49%	49%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	35%	44%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	47%	58%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	54%	64%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	25%	43%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	32%	43%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	10%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	59%	80%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	63%	67%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	17%	20%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	10%	14%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	58%	57%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	39%	21%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	36%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	26%	19%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	16%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	1%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	45%	24%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	16%	14%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	19%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	19%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	10%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	10%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	14%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	30%	37%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	37%	47%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	43%	47%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	60%	58%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	68%	69%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	4%	12%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	4%	20%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	43%	37%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	18%	20%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	40%	70%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	48%	70%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	14%	20%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	61%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	28%	24%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability) HMP Ranby 2015

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

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		49	146
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	3%
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.)	19%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	10%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	19%	33%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	77%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	42%	66%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	68%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	89%	55%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	60%	72%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	67%	67%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	95%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	24%	31%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	42%	47%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	15%	21%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	34%	31%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	52%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	43%	51%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	41%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	54%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	70%	84%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	64%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	36%	42%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	41%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	19%	7%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	76%	77%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	64%	67%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	15%	20%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	17%	12%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	65%	55%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	26%	24%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	34%	29%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	20%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	2%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	2%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	9%	0%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	24%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	19%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	4%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	8%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24%	13%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	36%	36%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	67%	38%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	80%	34%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	65%	57%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	60%	71%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	15%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	22%	16%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	0%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	23%	42%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	13%	22%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	47%	72%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	61%	68%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	11%	22%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	44%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	31%	21%