

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Full Sutton

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

11–22 January 2016

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	41
Section 4. Resettlement	47
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	53
Section 6. Appendices	57
Appendix I: Inspection team	57
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	59
Appendix III: Care Quality Commission Requirement Notice	65
Appendix IV: Prison population profile	67
Appendix V: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	71

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

Located not far from York, Full Sutton is one of only five high security dispersal prisons in the country, holding just under 600 adult men. Nearly all its prisoners present significant risks to both security and to the public at large. Almost half are serving life sentences, with a similar number doing in excess of 10 years or other indeterminate sentences. At the time of the inspection, 154 men were designated category A, with nine considered to be 'high risk'. A small number of prisoners had committed offences connected or sympathetic to terrorist goals and some had achieved significant criminal notoriety for other reasons.

At our last inspection in 2012, we described an impressive establishment that was ensuring reasonably good or better outcomes against all our four healthy prison tests. At this inspection we found that this remained the case, with the prison continuing to meet its challenges calmly and competently. Against three of our tests of a healthy prison we found outcomes that were 'reasonably good' and concerning the provision of activity, outcomes were judged to be 'good'.

Full Sutton, notwithstanding the potential risks, is a safe prison. We describe reception arrangements as swift and welcoming and induction as both expedient and thorough. Violence remained rare and incidents were generally low level. The significant proportion of prisoners who were vulnerable mainly by virtue of their offence, generally received an equality of treatment and felt safe. Incidents of self-harm were relatively few and case management of those in crisis had improved. Those at risk felt well cared for, but despite this, two prisoners had taken their own lives since we last inspected. Adult safeguarding arrangements had become more established.

As a high security prison, physical and procedural security measures were extensive and inevitably intrusive, adding to the depth of imprisonment experienced by those held. Security was however, managed well with quite sophisticated arrangements in place. These included developed intelligence management arrangements to deal with gangs and potential radicalisation, which seemed to us to be applied with proportionality. Use of illicit drugs was very low level although there was some emergent evidence that NPS (new psychoactive substances) were becoming available.

Our one key criticism of the way safety was managed concerned the segregation unit; in contrast with our general findings in the prison. Significant numbers of prisoners had been segregated and some for extended periods of time. We did not underestimate the challenges faced by staff in managing the very difficult men held in the unit but in our view, management supervision was insufficient and accountability was lacking. We further questioned the adequacy and legitimacy of some risk assessments and the approaches taken to care planning. Relationships between staff and prisoners were not good enough. We have made a 'main recommendation' calling for improvements to this facility. The recently introduced reintegration unit on G wing was a good initiative that would help but its purpose required greater clarification.

The environment and quality of accommodation at Full Sutton was generally very good and prisoners had good access to amenities and services. Relationships between staff and prisoners were formal but respectful. The personal officer scheme and consultation arrangements with prisoners were very effective. The promotion of equality was improving and there had been detailed work undertaken to understand the perceptions and concerns of minority groups. Despite this, and despite some reasonably good work to support groups with protected characteristics, more still needed to be done to understand and tackle the negative perceptions, in particular, from prisoners of a black and minority ethnic background and Muslim prisoners. A very good chaplaincy team was supporting the faith interests of prisoners constructively and with sensitivity.

Overall, outcomes in the provision of health services were reasonable and the quality of food, which included a self-catering option, was appreciated by many prisoners.

Prisoners had good access to time out of cell, which approached 10 hours a day for those who were fully employed. There was enough activity for all to be employed at least part-time, and at any one time about 70% of prisoners were engaged in activity. The leadership and management of learning and skills was good and the range of work and training was reasonable, although there was some underemployment in some of the workshops. The quality of teaching and learning was good and achievements on most courses were similarly good. Our Ofsted colleagues assessed the overall effectiveness of learning and skills, along with all their component assessments, as 'good'.

The provision of resettlement services had deteriorated somewhat since our last inspection. The risks managed by the prison demanded that the offender management unit had a higher profile within the prison and almost one-third of prisoners did not have an up to date OASys assessment, sentence planning was weak and offender supervision too variable. The sharing of information between the prison and the National Probation Service (NPS) was limited and responses and communication from NPS was often lacking and hindered risk management. Very few prisoners were released from Full Sutton but those who were, received a near bespoke service that ensured their needs were well met.

Full Sutton remains a high performing prison. We have raised some concerns in this report, notably regarding the segregation unit, the promotion of equality and the need for better offender risk management. That said, the establishment is well led, confident and capable. It has a clearly defined role holding long-term and in many cases, dangerous prisoners who have committed very serious offences. The prison discharges this responsibility with proportionality and ensures some good outcomes for those held.

Martin Lomas
HM Deputy Chief Inspector of Prisons

February 2016

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Full Sutton is a high security establishment for category A and B adult males.

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

Public

Region/Department

Directorate of High Security

Number held

580

Certified normal accommodation

606

Operational capacity

626

Date of last full inspection

3–7 December 2012

Brief history

HMP Full Sutton opened in 1987 as a purpose-built high security establishment.

Short description of residential units

A, E and F are general wings and B, C and D wings accommodate vulnerable prisoners. G wing is the first night and induction wing and F wing is developing as a reintegration unit for those leaving segregation. There is also a segregation unit and a health care unit

Name of governor/director

Ed Cornmell

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service provider

Spectrum Community Health CIC

Learning and skills providers

Novus

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Helen Scull

Community rehabilitation company (CRC)

Purple Futures

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 *Reception was welcoming and efficient. First night arrangements were good, with a suitable focus on safety. The use of peer mentors to support and reassure new arrivals was effective. Few prisoners felt unsafe and levels of violence were low. Levels of self-harm were relatively low, and the care and management of prisoners at risk of self-harm were good on the wings, although there were examples of poor practice for such prisoners on the segregation unit. Security was proportionate and effective, and helped to maintain a stable and safe environment. Drug availability had increased and, although there was a good supply reduction strategy, it was not supported by good governance. Levels of use of force were low. The segregation unit was a concern; decisions were not always based on an adequate or ongoing assessment of risk. The regime on the unit was poor for many long-stay prisoners but the new reintegration unit was a good initiative. Substance misuse arrangements were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Full Sutton were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, four had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S3 Most prisoners reported respectful treatment by escorting staff but prisoners' property often did not arrive with them, or took too long to be issued.
- S4 Conditions in reception had improved and were good. Staff were welcoming and helpful, and processes were efficient. The first night centre was exceptionally clean and well prepared. The initial safety screening was conducted sensitively, providing good early reassurance to newly arrived prisoners, and there was effective use of peer mentors to provide further support to new arrivals.
- S5 Induction was comprehensive, supported by prisoner peer workers, and started on the day of arrival. Allocation to wings was well informed, thoughtful and usually happened on the day after arrival.
- S6 Few prisoners felt unsafe at the time of the inspection, and they reported relatively low levels of victimisation from other prisoners. The number of incidents of violence was small, and similar to that at the time of the previous inspection, and most were low level. Monthly safer custody meetings considered a wide range of data, to identify current and emerging issues, and took action to make the prison safer. Monitoring and intervention processes, for perpetrators of antisocial behaviour and their victims alike, were very good.
- S7 Levels of self-harm were relatively low and a small number of prisoners accounted for a disproportionate number of incidents. The overall quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had improved, with consistent case management and multidisciplinary reviews. Prisoners on the wings on open ACCTs told us that they felt well cared for. However, we saw some examples of poor care of prisoners in crisis held on the segregation unit. The number of such prisoners had reduced but some were held without evidence of the exceptional circumstances required to justify their location.

- S8 There had been two self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection. Most recommendations from Prisons and Probation Ombudsman death-in-custody reports had been achieved and were reviewed regularly to ensure compliance.
- S9 Security was well managed and the identification and management of risk were effective and proportionate. The prison managed the threats presented by radicalisation and extremist behaviour well. Security committee meetings were well attended and there were excellent links to relevant outside agencies, including local policing teams.
- S10 Over a quarter of prisoners, more than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection, said that it was easy to get illegal drugs at the prison. The random mandatory drug testing positive rate was exceptionally low but finds indicated that new psychoactive substances (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects), which are undetectable, were beginning to emerge as a problem. There was a good supply reduction strategy but the drugs team was not involved in security meetings and suspicion testing was not carried out reliably.
- S11 The detailed incentives and earned privileges policy was well understood by staff and prisoners, and was closely aligned with the sentence planning process. There was sufficient incentive to encourage good behaviour, and a large proportion of prisoners were on the enhanced level.
- S12 The number of adjudications was comparable with that at similar prisons and hearings were conducted fairly. Levels of use of force, including use of the special cell, were relatively low and governance arrangements were reasonably good. Video recording and accounts from officers evidenced de-escalation, and incidents were analysed to identify patterns and trends.
- S13 The segregation unit caused us some concern. We were not confident in the legitimacy of some decision making and there was insufficient day-to-day operational oversight. Relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were distant. Staff managed some very challenging behaviour but we questioned the proportionality of unlock practices, which were not based on an individual and continuing assessment of risk. For many segregated prisoners, care planning was inadequate and too many remained segregated for long periods. The regime was impoverished for long-stay prisoners, with little in place to help to prevent psychological deterioration caused by prolonged segregation. The reintegration unit on G wing was a positive initiative, and provided a good alternative to long-term segregation, but its purpose and aims had not been fully established.
- S14 The drug treatment service (DTS) had improved and was good. All aspects of drug treatment were well integrated with the mental health and primary health care services. Approximately 10% of the prisoner population were on the psychosocial caseload, with access to a good mix of high-quality interventions, and almost all of those who had received support had found it helpful. Few prisoners needed clinical drug treatment but their care was good.

Respect

*S15 Residential areas were calm and clean, and prisoners had good access to laundries and showers. Consultation arrangements were effective. Staff were competent and knew the prisoners in their care well. Relationships were respectful but formal and sometimes remote. The perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were very negative and some aspects of equality and diversity were underdeveloped. Complaints were well managed. Health services were reasonable overall. Catering arrangements and faith provision were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S16 At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Full Sutton were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 12 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, 10 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

S17 The cleanliness of residential units had improved and was good, and wings were calm and ordered. Cells were equipped and furnished adequately but those on the older wings did not have kettles, which was the subject of considerable complaint.

S18 Prisoners wore their own clothes, and there were laundry facilities on each wing. Access to showers was good and some had been refurbished to a good standard. Applications were logged and most prisoners said that they were dealt with fairly.

S19 Most prisoners said that staff treated them respectfully, although some staff were formal and sometimes remote in their approach. There was an innovative new project, working with prisoners and staff to improve the quality of working relationships. All prisoners had personal officers, and they made regular entries in case records, reflecting a good knowledge of the prisoners in their care. Prisoner consultation was effective and purposeful.

S20 Equality and diversity arrangements had improved, with a more active equality action group, but more work was required. Quarterly equality figures were monitored for apparent imbalances but there was insufficient discussion of trends or corrective actions taken. The large number of discrimination incident report forms submitted was mostly handled well.

S21 The perceptions of black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were very negative. Research into these perceptions had been undertaken, and a programme of action had begun. However, their perceptions remained negative, especially on safety, victimisation by staff and other prisoners, and respectful treatment.

S22 Foreign national prisoners were given adequate individual support but there was insufficient use of professional telephone interpreting services, and there were no dedicated forums for support and consultation.

S23 Some adjustments were made for prisoners with disabilities but support was still inadequate. There was good provision for the over-60s, with dedicated activities for them daily.

S24 A forum for gay, bisexual and transgender prisoners met regularly and was appreciated by them. There was a policy for transgender prisoners but confident and consistent management was not yet embedded.

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

- S25 There was good provision of worship, teaching and mutual support for all faiths. The chaplaincy was fully involved in the wider life of the prison, and relationships between people of different religions and beliefs were handled carefully.
- S26 The number of prisoner complaints submitted had reduced and was lower than at similar prisons. The replies we examined were mostly polite and addressed the issues at hand.
- S27 Health care provision was reasonable overall. There was good access to a range of integrated and effective health care services, although staff vacancies had limited some clinical facilities. Compliance with mandatory training and professional supervision standards was inadequate. Dental services were good but prisoners waited too long to access smoking cessation support and to see the optician. Chronic disease management was reasonable. Social care arrangements were underdeveloped and responsibilities were unclear. The inpatient unit provided a calm, well managed environment that supported the diverse needs of prisoners effectively.
- S28 Pharmacy services were good. Medicines management arrangements were generally safe, apart from inappropriate transport and supply arrangements on one wing.
- S29 Mental health in-reach was generally adequate to meet prisoner need but there were some gaps in psychological interventions. There were some long delays in facilitating transfer to hospital under the Mental Health Act.
- S30 Most prisoners were positive about the quality of the food provided. The preparation area for halal food had been separated from that for other food. The 'opt-out' scheme, which provided food for prisoners to cook themselves, was popular and cooking facilities on the wings were clean and well maintained.

Purposeful activity

- S31 *The amount of time unlocked was good for most prisoners. The leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities were good, with a strong focus on personal and social development, English and mathematics. There were sufficient activity places and attendance was reasonable. The range and level of activities were adequate and set to improve further. The quality of most teaching and learning was good, and peer mentors were used well. Prisoners achieved well but some opportunities to record skills developed during unaccredited training were missed. The library facilities were reasonable and there was a good emphasis on literacy. Recreational PE was good and well used. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S32 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Full Sutton were good against this healthy prison test. We made six recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, one had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*
- S33 Most prisoners had an activity to attend, and spent more than 10 hours a day out of their cells. Unemployed prisoners had a minimum of four hours unlocked but often more. We found around 20% of prisoners locked up during the working day but throughout the day prisoners were unlocked to engage in a range of activities, such as visiting the gym and the library. There were good association areas on all wings but exercise areas were stark.
- S34 The leadership and management of learning and skills and work were good, with a strong focus on prisoners developing skills that supported their personal and social development.

The range and level of provision offered were adequate and there were plans to introduce more. There were sufficient activity places for all prisoners to be engaged at least part time. Few prisoners were unemployed and around 70% of the population were engaged in activity at any one time. Effective targeting of outreach provision encouraged prisoners to engage with education and there was good promotion of English and mathematics.

- S35 The quality of most teaching and learning was good. Tutors were aware of, and skilled in, meeting the individual needs of learners and there was effective use of peer mentors. There was too little detail in the recording of skills development. Good learning support was provided for those on Open University and other distance learning courses.
- S36 Most of those in education and training made good progress. Behaviour was good but there was too little work available in some workshops to keep prisoners busy. Prisoners demonstrated safe working practices and prisoners on the cookery course learnt useful skills to help them live more independently. Not enough work led to accredited qualifications. High success rates were achieved on all courses except English. Most prisoners in work developed a range of useful skills. Attendance was reasonable.
- S37 The small library offered a wide range of stock and supported an excellent range of initiatives to promote literacy and reading but access was too restricted.
- S38 PE facilities were good and well used. The range of short courses provided had been reduced but an accredited training in activity leadership was still provided. Healthy living was promoted well.

Resettlement

S39 *The strategic management of resettlement was adequate. The prison held a highly risky population but too many prisoners were without an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment. Some offender supervisors had good contact with prisoners and actively motivated them to reduce their risk but in too many cases the quality of contact was inadequate and prisoners struggled to progress. The oversight and management of public protection arrangements were mostly sound. Demand for resettlement services was very low. Pre-release planning was in place and most resettlement pathway provision was reasonable. Visits provision was continuing to improve and offending behaviour programmes generally met need. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S40 *At the last inspection in 2012 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Full Sutton were good against this healthy prison test. We made nine recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that one of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, six had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S41 The strategic management of resettlement was adequate, supported by a clear action plan and regular reviews of progress. However, the offender management unit (OMU) did not have a high enough profile across the prison, and risk management information was not always recorded well enough across the prison.
- S42 The prison managed a highly risky and complex population, including many sex offenders and indeterminate-sentenced prisoners. Almost a third of prisoners did not have a current offender assessment system (OASys) assessment but the quality of completed assessments was reasonable.

- S43 The confidence and ability of offender supervisors were variable. In some cases, the prisoner was actively motivated and involved in their progression but in others the frequency and quality of contact were inadequate.
- S44 Public protection arrangements were mostly robust. The application and monitoring of contact restrictions were sound. Despite efforts made by the prison, too few eligible prisoners had a multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level set in preparation for release, which limited good risk management. The interdepartmental risk management team and pre-release public protection meetings provided good oversight of risk in most cases.
- S45 Re-categorisation work was mainly up to date and the number of progressive transfers had increased, although some prisoners still stayed too long at the prison with an inadequate focus on progression.
- S46 Demand for resettlement services was exceptionally low, with only three releases in the previous six months. Good pre-release planning was provided through the public protection team, which had suitable links with the community in most cases, but it was too early to judge the effectiveness of the new resettlement provider.
- S47 All prisoners released in the previous six months had gone to fixed accommodation, mostly to approved premises.
- S48 The National Careers Service adviser worked well with the OMU and the resettlement provider to offer pre-release guidance to prisoners requiring support with employment and training on release. Useful advice on CV building and job search was provided.
- S49 Health care support for prisoners on discharge was appropriate. A palliative care pathway was available and had been used appropriately in the previous 12 months. For prisoners with substance misuse issues, the DTS had regular input into sentence planning, pre-release and MAPPA meetings.
- S50 There was no structured advice or learning on money management, beyond small elements in some education courses. Help was given with opening bank accounts.
- S51 Many prisoners were held a long way from home. Provision for social visits was good and family days were much appreciated by prisoners.
- S52 Offending behaviour programme provision was good, and based on regular analyses of need and the identification of those suitable for a place. Some steps were being undertaken to motivate sex offenders in denial to address their offending behaviour.

Main concerns and recommendations

S53 Concern: The segregation unit had insufficient operational oversight on a daily basis and we were not confident about the legitimacy of some decisions. Prisoners were routinely placed on unlock protocols which were not always based on an individual or ongoing assessment of risk. Prisoners at risk of self-harm were sometimes held in segregation without evidence of the exceptional circumstances required to support their location, and ACCT documents were closed without assessment. Responses to prisoners at risk of self-harm – for example, the use of strip-clothing – were sometimes disproportionate and could exacerbate their distress.

Recommendation: Day-to-day oversight of decision making in the segregation unit should be adequate to ensure that actions are authorised appropriately. Unlock protocols should be proportionate to the risk posed. For prisoners at risk of self-harm, decisions to remove their clothing and locate them on the segregation unit should always be based on evidence of exceptional circumstances, and authorised by a senior manager.

S54 Concern: Black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners accounted for 26% and 20% of the population, respectively. In our survey, their perceptions of their treatment were far worse than those of their white and non-Muslim counterparts across most areas, including safety, relationships with staff and victimisation by staff. Some work had been undertaken to address these perception but they had not substantially improved since the previous inspection.

Recommendation: Further action should be taken to understand and, where possible, improve black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners' negative perceptions of their treatment and conditions.

S55 Concern: Despite being a highly complex and high-risk population, too many prisoners (30%) were without a current OASys assessment. The confidence and ability of offender supervisors were highly variable, and for too many prisoners the quality and frequency of contact were weak and failed to motivate and assist prisoners to reduce their risk and progress.

Recommendation: All prisoners should have an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment. Offender supervisors should motivate and assist prisoners to reduce their risk and enable them to progress.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1** *Most prisoners had felt safe during their journey to the establishment but many complained that their property had not arrived with them.*
- 1.2** Most prisoners were escorted in clean and well-equipped contractor or specific category A vehicles, and most prisoners we spoke to, and in our survey, said that they had felt safe during their journey to the establishment.
- 1.3** Prisoners we spoke to said that escort staff had treated them well, and we observed friendly and courteous interactions. However, in our survey, only 54% of black and minority ethnic and 51% of Muslim respondents said that they had been treated well by escort staff compared with 69% of white and 67% of non-Muslim respondents (see also section on equality and diversity). Many prisoners we spoke to complained about their property not arriving with them and long waits for it to arrive (see recommendation 1.15).
- 1.4** Escort vehicles entered the establishment swiftly and prisoners were disembarked quickly.
- 1.5** Video conferencing facilities were used when possible to facilitate court appearances and there had been 44 uses in the previous six months.

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.6** *Reception procedures were efficient, swift and welcoming. The first night centre was clean and well prepared. First night staff conducted initial risk interviews sensitively and peer mentors were used well to assist in settling in new prisoners. Induction was expedient and thorough.*
- 1.7** The reception area was much cleaner and in better condition than at the time of the previous inspection. The holding rooms, although clean, were bare but prisoners did not spend too long in them as they were taken to the first night centre as soon as possible.
- 1.8** We saw prisoners being processed quickly and thoroughly through reception in a friendly and relaxed manner. Staff were welcoming and made efforts to ensure that prisoners' anxieties were addressed. All recently arrived prisoners that we spoke to were positive about their experience.

- I.9** Prisoners were able to take only a small amount of property with them to the first night centre, with the remainder remaining in reception until it had been searched. The length of time that prisoners then waited for their property varied but could be as much as two weeks, depending on the availability of dedicated search team staff.
- I.10** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons (71% versus 66%) said that they had felt safe on their first night. The first night centre was exceptionally clean, and cells were well prepared and included a basic kit pack, a useful information booklet and provision to send a free letter. All new arrivals were offered a shower, a telephone call and access to a small grocery or smoker's pack.
- I.11** On arrival on the first night centre, all prisoners underwent a thorough risk assessment with one of the regular first night centre staff. This was conducted sensitively, providing good early reassurance to newly arrived prisoners, and was also used to start the induction period and to explain the regime.
- I.12** A range of information on each prisoner was assessed before their arrival and used to identify a suitable location on one of the wings – where they could also attend an association period to familiarise themselves. Prisoners we spoke to said that this was a welcome initiative as it helped to alleviate their anxieties about where they were going next.
- I.13** Peer supporters played a key role in helping new prisoners to settle in and were on hand throughout their stay on the first night centre.
- I.14** The main part of the induction was usually completed within 24 hours, with prisoners moving onto their new wing on the day after arrival. The remainder of the process normally took place within a week, with a comprehensive tracking system used to ensure that all prisoners undertook the full programme.

Recommendation

- I.15 Prisoners' property should arrive with them, and should be issued within two days of arrival.**

Bullying and violence reduction

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.16** *Few prisoners felt unsafe and incidents of violence were rare and usually low level. Safety was well managed. Procedures to monitor perpetrators and to support victims were sound. The dual nature of the population was well managed and few prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wings said that they currently felt unsafe.*

- I.17** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at other high security prisons said that they currently felt unsafe (19 versus 25%), fewer said that they had been victimised by other prisoners (33 versus 39%), and fewer than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had been victimised by staff (40% versus 49% and 48%, respectively).

- I.18** The monthly safer custody committee monitored a range of data and discussed current and emerging safety issues. A wide range of information from across the prison was collated and analysed, and unexplained injuries were investigated and reported on. Attendance at this meeting had improved and there was a clear drive to develop further the prison-wide approach to managing violence.
- I.19** There had been 32 violent incidents in 2015, mainly low level, which was similar to the number at the time of the previous inspection. Observations and recorded minutes evidenced a well-focused approach to managing prisoners responsible for acts of violence. Investigations into actual and perceived violent incidents were carried out quickly and actions were taken by the safer custody team to tackle perpetrators and ensure that victims were well supported. Higher-level and more sophisticated forms of intimidation, such as counterterrorism and extremism, were managed by the security department, who shared relevant information.
- I.20** The prison managed a combined mainstream and vulnerable prisoner population well. A large percentage of the vulnerable population were sex offenders, with the remainder being under protection for reasons of debt or an inability to cope in the mainstream population. Vulnerable prisoners had equitable access to the full range of regime activities, and adequate supervision was provided by staff in areas where both populations mixed, such as during domestic visits and religious services. In our survey, few prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wings said that they currently felt unsafe.

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.21 *Levels of self-harm were relatively low. The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documentation for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had improved, as had the analysis of data. We were concerned about the use of strip conditions for prisoners in crisis. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations from death-in-custody reports had mostly been fully implemented.*

- I.22** The safer custody team provided a good level of oversight of prisoners at risk of self-harm, and there was good analysis of information about self-harm at the monthly safer custody meeting. In general, the quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documentation had improved, with more consistent case management, multidisciplinary reviews and good ongoing qualitative recording of interactions and events.
- I.23** Levels of self-harm were relatively low, at around 68 incidents in the previous six months. A large percentage (around 45%) of incidents could be attributed to a small number of prisoners.
- I.24** Prisoners we spoke to who were (or had been) subject to ACCT procedures on the wings said that they were well cared for. The exception to this was those who had been located on the segregation unit while on an ACCT. Although the number of such prisoners had reduced since the previous inspection, we were not assured that appropriate authority required to justify holding these prisoners on the unit was always given. We were also concerned at how

quickly some ACCTs for segregated prisoners were closed, some without even having an assessment. We observed one prisoner held in a 'safer cell'³ in the segregation unit for several days in 'strip-conditions' (that is, issued with a rip-proof smock, shorts and blanket) with no other interventions or support. There was little information written in his ACCT document, and the next review had been set for six days later; this was far too late, given his level of risk (see main recommendation S53).

- I.25** There was a team of 10 Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners), and prisoners generally had good access to support. Only three of the Listeners provided support for the main wings but this was being addressed with a training course due to be undertaken which would increase the number of Listeners to an acceptable level.
- I.26** There had been two self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection and, with the exception of the issues surrounding segregated prisoners, all Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations from death-in-custody reports had been completed and were monitored by the safer custody team to ensure ongoing compliance.

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.⁴

- I.27** *A satisfactory adult safeguarding policy had been issued and was being implemented, in coordination with other processes to support prisoner safety.*

- I.28** The prison had published a policy document, 'Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults', focusing appropriately on those at risk of abuse or neglect. A representative of the prison engaged closely with the East Riding safeguarding adults board, and a number of referrals had been made to their safeguarding adults team. These processes were well integrated with the protective work of the prison's safer custody team.

³ A 'safer cell' is a cell in which the number of ligature points has been reduced, and moulded resin furniture and fittings have been installed.

⁴ We define an adult at risk as a vulnerable person aged 18 years or over, 'who is or may be in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability, age or illness; and who is or may be unable to take care of him or herself, or unable to protect him or herself against significant harm or exploitation'. 'No secrets' definition (Department of Health 2000).

Security

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.29** *Procedural security was extensive but proportionate and dynamic security arrangements were good. The security department was well managed, and the identification and management of risk were effective. Restrictions on movement and allocation, including that for category A prisoners were proportionate. Intelligence was well handled. The risks presented by radicalisation and extremism were well managed.*
- I.30** As one of only five high security dispersal prisons in England and Wales, the prison held a significant number of category A and high risk prisoners. The security department was well managed with proportionate procedural security. Physical security at the prison was extensive. CCTV coverage was widespread and most areas could only be accessed from secure corridors with no windows or natural light.
- I.31** Important elements of dynamic security were in place and the management and use of intelligence was excellent. Over 500 intelligence reports were submitted each month and they were processed and communicated quickly. Relationships between staff and prisoners (see section on staff-prisoner relationships) and the interactions we observed during inspection indicated that many staff knew about the personal circumstances of the men in their care. Supervision of prisoners was effective and the prison regime was purposeful and predictable.
- I.32** Category A prisoners represented 26% of the prison's population and their management through regular reviews was good. Any restrictions to their regime were reasonable and proportionate and most had access to a full and purposeful regime. Security risk assessments and subsequent management systems we reviewed were effective. We saw no evidence to suggest that the prison was risk averse in terms of allocating activity spaces, although there were some rational restrictions in the areas of higher risk.
- I.33** Local corruption prevention measures were well organised and effective. There were excellent links with local and national policing teams and three full-time police intelligence officers were based at the prison.
- I.34** The prison managed complex systems to identify and deal with sophisticated issues associated with organised gangs, terrorist activities and radicalisation. There was an appropriate focus on extremism and the risks of radicalisation which were well managed. The prisons counterterrorism unit was well organised and received good and regular support from the high security estate, with an extremism strategy and intervention adviser available to offer advice and guidance. A comprehensive preventing extremism strategy had been published and monthly meetings identified and managed those suspected of extremist involvement, and those vulnerable to their influence were given a high priority. Training to help staff identify extremist behaviour indicators and how to report them had been introduced. It was evident that officers were confident in reporting and dealing with extremist behaviour and supporting those who were vulnerable to it.

- I.35** Although the random mandatory drug testing positive rate was 0% for the six months to December 2015, in our survey more prisoners than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that it was easy to get illegal drugs at the prison (28% versus 21% and 17%, respectively). Finds indicated that (currently undetectable) new psychoactive substances (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects) were beginning to emerge as a problem. Although the prison had a good supply reduction strategy and action plan, the drugs team was not involved in security meetings, and the former drug strategy meeting had been disbanded. Suspicion testing was not always undertaken, resulting in 11 test requests (37% of all requested) slipping out of time in the previous six months. The suspicion testing positive rate was low, at 2.5%, which amounted to only one positive test result.

Recommendation

- I.36** The supply reduction strategy should be overseen and implemented with the involvement of the drug treatment service team.

Incentives and earned privileges⁵

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.37** *The incentives and earned privileges policy was clear and well understood by staff and prisoners. The incentives encouraged good behaviour and prisoners on the basic level were managed appropriately.*

- I.38** The detailed policy for incentives and earned privileges (IEP) was clear and well understood by staff and prisoners. At the time of the inspection, 60% of the prison population was on the enhanced level. The differentials between the levels, especially the privilege of being able to self-cater, offered a good incentive, and in our survey more respondents than at comparator prisons and at than at the time of the previous inspection said that the scheme had encouraged them to change their behaviour.

- I.39** Reviews of IEP levels were held routinely and decisions were based on progress with achieving sentence plan targets as well as behaviour. The approach to judging whether prisoners in denial of their offence were complying with their sentence plan was clear and fair.

- I.40** There were only 11 prisoners on the basic level and they were all located on the segregation unit for refusing to relocate to main accommodation. They were managed appropriately through the segregation review process rather than the IEP system. Decisions to demote prisoners to the basic level on main locations were based on continued poor behaviour, and they were actively managed to improve their behaviour to get back to the standard level through achievable behaviour targets and reviews.

⁵ In the previous report, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated Expectations (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

Discipline

Expected outcomes:

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

I.41 *The number of adjudications was comparable to that at similar prisons, and hearings were conducted fairly. Use of force was relatively low, governance arrangements were reasonably good and paperwork was usually completed correctly. Accounts from officers usually demonstrated that de-escalation was used as a preferred option. The segregation unit caused concern, with insufficient day-to-day operational oversight. Relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were too often distant. The regime was impoverished for long-stay prisoners but the reintegration unit on G wing was a positive initiative.*

Disciplinary procedures

- I.42** There had been 300 adjudications in the previous six months, which was similar to the number at similar prisons and to the findings at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.43** The written records of hearings that we examined and those we attended indicated that proceedings were conducted fairly and that prisoners were given the opportunity to explain their version of events. Adjudication standardisation meetings took place at least quarterly and there was sufficient analysis of information to help to identify issues that required attention.

The use of force

- I.44** Force had been used 60 times in the previous six months, which was slightly higher than at the time of the previous inspection but slightly lower than at similar prisons.
- I.45** The management and monitoring arrangements for use of force were reasonably good. A committee met monthly to oversee processes and provide governance. Incidents were discussed, a sample of video records was scrutinised and a senior manager quality assured most paperwork. However, a few use of force forms had not been completed properly.
- I.46** Spontaneous and planned interventions were well organised and properly carried out, and documentation evidenced that de-escalation was often used to good effect and that proper authority was recorded.
- I.47** The use of special accommodation had reduced greatly, with only two uses in the previous six months. Lengths of stay were comparatively short, at an average of 2.75 hours, and authorisation paperwork was completed correctly and gave assurance that use was justified and accountable.

Segregation

- I.48** The physical condition of the unit was reasonably good but in-cell toilets were not screened and some were dirty. Indoor communal areas were clean and well decorated, and showers were in a reasonable condition. The exercise yards were stark.

- I.49** About 109 prisoners had been segregated in the previous six months, usually under Prison Rule 45 (good order and/or discipline) and often for long periods. At the time of the inspection, 24 prisoners were being held on the segregation unit. Of these, 60% had been there for over three months. All had refused to return to main prison location.
- I.50** Quarterly management meetings were well attended and undertook good analysis. However, there was little evidence of a positive impact on improving the standard of care for prisoners.
- I.51** Segregation staff had to manage some very challenging behaviour. We saw a few examples where staff engaged positively with prisoners but many relationships were disappointingly distant, with little positive interaction.
- I.52** The daily routine included a daily shower, a one-hour exercise period and access to a telephone but prisoners had to apply for these on the evening before. In reality, prisoners spent nearly all of their day locked in their cells with nothing meaningful to do, with little in place to help to prevent psychological deterioration caused by prolonged segregation. Individual care planning for longer-stay prisoners was being developed but for most it was still inadequate (see main recommendation S53).
- I.53** A risk assessment process was in place to determine how many officers were to be present when individual prisoners were unlocked. However, these unlock risk assessments were poorly applied and had led to confusion between risk and behavioural management, and decisions about staff unlock levels were often not justified or authorised properly. For example, all prisoners, regardless of the risk they posed, were subject to a three-officer unlock for at least a week following their arrival on the unit. The unlock level of a prisoner was discussed by staff on the unit but decisions were not subject to regular review at an appropriate managerial level. At the time of the inspection, five prisoners were being unlocked with no fewer than four officers present, 15 with at least three, and seven with two (see main recommendation S53).
- I.54** The reintegration unit (a small unit located on the upper floor of G wing) had recently opened and aimed to provide a place of progression for demanding and complex segregation prisoners. It was a positive initiative and provided a good alternative to long-term segregation, with carefully managed time out of cell and integration plans. Peer mentors were used well to encourage socialisation. However, its role had not been clearly defined and a distinct strategy had not yet been published that set out the expected working practices and aims of the unit. Many managers and staff, including offender supervisors, were unclear about what the unit offered or its admission criteria.

Recommendation

- I.55** **The role of the reintegration unit should be clarified.**

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.56 *The drug treatment service had improved and was good. Prisoners on the psychosocial caseload had access to a good mix of high-quality groups and one-to-one interventions. All aspects of the substance misuse treatment were well integrated with the mental health and primary health care services. Few prisoners required opiate substitution treatment but their care was good. Nearly all prisoners who had received support said that they had found it helpful.*

I.57 Clinical and psychosocial services were delivered by Spectrum Community Health CIC, known in the prison as the 'drug treatment service' (DTS). The team comprised a mix of well-trained and experienced officers and nurses. Overall, we saw an improvement across the service since the previous inspection.

I.58 Psychosocial provision comprised a good mix of high-quality group-work and one-to-one interventions. At the time of the inspection, 59 prisoners were on the psychosocial caseload, which amounted to approximately 10% of the population.

I.59 Service user involvement had improved: a total of 16 peer supporters regularly fed back information from service users, and evaluations were conducted after prisoners had completed group-work. Peer supporters told us that they were well supervised and supported to deliver one-to-one interventions and work with DTS staff on designing new group programmes.

I.60 Although the abstinence recovery centre had stopped operating in February 2015, the DTS had continued to provide a well-structured package of recovery-focused interventions that supported prisoners through their recovery effectively. In our survey, an unusually high percentage of prisoners (96%) who had received support for a drug or alcohol problem said that they had found it helpful.

I.61 Clinical care for the five prisoners receiving opiate substitution treatment was integrated seamlessly with the psychosocial input as the same practitioners delivered all components. Reviews were conducted appropriately, with the clinical lead nurse delivering the prescribing service. The same nurse was also the mental health lead, which enabled excellent integration of DTS with the mental health and primary health care services.

I.62 Supervision of medication hatches was generally good.

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 cleanliness of residential units had improved and there was a programme of refurbishment. Prisoners could keep themselves and their cells clean. There were sufficient telephones, and mail services were appropriate. Applications were well managed.*
- 2.2** The cleanliness of residential units had improved and was good, and a programme of refurbishment had started. However, windows across the establishment were opaque, making the atmosphere in residential areas and cells oppressive. Although the design of older residential wings made supervision of some areas difficult, we found that wings were calm and settled.
- 2.3** Cells were equipped and furnished adequately, and in our survey more prisoners than at comparator establishments said that they could get cell cleaning materials every week. However, prisoners on the older wings complained that they could not have kettles in their cells and had to rely on flasks filled from communal boilers for hot drinks when locked in their cells; this longstanding issue was being addressed by the consultation forum (see paragraph 2.11).
- 2.4** There were sufficient showers, and in our survey 97% of prisoners said that they could use them every day. They were clean and there was a programme of refurbishment, providing facilities of a good standard.
- 2.5** Prisoners could wear their own clothes, and there were laundry facilities on each wing. There was a good supply of prison clothing for those who applied for it but some prisoners complained that it had not been provided routinely on their arrival, while they waited for their property to be searched and returned to them, which meant that they had been left without clean clothing to change into (see recommendation 1.15).
- 2.6** Prisoners could make applications every day, and in our survey more respondents than at comparator prisons said that these were dealt with fairly. Each application was logged and prisoners were provided with a copy so that it could be tracked.
- 2.7** There were sufficient telephones on each wing, away from the main areas, with adequate privacy hoods, and prisoners had reasonable access. Arrangements for sending and receiving mail were appropriate.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

2.8 *Relationships between staff and prisoners were reasonable but some interactions were formal and remote. The personal officer scheme worked well. Prisoner consultation was of a high standard.*

2.9 In our survey, most prisoners said that staff treated them respectfully and that there was a member of staff they could turn to for help with problems. Staff had a good knowledge of the prisoners in their care. We saw some constructive and friendly interactions, although some staff were formal and remote in their dealings with prisoners. We saw little interaction during association periods, other than dealing with requests or practical matters.

2.10 The personal officer scheme worked well. In our survey, 96% of prisoners said that they had a personal officer, and 63% that they were helpful. Prisoner records included full accounts by personal officers of regular contact with prisoners and problems requiring resolution being followed up.

2.11 Prisoner consultation was effective and purposeful. A prisoner consultation forum, usually chaired by the governor, met every month and considered an agenda decided by the prisoner forum members. Prisoner representatives told us that matters raised were addressed directly by managers, who attended meetings when matters concerning their areas of responsibility were discussed. Custodial managers also met wing representatives regularly to resolve local issues.

2.12 An innovative 'rehabilitative culture' project had started, with the aim of improving mutual respect between prisoners and staff. Meetings between staff and prisoners, with the support of academics, had been held and prisoner wing-based 'respect champions' had been appointed. Although this appeared to be a positive development, the prisoner respect champions we met were uncertain of their role and some members of the prisoner consultation forum felt that they had not been sufficiently involved.

Good practice

2.13 *Prisoner consultation was effective, with a process that ensured that matters of importance to prisoners were addressed by the managers responsible. The project to improve mutual respect between staff and prisoners was a promising initiative.*

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 characteristic⁶ 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.

2.14 *The management of equality had improved but there was still insufficient analysis and targeted action. Black and minority ethnic, and Muslim prisoners had negative perceptions, in spite of the considerable work carried out to address this issue. There was good provision under the protected characteristics of age and sexual orientation. Foreign nationals had a good service but insufficient opportunity for mutual support. Peer support for prisoners with disabilities had improved but provision was still inadequate. The care of transgender prisoners was too inconsistent.*

Strategic management

- 2.15** Considerable work on equality issues had been carried out and there was an up-to-date strategy and action plan. Equality action group meetings were held bimonthly. Some work had also been done to use and disseminate quarterly data generated by the National Offender Management Service equality monitoring tool (EMT). These data were communicated to prisoners, who had been well represented at recent equality meetings. However, there had not been a systematic analysis of the implications of imbalances which had been highlighted by the EMT, or any actions taken as a result, although some relevant research projects had been undertaken (see below).
- 2.16** The number of discrimination incident report forms submitted was high. The number of discrimination incident report forms submitted was high although many did not evidence discriminatory behaviour. Investigations were carried out to a reasonable standard. Equality representatives worked well on all wings, and the need for training had been partly met by issuing information packs to them. The Humberside Diversity Panel offered good support and scrutiny.

Recommendation

- 2.17** **The equality action group and senior management team should receive analysis of the implications of the equality monitoring tool data, decide on actions to be taken in consequence, and monitor the outcomes of those actions.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.18** The perceptions of black and minority ethnic prisoners about their treatment were negative. In our survey, 30% of these prisoners (against 13% of white prisoners) said that they currently felt unsafe, more said that they had been victimised by staff and other prisoners,

⁶ The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

and fewer said that staff treated them respectfully. We saw little direct evidence of this but these prisoners often spoke about the lack of black and minority ethnic staff, and the unfamiliarity of many staff with diverse cultures (see main recommendation S54).

- 2.19** The establishment, and in particular the psychology team, had carried out research in an attempt to understand and address these negative perceptions. One such project, on work allocation, had confirmed that black and minority ethnic prisoners were less likely than others to be allocated jobs, and data showed that this group was much less likely to be recommended for wing jobs. Another, substantial piece of research from in-depth interviews with prisoners and staff had identified some themes in the reasons for these negative perceptions. These were being responded to in the rehabilitative culture programme (see paragraph 2.12), and also in a six-month piece of work on black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners' perceptions and engagement, currently being carried out.
- 2.20** In our survey, more prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that their religious beliefs were respected. However, Muslim prisoners reported more negatively than others about this, and about most other topics. Half as many Muslim prisoners as others said that staff spoke to them during association periods (see main recommendation S54).
- 2.21** Foreign nationals comprised less than 10% of the population, and were given good individual support. However, for those who were not proficient in English this support was insufficient, with only a limited amount of translated material and professional telephone interpreting services being used only 28 times in the previous six months, half of these by health services staff (see paragraph 2.57). We were not satisfied that they were always used on occasions when confidentiality was required. There were no forums for foreign nationals, for consultation, support and the opportunity to meet, to discuss their common issues with appropriate experts. No prisoners had been held solely under immigration powers in the previous year.
- 2.22** A new disability officer had begun to provide some reasonable adjustments for prisoners with disabilities; for example, handrails had been fitted in the showers, and more equipment was delivered during the inspection. This had raised provision from a low base but it was still inadequate. Identification of, and support for prisoners with social care needs were weak (see paragraph 2.48). Assistance with personal care and daily needs depended too much on the helpfulness of fellow prisoners acting as volunteer 'buddies' and peer mentors. This did not compensate for the lack of systematic needs assessment and of structured care through trained staff and prisoners working to clear job descriptions.
- 2.23** There was good provision for the over-60s, with activities daily. These were well attended, with PE and health services staff taking a full part.
- 2.24** In the previous year, there had been a great improvement in the provision for gay and bisexual prisoners. A gay, bisexual and transgender forum met regularly and fed into the equality meetings, and gay and bisexual prisoners spoke highly of the support available to them.
- 2.25** A policy had been drawn up on transgender prisoners, and there was evidence that a transgender prisoner previously held at the establishment had been well supported. In a current, relatively complex case, clinical and other procedures had been researched and established carefully but there was insufficient clarity for staff on how to manage the prisoner's changing needs and preferences, and day-to-day supervision was not sufficiently confident or consistent.

Recommendations

- 2.26** Key prisoner information should be translated into relevant languages and professional interpreting services should be used for confidential matters.
- 2.27** There should be a clear system for assessing and meeting the needs of those with disabilities, including safe and effective arrangements for peer support.
- 2.28** A care plan should be in place and available to all staff for any prisoner seeking or contemplating gender reassignment.

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

2.29 *A united and effective chaplaincy served the establishment well. A careful and constructive approach was taken to differences of religion and belief.*

2.30 The chaplaincy team was united and fulfilled all the established chaplaincy tasks with sensitive efficiency. It had recently been enhanced by the appointment of a Roman Catholic chaplain. Worship and teaching opportunities were offered to all groups, and prisoners appreciated the lunchtime Muslim prayers in the workshop area, for those who did not return to the wing at this time. The faith library was a good initiative, and, in recognition of the long sentences being served by many prisoners, chaplains offered in-depth as well as introductory courses on their faiths. Chaplains were involved in the life of the establishment and regularly took part in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm.

2.31 Relationships between people of different religions and beliefs were handled carefully and there had been a programme of staff awareness training on aspects of Islam, although there were few events to celebrate diversity. The chaplaincy coordinated the prison visiting scheme and had good links to the community, to bring in visitors from diverse backgrounds.

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.

2.32 *The number of complaints submitted had reduced and was lower than at similar prisons. Replies were polite and addressed the issues.*

- 2.33** Prisoners knew how to use the complaints system. In the previous six months, a total of 1,335 complaints had been submitted. Although this was a reasonably high number, it was lower than at the time of the previous inspection and than at similar prisons.
- 2.34** Arrangements for recording, managing and investigating complaints had improved and were good. All complaints were logged and dispatched quickly to be dealt with. Senior managers carried out an analysis of the types of complaint made, and there was evidence that action was being taken to deal with emerging themes and problems.
- 2.35** The replies that we examined were polite and addressed the issues. Interim replies for more complicated cases were issued to prisoners, along with a predicted conclusion date. Most prisoners (about 90%) received a response within three working days of receipt.

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.

2.36 *Prisoners were less satisfied with access to legal advice than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection.*

2.37 Library officers, one of whom had been trained in legal services, were available for consultation on legal matters by appointment, and the library held an adequate range of legal textbooks (see section on learning and skills and work activities). 'Access to justice' laptops were available to those who needed them. However, in our survey, fewer respondents than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that it was easy to communicate with their legal adviser or attend legal visits. Wing staff could provide lists of solicitors, and the online 'Tracks' system was available in the library for those needing information on immigration issues.

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.

2.38 *Health care provision was reasonable overall, with good access to an appropriate range of services, but prisoners waited too long for smoking cessation services and to see the optician. Services were well governed but vacancies across the teams had placed pressure on clinical staff. Chronic disease management was reasonable but social care arrangements were underdeveloped. The inpatient unit provided a calm, decent service. Dental services were good. Medicines management was generally safe, apart from on G wing, where immediate improvements were required. Mental health services were generally adequate but there were gaps, particularly in the primary care pathway.*

2.39 *The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁷ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. A number of areas were identified that required improvement, with subsequent notices issued by the CQC which are detailed within Appendix III of this report.*

Governance arrangements

- 2.40** The Care Quality Commission issued two ‘requirement to improve’ notices following the inspection (see Appendix III).
- 2.41** A range of integrated health services were provided by Spectrum Community Health CIC. A partnership board had been constituted, involving local high-secure providers, and a prison-specific arrangement was being developed. The health care department was represented on the prison senior management team and health commissioners undertook regular reviews of the service provided.
- 2.42** A patient forum made up of wing-based prisoner representatives was proactive in identifying service improvement. Clinical governance systems were appropriate and leadership arrangements were well established. Incident management was effective and learning was disseminated.
- 2.43** There were clinical vacancies in all areas, with additional hours being worked by permanent staff to maintain services. Some provision seen at the previous inspection, such as the dialysis service, had ended. Despite the increased pressure on staff, practitioners were providing decent and timely care.
- 2.44** Staff could access ad hoc professional development opportunities but attendance at core mandatory training did not reach the standard required, and professional supervision for nurses was poor. Credentials and registration were validated robustly and staff said that induction to the health services team was good.
- 2.45** The provider had a programme for clinical audit but there was only limited evidence that this was having an impact on practice issues. Information-sharing protocols were in place. In a small number of cases, appropriately trained custody staff sat in on consultations because of the exceptional level of risk posed; when prisoners declined to consent to these arrangements, other health professionals undertook this role.
- 2.46** There was equity of access to services. A large, separate waiting area for vulnerable prisoners in the health centre replicated a community health facility. All the clinical rooms were clean and complied with infection control standards.
- 2.47** Responses to medical emergencies, both within the prison and by external agencies, were good. Resuscitation equipment was appropriate and checked regularly. However, the equipment bags held on the wings were not sealed, which could result in essential equipment being removed. The cabinets in which equipment was stored were dirty and full of debris. Too many custody staff were unaware of the location of the automated electronic defibrillators or how to use them.

⁷ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC’s standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

- 2.48** There was an identified lead for older people, who facilitated additional support. Social care arrangements were contracted to Spectrum by East Riding of Yorkshire Council but this service was not yet embedded. There was a lack of clarity by health services staff about appropriate referrals, and the council was slow to respond to those received. Few full assessments had been completed and there were no care plans (see also paragraph 2.22).
- 2.49** Health care complaints were responded to appropriately but there were some delays. The health care complaints form was not available in languages other than English (see recommendation 2.26) or in an easy-read format.
- 2.50** Health promotion followed national initiatives but there was only limited evidence of active and well-informed campaigns for prisoners. New arrivals at the prison were informed at the initial health screening about access to barrier protection.

Recommendations

- 2.51 All staff should participate in all aspects of core mandatory training, and clinical supervision should be available and taken up by all professional staff.**
- 2.52 The emergency resuscitation equipment should be secured and maintained appropriately.**
- 2.53 Custodial staff should be trained in basic life support, and know the location of and how to use automated external defibrillators.**
- 2.54 There should be an ongoing timetable of health promotion activity that meets the needs of the population, supported by accessible literature, a health promotion action group and health promotion action plan.** (Repeated recommendation 2.74)

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.55** New arrivals were seen and assessed appropriately by a health services practitioner, with early access to specialist follow-up. Prisoners could book a health care appointment by application and these were prioritised by a senior nurse. Urgent appointments could be facilitated on the day of referral.
- 2.56** The health centre was appropriate for its purpose, and the waiting areas were clean and tidy. The failure-to-attend rate was generally low. There was an appropriate range of clinics and prisoners were seen promptly, with no waits, except for smoking cessation and the optician.
- 2.57** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection said that the overall quality of health care was good or very good (46% versus 40% and 37%, respectively). The care provided was appropriate but the quality of clinical record keeping was variable in the cases we reviewed. Chronic disease management arrangements were led effectively by the GP, who coordinated multidisciplinary reviews, but many formal care plans were too basic. Professional interpreting for those whose first language was not English was available and used in some cases but prisoners said that it was not readily promoted or always facilitated (see paragraph 2.21 and recommendation 2.26).
- 2.58** Of 79 external hospital appointments scheduled for the previous two months, 33 had been cancelled by the prison, which could have had an impact on the health needs of patients. However, proposed cancellations were assessed and prioritised by the GP.

- 2.59** The inpatient unit had eight beds, a palliative care suite and two safer custody cells. Six beds were occupied during the inspection. The unit provided a calm, well-managed environment that supported the diverse needs of prisoners effectively. There was a dedicated, fully functioning dialysis suite but it was not being used owing to staff shortages. The unit was managed by competent and well-informed custody staff. Health services staff provided regular clinical input and worked collaboratively with the prison team. The unit had an appropriate therapeutic regime, with prisoners routinely able to access mainstream activities and fresh air. The needs of prisoners on the unit were assessed adequately and the care arrangements to support them were effective. However, there was no operational framework to determine the priorities for admission and discharge, which could have had an impact on care decisions when the unit was full.

Recommendations

- 2.60** Access to smoking cessation and optician services should be improved and equivalent to community provision.
- 2.61** External appointments should not be cancelled unless there are exceptional reasons.
- 2.62** The inpatient unit should introduce a formal operational policy that establishes agreed admission and discharge criteria.

Pharmacy

- 2.63** Medicines were supplied by an in-house pharmacy, against valid prescriptions stored on SystemOne (the electronic clinical record). Administration was undertaken by trained pharmacy technicians. About 80% of the prison population had been supplied with medicines in the previous year, of which 80–90% had been provided in-possession, which was positive. It was also helpful that patients' current risk assessment was displayed on the computer screen as soon as their file was opened. However, in-possession risk assessments focused solely on the patient, rather than also considering the medicines in use, and some had not been reviewed for five years.
- 2.64** Medicines administration from the central dispensary was safe, and arrangements had improved. Medicines on most wings were held securely and transported appropriately, apart from on G wing. The process for medication transportation and administration to prisoners on G wing was not acceptable, with medicines being supplied from a desk positioned in an open area.
- 2.65** There was a monthly medicines and therapeutics committee, chaired by the pharmacist. A multidisciplinary team reviewed medicine usage with patients when their medication needed to be changed. Patients were usually given pregabalin (prescribed to treat neuropathic pain) as a liquid, which had greatly reduced its use in the prison and the risk of diversion.
- 2.66** The pharmacy team ran smoking cessation clinics, and the pharmacist was an independent prescriber, which meant that prescription-only medicines could be supplied readily. With the previous health care supplier, a wide range of patient group directions (to enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) had been in place but these had lapsed shortly before the new provider had taken over and had not been replaced.

Recommendations

- 2.67** In-possession risk assessments should consider the risks of the drug as well as the patient and be reviewed regularly.
- 2.68** All supervised medicines should be transported and administered safely and in line with professional accountabilities. Confidentiality should be adhered to appropriately.

Dentistry

- 2.69** The dental service was provided by Smart Dental. A dentist and dental hygienist delivered two sessions a week, supported by a dental manager. At the time of the inspection, prisoners were waiting up to eight weeks for an initial appointment, which was too long. The delay was due to a shortage of dentists from both current and previous providers. However, there were five weekly emergency slots for those in need of immediate treatment.
- 2.70** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at the time of the previous inspection said that the quality of dental services was good or very good (51% versus 77%). We found a good range of care, treatment and dental promotion. The dental manager offered advice on smoking cessation and ran a rolling programme for gum disease.
- 2.71** Custody staff sat in on all consultations owing to the security risk posed by certain types of dental equipment.

Recommendation

- 2.72** Access to the dentist should be equivalent to that in the community.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.73** There was a stepped-care model for mental health care provision, ranging from primary care to complex interventions, all of which was delivered by a small team of nurses directly employed by Spectrum. The team was supported by visiting sessions from three consultant psychiatrists. At the time of the inspection, there were two mental health nurse vacancies and there was no clinical psychologist, occupational therapy or counselling service.
- 2.74** There was an open referral system and the team met daily to coordinate assessments, with the aim of seeing everyone within seven days and urgent cases within 24 hours. The team operated a case management approach for 85 prisoners, of whom 34 had severe and enduring mental health problems and were managed under the care programme approach (CPA).
- 2.75** The mental health nurses were experienced and competent but faced many demands, which inevitably saw them prioritising crisis care. Working relationships with other functions in the prison were good, including regular engagement with the safer custody team and active involvement in ACCT reviews. Mental health nurses visited all prisoners on the segregation unit daily.
- 2.76** Despite the high demand, the team delivered a reasonable service. However, CPA care planning arrangements were inadequate and the clinical records we examined did not reflect the care being offered. Four prisoners had been accepted for transfers to NHS facilities

under the Mental Health Act in the previous year, three of whom had faced delays beyond the current national guidance of two weeks. Few of the custody staff we spoke to had received mental health awareness training.

Recommendations

- 2.77** **Mental health services should include clinical psychology, cognitive behavioural therapy and therapeutic groups.** (Repeated recommendation 2.105)
- 2.78** **Care programme approach planning arrangements should comply with national standards.**
- 2.79** **The transfer of patients to hospital under the Mental Health Act should occur within agreed Department of Health timescales.**
- 2.80** **Mental health awareness training should be provided to all frontline prison staff.**

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.

2.81 *The standard of food provided was good and some prisoners had the option to self-cater.*

- 2.82** In our survey, more than half of prisoners said that the food provided was good or very good, which was better than the comparator and than at the time of the previous inspection.
- 2.83** The kitchen was clean and well organised. The preparation area for halal food had been separated from that for other food. Prisoners working in the kitchen were an integrated group from main and vulnerable prisoner wings and had been selected and trained appropriately. They could gain national vocational qualifications.
- 2.84** The menu, on a four-week cycle, catered for the full range of dietary preferences, medical needs and religious requirements. A limited breakfast pack of cereal and fruit juice was issued on the day before it was to be eaten. Lunch was issued to prisoners as they went to work, and in some work areas we were concerned that perishable food was not stored in refrigerators.
- 2.85** There was an annual food survey, and written replies were provided to comments made in the servery comments books. In addition, the catering manager had regular meetings with kitchen workers.
- 2.86** A total of 140 prisoners catered for themselves in the popular 'opt-out' scheme. They were provided with food to the value of £10 to cook every week, and the cooking facilities on the wings were clean and well maintained. The list of items available changed on a two-week cycle.

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

2.87 *Prisoners could purchase a wide range of goods, which met their needs.*

2.88 The prison shop was provided by DHL, whose staff were located on site, which meant that problems with orders could be resolved quickly.

2.89 There were over 300 products on the prison shop list, many of which had been suggested through regular prisoner consultative committee meetings (see paragraph 2.11). Items included religious artefacts and toiletries for prisoners from different ethnic backgrounds, a wide range of magazines, newspapers and greetings cards, and a selection of hobby materials. There was also a good selection of fresh and frozen foods, including fruit and vegetables. A range of catalogues was available for additional items, and there was no administration charge for orders placed.

2.90 In our survey, 64% of respondents said that the shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs, which was better than the 49% comparator.

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.⁸

3.1 *Prisoners had a reasonable amount of time unlocked. Exercise areas were stark and uninviting.*

3.2 The amount of time out of cell was good for full-time employed prisoners, at more than 10 hours a day, some staying at work over the lunchtime period. The few unemployed prisoners had a minimum of four hours unlocked, and in our spot checks we found 20% of prisoners locked in their cells. However, in reality, prisoners, including those without an activity, were unlocked throughout the day for various activities, such as visiting the gym and the library.

3.3 Exercise was provided every evening when working prisoners returned to the wings, and in our survey 41%, which was higher than the comparator, said that they went outside for exercise three or more times a week. All exercise areas were stark and uninviting. Association areas on all wings were spacious, with good facilities, including exercise machines.

Recommendation

3.4 **Exercise areas should contain adequate seating and provide a pleasant environment for time outdoors.**

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.

3.5 *Effective partnerships between the prison and education managers had resulted in improvements in the achievements of learners. There were sufficient places available for all prisoners to have at least part-time activity. The range of education courses was adequate but not enough work led to qualifications. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was good. Achievements were mostly high, except in English courses. Prisoners who attended activities developed useful personal, social and work skills and many gained self-confidence. Behaviour was good. Attendance had improved in education classes and was good in work. Relatively few prisoners used the library regularly but there was good promotion of literacy.*

⁸ 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.

3.6	<i>Ofsted⁹ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:</i>	
	Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work:	<i>Good</i>
	<i>Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Good</i>
	<i>Quality of learning and skills and work provision, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment:</i>	<i>Good</i>
	<i>Personal development and behaviour</i>	<i>Good</i>
	<i>Leadership and management of learning and skills and work:</i>	<i>Good</i>

Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.7** The strategy for learning and skills and work was good. Senior managers had implemented a range of effective strategies to meet the needs of prisoners better, with a strong focus on improving their personal and social skills to enable them to live, learn and work more effectively throughout their sentence.
- 3.8** Senior managers had placed a good emphasis on improving prisoners' English and mathematics skills, and this was reflected in a new skill-for-life strategy and the introduction of minimum qualifications in English and mathematics as prerequisites to any employment.
- 3.9** The management of the education and training provided by Novus' Foundations for Change (Novus) was good. The education manager had applied performance management procedures appropriately and used the results of observations of teaching, learning and assessment to plan appropriate staff training. These procedures had resulted in improved success rates on most courses but achievement of English qualifications required further improvement.
- 3.10** The prison's self-assessment was self-critical and reasonably accurate. However, there was insufficient analysis and use of data to monitor the participation and progress of all groups of learners. Improvement plans did not contain sufficient specific, measurable milestones to assess the success of each action.

Recommendation

- 3.11** **The analysis and use of data to identify areas of low participation and underperformance should be improved.**

⁹ 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>.

Provision of activities

- 3.12** The prison provided around 496 activity places, which was sufficient to enable most prisoners to engage in full-time purposeful activities, and around 70% of the population was engaged in activity at any one time. Non-attendance was mostly justified by part-time work and retirees. The allocations process was effective and few activity places were unfilled. However, a few workshops were over-allocated, which resulted in some prisoners being under-occupied as they were not needed.
- 3.13** The range of education courses was adequate to meet the needs of most prisoners, except for those serving the longest sentences or with significant prior attainment. Prisoners were able to attend courses from entry level up to level 2 in English, mathematics, information technology and art. A range of short personal and social development courses was also available. Forty-three learners were actively supported in undertaking Open University and other distance learning courses.
- 3.14** The number and range of vocational training places were limited, with small numbers of learners participating in mentoring, cleaning and catering courses. Workers in the warehouse managed by an external contractor gained a level 2 qualification in warehousing, storage and packing. A small number gained a recognised relevant qualification in Braille through the Royal National Institute for the Blind. The construction skills and Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA) workshops had been closed since the previous inspection but there were well-advanced plans to provide additional activity places with the introduction of barbering and business administration qualifications.
- 3.15** There were work opportunities for prisoners as wing cleaners, painters, library and gym orderlies, servery workers and kitchen workers. A further large number of work places were offered in textile, printing and contract service workshops, which provided sufficient work to meet the needs of the population. However, not enough work led to accredited qualifications.
- 3.16** Outreach provision for those not attending classroom lessons was used well to promote education and training to the 'hardest to reach' prisoners, including those in segregation who had significant barriers to learning.

Recommendations

- 3.17** **The education provision should be extended to include higher-level learning and a greater range of subjects to meet the needs of those serving longer sentences or with higher prior academic attainment.**
- 3.18** **Opportunities for prisoners to gain accredited qualifications at work should be increased.**

Quality of provision

- 3.19** The quality of teaching, coaching, learning and assessment was good. Teachers planned sessions adequately and reviewed learning objectives with learners. In the best sessions, teachers used probing questions well to check and reinforce learners' understanding and help them to make good progress. In a few lessons, learners were not actively engaged in discussions and made slow progress.

- 3.20** Teachers and instructors were aware of the individual support needs of learners and were highly skilled in overcoming their significant barriers to learning. High-quality vocational training was provided in industrial cleaning, and food preparation and cooking, where teachers made clear links between practical work and theory. Work in the prison kitchens was well structured and provided good opportunities for prisoners to build relevant skills.
- 3.21** A large number of prisoners were effective as peer mentors, supervising and helping less-able prisoners. However, few of them held appropriate qualifications. Teachers and workplace supervisors gave prisoner peer mentors sufficient direction and support to ensure that session objectives were achieved.
- 3.22** Teachers challenged inappropriate language, behaviour and personal views based on stereotypes effectively. There was good promotion of equality and diversity, and respect for others. Staff in all work areas reinforced health and safety, and promoted safe working well.
- 3.23** Teachers set relevant long-term goals but these were not sufficiently linked to learners' individual skills action plan. In addition, teachers did not set sufficiently challenging progress and progression targets.
- 3.24** The employment-related skills that prisoners developed in work activities and vocational training were captured well in a 'passport to employment' booklet. However, this information was not yet well linked to the improvement targets in individual learning plans. There was insufficiently detailed recording of progress in non-accredited learning.
- 3.25** Good encouragement and support was offered to those undertaking all forms of distance learning. Prisoners were well advised when applying for sources of funding. Prisoners were provided with good access to computers in the education department and effective informal tutorial advice.

Recommendations

- 3.26 The recording of skill development in education, training and work areas should be improved, to plan challenging progression targets.**
- 3.27 The recognition and recording of all behavioural, personal and social development to measure achievement on non-accredited courses should be improved.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.28** Most prisoners had access to work and vocational training opportunities to enable them to develop employment skills and a work ethic. Attendance and punctuality at work were good. Attendance rates in education classes had improved in recent months and were satisfactory.
- 3.29** Learners on the cookery course learned useful skills to help them to live more independently and make good use of the 'opt-out' arrangements to prepare their own meals on the wings (see also paragraph 2.86).
- 3.30** In vocational training, prisoners were enthusiastic and had a good attitude to their learning. Standards of behaviour in workplaces and education classes were good and learners worked well together; they were mindful of their peers and contributed to discussions in a controlled and meaningful way.

- 3.31** Most prisoners were able to make informed choices about their next steps in seeking education, training and future employment within the prison.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.32** Achievements on almost all education and vocational training courses were high. Achievement on functional skills courses in mathematics had improved to around 80%. Although retention rates on English courses were high, the achievement of English qualifications at all levels required further improvement.
- 3.33** The quality of artwork produced was excellent. Most prisoners in education classes worked well to meet the standards of work expected of them, and written work was of a satisfactory standard. A few learners in education classes made slow progress and remained in learning well beyond the expected duration of their course. There were no significant gaps in achievement between different groups of learners.
- 3.34** Prisoners on the cleaning course had a good understanding of how good mathematics skills supported their work – for example, using ratios and percentages when using chemicals.
- 3.35** In prison work settings, prisoners worked well to meet deadlines and developed a range of useful employment skills. They enjoyed working in the prison kitchens, rapidly developing skills in a range of food preparation activities and cooking, including, for some, good baking skills. Prisoners in the two textile workshops quickly learned how to make a variety of garments to the required quality standards.

Recommendation

- 3.36** **Support provided to learners on English courses should be improved so that all make good progress and achieve their planned qualifications.**

Library

- 3.37** The library was a small but welcoming facility provided by East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Staffed by two librarians and three orderlies, it offered a wide range of up-to-date fiction, non-fiction and reference works, as well as easy readers, graphic novels, periodicals and newspapers, and a modest collection of foreign language titles. Other resources included a large stock of audio books and an extensive selection of music CDs but no computers were available for prisoners to use for private study or research. Small selections of books were provided for prisoners in other areas, such as the inpatient and segregation units.
- 3.38** Library opening was restricted to two one-hour sessions in the afternoons from Monday to Thursday, with additional sessions on Friday mornings for retired prisoners and those on the induction wing. Rotas provided for visits from each residential wing on two afternoons a week but access for those following learning and work activities full time was too limited. In our survey, only 33% of prisoners said that they visited the library at least once a week, which was well below the comparator. Data analysis by library staff was not sufficiently detailed to identify how many prisoners visited it regularly or the level of participation by particular groups in library use and activities.

- 3.39** Close and productive working by the prison's writer in residence and librarians had resulted in an excellent range of initiatives to promote literacy. Many of these were effective at encouraging reading, while others contributed well to prisoners' wider personal development – for example, reading at family visits, successful entries for Koestler writing awards, the Reading Ahead challenge, coordination of the Turning Pages scheme (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read) and a popular chess club.

Recommendation

- 3.40** The analysis of data to monitor the use of the library should be improved.

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.

3.41 *PE was well managed and there was a wide range of facilities and recreational activities. Healthy living was well promoted and there was a wide range of activities, some of which were accredited, although fewer of these courses were being run owing to low staffing levels. The links between PE and health services staff were effective in ensuring that prisoners' remedial training needs were met.*

- 3.42** There was a wide range of well-maintained PE facilities, which included a large multi-purpose gym, two fitness rooms with a range of weights and cardiovascular equipment, and an all-weather football pitch. Prisoners also had access to training equipment on the accommodation wings. There were appropriate, clean changing facilities and showers.
- 3.43** There was a weekly programme of recreational physical training sessions and activities that met the needs of all groups of prisoners. These activities included specific sessions for the over-60s. Effective links with health services staff ensured that prisoners' rehabilitation needs were reflected in their fitness programmes. Healthy living was well promoted.
- 3.44** Advice on in-cell exercise was provided for those who could not attend the gym for a range of reasons. Limited exercise equipment was also available on each wing.
- 3.45** Rather than the full establishment quota of nine full-time PE staff, seven full-time instructors and one part-time staff member ran the gym. They had maintained a full programme of recreational PE but there had been a reduction in the number of courses available for prisoners owing to the low staffing levels. The wide range of short courses, although reduced, included accredited courses in activity leadership.
- 3.46** The gym induction was comprehensive and introduced prisoners to the available facilities and the range of activities, and included training in the safe and appropriate use of exercise equipment. In our survey, 41% of respondents said that they used the gym three or more times a week, which was considerably more than in similar prisons.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

4.1 *The strategic management of resettlement was adequate, with regular pathway meetings and reviews of the action plan. However, the offender management unit did not hold a high enough profile across the prison and information exchange was limited, which made it difficult to review risk of harm or show progress made.*

4.2 The establishment as part of the high security dispersal estate was used as a central resource for managing category A and B prisoners from across England and Wales, most serving very long sentences.

4.3 The strategic management of resettlement was adequate. An up-to-date strategy was based on some analysis of needs. Although the needs analysis used offender assessment system (OASys) assessment data to profile the population, it did not include prisoner views of their needs or analyse need in relation to the diverse population, such as older prisoners, those serving indeterminate sentences or the large population of sex offenders.

4.4 The monthly resettlement pathway meeting was fairly well attended. A clear action plan set out priorities and was reviewed regularly, to reflect progress made and identify slippage.

4.5 The offender management unit (OMU) was not sufficiently central to all reducing reoffending and public protection work. Information exchange was not always good enough; for example, with the exception of some personal officers, P-Nomis (electronic case notes) was not widely used for recording contact with prisoners and progress made against sentence planning targets. This made it difficult for OMU staff to know what was happening in a case or review the risk of harm.

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.

4.6 *There was a substantial backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments and plans. Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners was too variable and some offender supervisors were not confident enough in the role. The quality of completed assessments was reasonable but sentence planning was sometimes weak. Public protection restrictions were applied appropriately but too few prisoners nearing release had a multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level set by the National Probation Service (NPS), which limited the prison's involvement in pre-release risk management. The lack of access to the NPS case recording system further hindered communication and risk management information exchange. Categorisation work was up to date but some prisoners stayed too long at the establishment with too little focus on their progression or transfer.*

4.7 All prisoners held at the establishment were serving a sentence of over four years and 70% were serving an indeterminate sentence. Of the total population, almost half were convicted of sex offences and almost a third of these were judged to be unsuitable for sex offender treatment programmes (SOTPs) owing to their level of denial of their offending behaviour. Most cases were managed by the National Probation Service (NPS) as they presented a high risk of harm or had committed offences requiring multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) oversight.

4.8 At the time of the inspection, there was a substantial backlog of OASys assessments, with almost a third of prisoners not having an up-to-date assessment or plan; given the highly risky and complex population, this was detrimental to offender management. Of the 183 late assessments, 96 were the responsibility of the NPS and the remainder the responsibility of the prison OMU. The OMU attempted to chase missing assessments from the NPS, and additional resources from within the prison had been agreed to try to reduce this backlog (see main recommendation S55).

4.9 Most of the completed OASys documents we reviewed contained a reasonable assessment of offending-related needs. However, some of the sentence plans for those in denial of their offending behaviour were weak, setting objectives that were too broad, based on compliance with the prison regime.

4.10 The OMU was adequately resourced, with 24 part-time offender supervisors who were also supervising officers on the wings, and 2.6 probation staff. The dual role for offender supervisors had the benefit of providing ongoing informal contact with prisoners and a good opportunity to observe day-to-day behaviour. However, not all offender supervisors wanted to be in the role, and a few lacked the confidence and/or skills for assessing and managing risk of harm. Formal training opportunities had been limited and some offender supervisors we spoke to said that they had not had any training in working with sex offenders or those presenting a high risk of harm to others.

4.11 Although probation staff provided oversight and support to uniformed offender supervisors in completing OASys assessments, there was no formal oversight of the quality and frequency of ongoing contact with prisoners. In the cases we looked at, the levels and quality of contact were variable. In some cases, the prisoner was actively motivated and involved in their progression, but in others the frequency and quality of contact were inadequate. Some

prisoners we spoke to were unclear about how they could progress and achieve their sentence planning targets, and some said that they had no meaningful contact with their offender supervisor.

Public protection

- 4.12 The identification and application of safeguarding arrangements, such as restrictions on child contact, were sound. MAPPA-eligible prisoners were identified on P-Nomis and we saw links to local MAPPA included within some risk management plans.
- 4.13 However, of seven MAPPA-eligible prisoners due for release within the next four months, only three had a clear MAPPA management level, which potentially limited the prison's contribution to pre-release risk management planning for the other four and left the prisoners unsure about the arrangements for their supervision on release. In the case of one prisoner (who was due to be released within two weeks of the inspection), despite ongoing attempts by the OMU to confirm his MAPPA level with the external NPS probation officer, communication from the NPS had been poor, leaving the prison unsure about where the prisoner would live and any licence conditions.
- 4.14 The interdepartmental risk management team (IDRMT) meeting and a pre-release public protection meeting provided extra oversight of the risk of harm. The IDRMT meeting provided a forum within which to discuss cases two years before release, to identify further interventions required or review the management of more complex cases. The pre-release meeting provided an opportunity to develop a pre-release plan six months before release but, as it did not involve MAPPA and there was no ongoing review in the lead-up to release, it was not fulfilling its potential.
- 4.15 There was no access to N-Delius (the case management system for the NPS) within the OMU, which hindered communication and risk management information exchange.
- 4.16 A large number of parole hearings were undertaken and the OMU worked hard to keep the preparation of reports up to date.

Recommendations

- 4.17 **Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels should be confirmed well ahead of release to enable the prison to be involved in pre-release risk management planning in all relevant cases.**
- 4.18 **Access to the National Probation Service case recording system should be provided, to improve communication and risk management information exchange.**

Categorisation

- 4.19 Recategorisation work was mainly up to date. The categorisation processes we reviewed, for category A and B prisoners alike, were appropriate, with sufficient information to support a recommendation.

- 4.20** The number of prisoners moved on from the establishment to progress with their sentence plan had increased and was now good, with 23 moves in the previous two months. However, a few prisoners stayed for many years at the prison; 10% had stayed for over 10 years, some for substantially longer, and they had received little recent focussed work on their offending behaviour, their reduction of risk or progression (see main recommendation S55).

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.

4.21 *Few prisoners were released into the community. A new resettlement provider was in place but it was too early to judge its effectiveness. Resettlement pathway provision was good overall, despite a few weaknesses. Provision for social visits was good and family days were appreciated by prisoners, but there was no accredited parenting course. The range of offending behaviour programmes was appropriate and places were managed well.*

- 4.22** Few prisoners were released from the establishment into the community, with only three releases in the previous six months. Some category B prisoners were transferred to prisons with a resettlement function in the last few months of their sentence, to improve their opportunities to access services in the local area.
- 4.23** The public protection team provided good pre-release planning, and had suitable links with the community in most cases. Up until December 2015, this team had also provided resettlement help but this responsibility had recently transferred to the new community rehabilitation company (CRC) Advanced Personnel Management (APM). APM staff visited the prison once a fortnight but could provide help with accommodation; education, training and employment; debts and other resettlement issues. However, it was too early to judge the effectiveness of this new provision, few prisoners or prison staff were aware of it, and APM staff did not attend the pre-release meeting held by the public protection team.

Recommendation

- 4.24** **The resettlement help provided by Advanced Personnel Management (APM) should be better publicised, and APM staff should attend the pre-release public protection meeting, to establish a risk-based resettlement plan.**

Accommodation

- 4.25** All prisoners released in the previous six months had gone to fixed accommodation, with most going to approved premises. The resettlement officer provided advice and support on accommodation issues to newly arrived prisoners and to those preparing for release. APM (see paragraph 4.23) was planning to deliver further help.

Education, training and employment

- 4.26** Information, advice and guidance, provided by the National Careers Service, contracted to Careers Yorkshire and The Humber through their agent, Prospects, were good. The adviser carried out effective interviews with newly arrived prisoners to identify their skills support needs, and skills action plans were agreed to meet these needs. The adviser promoted all forms of distance learning effectively and provided good support for learners.
- 4.27** The adviser interviewed the few prisoners who were directly released, to provide information about employment and training opportunities in the prisoner's destination area. Effective working with the OMU and APM helped prisoners approaching release to build a CV and understand the principles of job search.
- 4.28** There was no specific pre-release preparation course and only limited use of the prison's virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities).

Health care

- 4.29** Pre-release and transfer arrangements for prisoners with physical and mental health needs were appropriate.
- 4.30** Palliative care was available within the health care inpatient service and had been used appropriately in the previous 12 months.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.31** The drug treatment service (DTS) was well integrated with the OMU. The DTS team had regular input to sentence planning, pre-release, MAPPA and managing challenging behaviour meetings through verbal and written reports.
- 4.32** The DTS conducted one-to-one pre-release planning sessions with prisoners but there were plans to deliver groups with peer support input. Video and telephone links with community agencies were also used to good effect in release planning.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.33** The most recent needs analysis showed that few prisoners had money or debt problems. The only provision for improving financial management skills was in courses such as mathematics. Prisoners could receive help to open a bank account.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.34** Many prisoners were held a long way from home. Visits could be booked at the prison, by telephone or online. The visitors centre provided a pleasant environment, although the refreshments counter had not been open for some months; however, visitors could buy a limited range of snacks from vending machines. Processes to identify and check-in visitors were efficient.

- 4.35** Visitors we spoke to said that some sessions started late, which meant that some people had a shorter visit. This was the case when we observed a visits session, when visitors did not begin to move over to the visits hall until the advertised visits start time. However, the searching process was undertaken as efficiently as possible, which minimised the delay. The four closed visit areas were bare but clean, and the area used for high-risk category A prisoners was adequate.
- 4.36** The main visits hall was large, clean and bright. Murals and posters decorated the walls and helped to soften the environment. Staff supervision of visits was good and officers were clearly aware of relevant issues. Those we observed were friendly and appropriately caring.
- 4.37** In addition to regular social visits, family visits were scheduled every month and were appreciated by prisoners and their families. However, only prisoners on the standard or enhanced levels of the incentives and earned privileges scheme could apply. Plans to introduce family days for prisoners without children or those under child protection arrangements were well developed and the first one had been scheduled for April 2016. Family-orientated courses were not available.

Recommendations

- 4.38** **All prisoners, whatever their privilege status, should be able to attend family visits, subject to security and risk assessments.** (Repeated recommendation 4.39)
- 4.39** **A family learning/parenting course should be reintroduced.** (Repeated recommendation 4.38)

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.40** The establishment was a national resource for SOTPs, delivering the extended programme and the Healthy Sex Programme. Waiting lists were managed by the National Offender Management Service and prisoners were transferred into the prison to take up places.
- 4.41** In addition, the thinking skills programme and Resolve were available. Waiting lists were not excessive and the prioritisation of prisoners to places was appropriate. The A to Z programme was a motivational programme that was sometimes used to enable sex offenders in denial or those fearful of group-work to progress. Some one-to-one work was delivered by the probation officers, or psychologists in a few of the more complex or difficult cases.
- 4.42** All prisoners were assessed for offending behaviour programmes on arrival and reviewed regularly to determine the level of demand for places. Good and regular needs analysis enabled the provision of programme places to be increased or decreased as needed. Completion targets were met and there was good attention to diversity and responsivity within programme delivery.
- 4.43** The Healthy Identity programme was also available, aimed at prisoners who had been involved in extremism. The Sycamore Tree programme had ended, which limited the focus on victim awareness beyond that provided within accredited programmes.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

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

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 Day-to-day oversight of decision making in the segregation unit should be adequate to ensure that actions are authorised appropriately. Unlock protocols should be proportionate to the risk posed. For prisoners at risk of self-harm, decisions to remove their clothing and locate them on the segregation unit should always be based on evidence of exceptional circumstances, and authorised by a senior manager. (S53)
- 5.2 Further action should be taken to understand and, where possible, improve black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners' negative perceptions of their treatment and conditions. (S54)
- 5.3 All prisoners should have an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment. Offender supervisors should motivate and assist prisoners to reduce their risk and enable them to progress. (S55)

Recommendations

To NOMS

Offender management and planning

- 5.4 Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) levels should be confirmed well ahead of release to enable the prison to be involved in pre-release risk management planning in all relevant cases. (4.17)
- 5.5 Access to the National Probation Service case recording system should be provided, to improve communication and risk management information exchange. (4.18)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.6 Prisoners' property should arrive with them, and should be issued within two days of arrival. (1.15)

Security

- 5.7 The supply reduction strategy should be overseen and implemented with the involvement of the drug treatment service team. (1.36)

Discipline

- 5.8** The role of the reintegration unit should be clarified. (1.55)

Equality and diversity

- 5.9** The equality action group and senior management team should receive analysis of the implications of the equality monitoring tool data, decide on actions to be taken in consequence, and monitor the outcomes of those actions. (2.17)
- 5.10** Key prisoner information should be translated into relevant languages and professional interpreting services should be used for confidential matters. (2.26)
- 5.11** There should be a clear system for assessing and meeting the needs of those with disabilities, including safe and effective arrangements for peer support. (2.27)
- 5.12** A care plan should be in place and available to all staff for any prisoner seeking or contemplating gender reassignment. (2.28)

Health services

- 5.13** All staff should participate in all aspects of core mandatory training, and clinical supervision should be available and taken up by all professional staff. (2.51)
- 5.14** The emergency resuscitation equipment should be secured and maintained appropriately. (2.52)
- 5.15** Custodial staff should be trained in basic life support, and know the location of and how to use automated external defibrillators. (2.53)
- 5.16** There should be an ongoing timetable of health promotion activity that meets the needs of the population, supported by accessible literature, a health promotion action group and health promotion action plan. (2.54, repeated recommendation 2.74)
- 5.17** Access to smoking cessation and optician services should be improved and equivalent to community provision. (2.60)
- 5.18** External appointments should not be cancelled unless there are exceptional reasons. (2.61)
- 5.19** The inpatient unit should introduce a formal operational policy that establishes agreed admission and discharge criteria. (2.62)
- 5.20** In-possession risk assessments should consider the risks of the drug as well as the patient and be reviewed regularly. (2.67)
- 5.21** All supervised medicines should be transported and administered safely and in line with professional accountabilities. Confidentiality should be adhered to appropriately. (2.68)
- 5.22** Access to the dentist should be equivalent to that in the community. (2.72)
- 5.23** Mental health services should include clinical psychology, cognitive behavioural therapy and therapeutic groups. (2.77, repeated recommendation 2.105)
- 5.24** Care programme approach planning arrangements should comply with national standards. (2.78)

- 5.25** The transfer of patients to hospital under the Mental Health Act should occur within agreed Department of Health timescales. (2.79)
- 5.26** Mental health awareness training should be provided to all frontline prison staff. (2.80)

Time out of cell

- 5.27** Exercise areas should contain adequate seating and provide a pleasant environment for time outdoors. (3.4)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.28** The analysis and use of data to identify areas of low participation and underperformance should be improved. (3.11)
- 5.29** The education provision should be extended to include higher-level learning and a greater range of subjects to meet the needs of those serving longer sentences or with higher prior academic attainment. (3.17)
- 5.30** Opportunities for prisoners to gain accredited qualifications at work should be increased. (3.18)
- 5.31** The recording of skill development in education, training and work areas should be improved, to plan challenging progression targets. (3.26)
- 5.32** The recognition and recording of all behavioural, personal and social development to measure achievement on non-accredited courses should be improved. (3.27)
- 5.33** Support provided to learners on English courses should be improved so that all make good progress and achieve their planned qualifications. (3.36)
- 5.34** The analysis of data to monitor the use of the library should be improved. (3.40)

Offender management and planning

- 5.35** The resettlement help provided by Advanced Personnel Management (APM) should be better publicised, and APM staff should attend the pre-release public protection meeting, to establish a risk-based resettlement plan. (4.24)

Reintegration planning

- 5.36** All prisoners, whatever their privilege status, should be able to attend family visits, subject to security and risk assessments. (4.38, repeated recommendation 4.39)
- 5.37** A family learning/parenting course should be reintroduced. (4.39, repeated recommendation 4.38)

Examples of good practice

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.38** Prisoner consultation was effective, with a process that ensured that matters of importance to prisoners were addressed by the managers responsible. The project to improve mutual respect between staff and prisoners was a promising initiative. (2.13)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Michelle Bellham	Researcher
Patricia Taflan	Researcher
Tim McSweeney	Researcher
Paul Roberts	Substance misuse inspector
Steve Eley	Health services inspector
Sue Melvin	Pharmacist
Andrea Crosby-Josephs	CQC
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Alastair Pearson	Ofsted inspector
Mark Shackleton	Ofsted inspector
Tessa Webb	Offender management inspector
Caroline Nicklin	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2012, prisoners were processed quickly from reception to the induction unit, and most felt safe on their first night. Induction was effective and while prisoners were held on the induction unit they could associate on the wing where they would eventually reside, which helped to reduce anxiety. The number of fights and assaults was low and had reduced significantly since the last inspection. The use of force was reasonably low. Vulnerable prisoners had a reasonable regime. Suicide and self-harm prevention work required further improvement. Strip clothing was used more often than was necessary to manage self-harm and too often for those in special accommodation. Security was proportionate, and privilege arrangements were fair. Prisoners were negative about the segregation unit and the regime was poor for most. Drug availability was low and there was good support for substance misuse needs. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test

Main recommendations

The regime in the segregation unit should be improved, including for those held in close supervision centre conditions, and residents should have consistent daily access to showers, exercise, telephone calls and participation in constructive and meaningful activity aimed at their reintegration. (HP48)

Not achieved

Strip conditions or segregation of prisoners in crisis should only be used in exceptional circumstances following effective risk assessment and authorisation by a governor grade. (HP49)

Not achieved

Recommendations

All suspected violent incidents should always be thoroughly investigated. (1.21)

Achieved

The prison should address prisoners' concerns about intimidation by staff. (1.22)

Achieved

The prison should analyse information about self-harm to identify trends and patterns of behaviour. (1.29)

Achieved

Listeners should be recruited for the main wings. (1.30)

Not 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.35)

Achieved

There should be improved managerial oversight of and accountability for all aspects of use of force, including planned interventions and use of designated special accommodation. (I.55)

Achieved

Prisoners should only be strip-searched on entry to the segregation unit on the basis of a risk assessment. (I.64)

Not achieved

The use of the two camera cells in the segregation unit should be reviewed, and governance of their use should be improved. (I.65)

Achieved

There should be formal care and reintegration planning arrangements for prisoners who remain in the segregation unit for longer than a month. (I.66)

Partially achieved

Drug treatment officers should receive casework supervision from a professional with a background in substance misuse, and their ongoing training needs should be assessed and met. (I.77)

Achieved

Prisoners not located on the abstinence recovery centre should be offered group work modules to supplement their one-to-one work. (I.78)

No longer relevant

The drug treatment service should develop service user feedback to inform future provision. (I.79)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2012, the accommodation was reasonable but many floor coverings required upgrading. The wings were relaxed and staff-prisoner relationships were generally positive, although not all staff used prisoners' preferred names. Prisoners knew their personal officers, but case notes and links with offender supervisors were underdeveloped. Black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners had significantly worse perceptions of their treatment and conditions than white or non-Muslim prisoners. We did not find evidence to explain the strength of these perceptions but more work was required to understand and address them. Prisoners with disabilities needed more support. Faith arrangements, health services and catering provision were all good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The prison should take further action to understand and, if possible, improve black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners' negative perceptions of their treatment and conditions. HP 50

Partially achieved

Recommendations

All staff should routinely use prisoners' titles and surnames or preferred names. (2.17)

Achieved

The equality action plan and diversity monitoring data should be shared with prisoner equality representatives and discussed at the equality action group forums. (2.25)

Achieved

The prisoner equality representatives should receive diversity training. (2.26)

Not achieved

Outcomes for black and minority ethnic prisoners should be within range for all areas in SMART equality monitoring data, which should be extended to cover all minority groups. (2.27)

Not achieved

More staff and prisoners should be trained in mediation. (2.28)

Not achieved

Discrimination incidents should be monitored over time by their location, outcome and type of protected characteristic to identify trends and patterns. (2.29)

Not achieved

Where possible, the prison should work with UKBA to create written actions plans to move segregated detainees to immigration removal centres following individual risk assessment. (2.41)

No longer relevant

The prison should work with UKBA to ensure that immigration detainees are held for the minimum time, and only held in prison in the most exceptional circumstances. (2.42)

Achieved

Prisoners with disabilities should have equitable access to bathing facilities on their wings. (2.43)

Partially achieved

Gay and bisexual prisoners should receive formal support. (2.44)

Achieved

Legal services officers should receive training. (2.60)

Achieved

The partnership board should agree mandatory and essential health care staff training that reflects best practice in the NHS and enables staff to address the needs of the population effectively. (2.71)

Achieved

All clinical staff should access regular, documented clinical supervision in line with an agreed local supervision policy. (2.72)

Not achieved

All clinical rooms should meet current infection control requirements. (2.73)

Achieved

There should be an ongoing timetable of health promotion activity that meets the needs of the population, supported by accessible literature, a health promotion action group and health promotion action plan. (2.74)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.54)

The health care unit should offer a regime that provides therapeutic, meaningful and constructive activities to inpatients. (2.86)

Achieved

There should be a range of patient group directions to allow prompt and appropriate treatment of patients without referral to a GP. (2.92)

Not achieved

Medication administration from the new central treatment room for A, B, C and D wings should be secure. (2.93)

Achieved

There should be an assessment of oral health needs and service capacity, with a supporting action plan to meet the dental needs of the population. (2.99)

Achieved

The partnership board should ensure that the dental surgery is working towards achieving the best decontamination practice (set out in HTMI-05). (2.100)

Achieved

Mental health services should include clinical psychology, cognitive behavioural therapy and therapeutic groups. (2.105)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.77)

The transfer of patients to external mental health services should be prompt and take place within Department of Health transfer guidelines timescales. (2.106)

Not achieved

Breakfast should be provided on the day it is to be consumed. (2.113)

Not achieved

The kitchen should have a separate preparation area for halal food. (2.114)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2012, time out of cell was reasonable, at approximately 10 hours a day. There were sufficient activity places, but some prisoners were locked up when there were opportunities to engage in off-wing activities. There was a determined drive to achieve a purposeful working week. Strategic management of learning and skills was effective and focused. The quality and range of activities was good, as was the delivery of educational and vocational training. The library was conducive to learning, and the gym offered a quality service, including accredited and non-accredited programmes, and healthy living opportunities were well promoted. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

The prison should ensure better coordination of the sequencing of sessional as well as non-timetabled activity to improve prisoners' time out of cell further and minimise disruption to activities. (3.5)

Achieved

Action for development resulting from the observation of teaching and learning of instructional officers should be clear. (3.10)

Achieved

The management of the supply chain to prison workshops should ensure that challenging production targets are maintained. (3.16)

Partially achieved

Information learning technology should be used creatively to improve the learning environment. (3.24)

Not achieved

The prison should improve the analysis of data on learners' achievements in the Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA) provision. (3.31)

No longer relevant

The Storybook Dads scheme should be reintroduced. (3.35)

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 2012], resettlement, public protection and offender management unit (OMU) policies met the needs of the prison. Although offender supervisors were wing-based, their casework role needed further clarification and development. Offender management links within the prison were good, and public protection arrangements were solid. Pre-release arrangements were impressive. Resettlement accommodation support was good but finance and debt advice needed to be developed. The visits arrangements had improved significantly. The range of offending behaviour programmes was broadly appropriate for the population. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

The reducing reoffending pathway meeting should incorporate the strategic overview of offender management to ensure its effective development and integration within the prison's resettlement work. (4.6)

Not achieved

All staff and departments who have contact with prisoners should be actively involved in sentence planning. (4.17)

Not achieved

The role of offender supervisors should be clarified and quality assurance arrangements should ensure that prisoners' needs are met when managing, assessing and reducing their risk of reoffending and harm. (4.18)

Not achieved

There should be better integration between the work of the public protection unit and that of offender supervisors. (4.21)

Partially achieved

The drug treatment service should strengthen links with the offender management unit, and share care plans with offender supervisors, with their clients' permission. (4.31)

Achieved

The need for finance, benefit and debt support, particularly debt management and advice, should be established and action taken to meet identified need if necessary. (4.33)

Not achieved

A family learning/parenting course should be reintroduced. (4.38)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.39)

All prisoners, whatever their privilege status, should be able to attend family visits, subject to security and risk assessments. (4.39)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.38)

The prison should deliver the Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme often enough to meet the needs of the population. (4.43)

No longer relevant

Appendix III: Care Quality Commission Requirement Notice



Requirement Notices

Provider: Spectrum Community Health CIC

Location: HMP Full Sutton

Location ID: 1-2124220572

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

Action we have told the provider to take

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

Regulation 12 Safe care and treatment

Regulation 15 Premises and equipment

We found that the registered provider had not ensured the proper and safe management of medicines, and not all premises and equipment used by the service was suitable for the purpose for which it was being used. This was in breach of regulation 12(1) (2) (e) (g) and 15(1) (c) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

How the regulation was not being met:

Medication was being transported from the pharmacy in a briefcase to G wing. It was then being administered in a door way on a small table in full sight of other prisoners. We consider this to be a high risk situation in terms of the method of transport and the lack of confidentiality being provided to the recipient of the medication. In possession medication was being received in the same way.

Regulation 18 Staffing

We found that persons employed by the provider in the provision of regulated activity did not receive appropriate support, training and supervision as is necessary to enable them to carry out the duties they are employed to perform. This was in breach of regulation 18(2)(a) of the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014.

How the regulation was not being met:

Staff had not received regular, formal, recorded management and clinical supervision. Not all mandatory training had been completed as required for nursing staff.

Appendix IV: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	0	565	97.8
Recall	0	11	1.9
Convicted unsentenced	0	2	0.3
Remand	0	0	0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	0	0
Total		578	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	3	0.5
Less than six months	0	0	0
six months to less than 12 months	0	0	0
12 months to less than 2 years	0	0	0
2 years to less than 4 years	0	1	0.2
4 years to less than 10 years	0	21	4
10 years and over (not life)	0	191	33
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	49	8.6
Life	0	310	54
Total		578	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 21		
Under 21 years		
21 years to 29 years	109	19
30 years to 39 years	167	28.6
40 years to 49 years	128	22.2
50 years to 59 years	105	18.3
60 years to 69 years	55	9.4
70 plus years	14	2.4
Please state maximum age here: 83		
Total	578	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British		525	90.8
Foreign nationals		53	9.2
Total		578	100

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	0		
Uncategorised sentenced	0		
Category A	0	154	26.9
Category B	0	408	71.2

Category C	0		
Category D	0	1	0.2
Other – category A high	0	9	1.6
Other – Prov A	0	1	0.2
Total		578	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White			
British		378	65.4
Irish		11	1.9
Gypsy/Irish Traveller			
Other white		30	5.1
Mixed			
White and black Caribbean		12	2.1
White and black African		1	0.2
White and Asian			
Other mixed		5	0.9
Asian or Asian British			
Indian		8	1.4
Pakistani		28	4.9
Bangladeshi		4	0.7
Chinese		1	0.2
Other Asian		10	1.7
Black or black British			
Caribbean		44	7.5
African		15	2.6
Other black		21	3.7
Other ethnic group			
Arab		1	0.2
Other ethnic group		3	0.5
Not stated		6	1
Total		578	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0		
Church of England	0	132	23
Roman Catholic	0	97	16.9
Other Christian denominations	0	58	10.1
Muslim	0	118	20.6
Sikh	0	2	0.3
Hindu	0	2	0.3
Buddhist	0	16	2.8
Jewish	0	3	0.5
Other	0	19	3.3
No religion	0	126	22
Total		578	100

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	0	12	2.09
Total		12	2.09

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	17	2.9
1 month to 3 months	0	0	33	5.8
3 months to six months	0	0	57	9.9
six months to 1 year	0	0	75	13.1
1 year to 2 years	0	0	110	19.2
2 years to 4 years	0	0	125	21.8
4 years or more	0	0	156	27.2
Other	0	0	2	0.3
Total			575	99.5

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-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	218	
Total		218	

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	0	0	0	0
1 month to 3 months	0	0	1	33.3
3 months to six months	0	0	2	66.7
six months to 1 year	0	0	0	0
1 year to 2 years	0	0	0	0
2 years to 4 years	0	0	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total			3	0.5

Main offence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	0	241	41
Sexual offences	0	245	43
Burglary	0	5	0.9
Robbery	0	27	4.7
Theft and handling	0		
Fraud and forgery	0	1	0.4
Drugs offences	0	35	6
Other offences	0	24	4
Civil offences	0	0	0
Offence not recorded /holding warrant			
Total		578	100

Appendix V: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment.¹⁰ 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 11 January 2016 the prisoner population at HMP Full Sutton was 575. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 209 prisoners.

We received a total of 184 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 88%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Ten respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and fifteen questionnaires were not returned.

¹⁰ 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
A	31
B	33
C	36
D	33
E	24
F	14
G (Induction)	3
Health care	8
Segregation	2

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Full Sutton.

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 differences¹¹ 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 Full Sutton in 2016 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other high security prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 4 high security prisons since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMP Full Sutton in 2016 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Full Sutton in 2012.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

¹¹ 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.

- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the vulnerable prisoner wings (B, C and D) and the rest of the establishment (A, E, F and G).
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between E wing and the other main population wings (A, F and G).
- A comparison of black and minority ethnic prisoners in 2016 to black and minority ethnic Prisoners in 2012.
- A comparison of Muslim prisoners in 2016 to Muslim prisoners in 2012.

Survey summary

Section I: About you

Q1.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See shortened methodology			
Q1.2	How old are you?			
	Under 21		0 (0%)	
	21 - 29		30 (17%)	
	30 - 39		49 (27%)	
	40 - 49		43 (24%)	
	50 - 59		38 (21%)	
	60 - 69		13 (7%)	
	70 and over		7 (4%)	
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?			
	Yes		177 (98%)	
	Yes - on recall		2 (1%)	
	No - awaiting trial		1 (1%)	
	No - awaiting sentence		0 (0%)	
	No - awaiting deportation		0 (0%)	
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?			
	Not sentenced		1 (1%)	
	Less than 6 months		0 (0%)	
	6 months to less than 1 year		0 (0%)	
	1 year to less than 2 years		0 (0%)	
	2 years to less than 4 years		0 (0%)	
	4 years to less than 10 years		15 (8%)	
	10 years or more		57 (32%)	
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)		18 (10%)	
	Life		87 (49%)	
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?			
	Yes		12 (7%)	
	No		163 (93%)	
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?			
	Yes		177 (99%)	
	No		1 (1%)	
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?			
	Yes		178 (99%)	
	No		1 (1%)	
Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?			
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)	113 (62%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese	1 (1%)
	White - Irish	5 (3%)	Asian or Asian British - other	0 (0%)
	White - other	10 (5%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean	8 (4%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean	13 (7%)	Mixed race - white and black African	2 (1%)

<i>Black or black British - African</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Black or black British - other</i>	5 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Arab</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	14 (8%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)		

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

Yes	5 (3%)
No	174 (97%)

Q1.10 What is your religion?

None	36 (20%)	Hindu	0 (0%)
Church of England	44 (25%)	Jewish	0 (0%)
Catholic	30 (17%)	Muslim	37 (21%)
Protestant	5 (3%)	Sikh	0 (0%)
Other Christian denomination	12 (7%)	Other	10 (6%)
Buddhist	5 (3%)		

Q1.11 How would you describe your sexual orientation?

<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>	166 (94%)
<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>	7 (4%)
<i>Bisexual</i>	4 (2%)

Q1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?

Yes	48 (27%)
No	132 (73%)

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

Yes	12 (7%)
No	167 (93%)

Q1.14 Is this your first time in prison?

Yes	65 (36%)
No	117 (64%)

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

Yes	62 (35%)
No	117 (65%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts**Q2.1 On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?**

<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	54 (30%)
<i>2 hours or longer</i>	118 (66%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (4%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	54 (30%)
Yes	56 (31%)
No	66 (37%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (2%)

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

<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	54 (30%)
Yes	11 (6%)

	No	109 (60%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	114 (63%)
	No	47 (26%)
	Don't remember	19 (11%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	123 (69%)
	No	46 (26%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	46 (25%)
	Well	70 (39%)
	Neither	43 (24%)
	Badly	11 (6%)
	Very badly	6 (3%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Yes, someone told me	77 (43%)
	Yes, I received written information	9 (5%)
	No, I was not told anything	93 (52%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	113 (62%)
	No	61 (34%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours	117 (66%)
	2 hours or longer	38 (22%)
	Don't remember	21 (12%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	126 (69%)
	No	46 (25%)
	Don't remember	10 (5%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well	40 (22%)
	Well	65 (37%)
	Neither	41 (23%)
	Badly	21 (12%)
	Very badly	9 (5%)
	Don't remember	2 (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	58 (33%)
	Physical health	32 (18%)

<i>Housing problems</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Mental health</i>	40 (23%)
<i>Contacting employers</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i>	18 (10%)
<i>Contacting family</i>	58 (33%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i>	60 (34%)
<i>Childcare</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Other</i>	12 (7%)
<i>Money worries</i>	24 (14%)	Did not have any problems	43 (24%)
<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	36 (20%)		

Q3.5 Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?

Yes	47 (27%)
No	81 (47%)
Did not have any problems	43 (25%)

Q3.6 When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Tobacco</i>	87 (49%)
<i>A shower</i>	51 (28%)
<i>A free telephone call</i>	25 (14%)
<i>Something to eat</i>	102 (57%)
<i>PIN phone credit</i>	42 (23%)
<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>	85 (47%)
Did not receive anything	36 (20%)

Q3.7 When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Chaplain</i>	84 (47%)
<i>Someone from health services</i>	90 (50%)
<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>	35 (20%)
<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>	48 (27%)
Did not have access to any of these	55 (31%)

Q3.8 When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>What was going to happen to you</i>	78 (44%)
<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	44 (25%)
<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>	61 (34%)
<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>	50 (28%)
<i>Health services</i>	61 (34%)
<i>Chaplaincy</i>	66 (37%)
Not offered any information	65 (37%)

Q3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?

Yes	127 (71%)
No	40 (22%)
Don't remember	13 (7%)

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

Have not been on an induction course	34 (19%)
<i>Within the first week</i>	64 (36%)
<i>More than a week</i>	65 (36%)
<i>Don't remember</i>	16 (9%)

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

Have not been on an induction course	34 (19%)
Yes	61 (34%)

No	59 (33%)
Don't remember	25 (14%)

Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	32 (18%)
	Within the first week	19 (11%)
	More than a week	108 (60%)
	Don't remember	21 (12%)

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?	39 (22%)	43 (24%)	22 (12%)	26 (14%)	28 (16%) 22 (12%)
	Attend legal visits?	28 (17%)	46 (28%)	20 (12%)	18 (11%)	15 (9%) 36 (22%)
	Get bail information?	3 (2%)	5 (4%)	9 (7%)	6 (4%)	7 (5%) 106 (78%)
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					20 (11%)
	Yes					95 (53%)
	No					65 (36%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	Yes					110 (61%)
	No					5 (3%)
	Don't know					64 (36%)
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?	147 (81%)	32 (18%)	2 (1%)		
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	175 (97%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)		
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	151 (84%)	19 (11%)	9 (5%)		
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	164 (92%)	14 (8%)	1 (1%)		
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	95 (52%)	55 (30%)	32 (18%)		
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	115 (64%)	65 (36%)	0 (0%)		
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	57 (32%)	69 (39%)	53 (30%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	Very good					24 (13%)
	Good					67 (37%)
	Neither					46 (26%)
	Bad					36 (20%)
	Very bad					7 (4%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?					
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know					0 (0%)
	Yes					116 (64%)
	No					65 (36%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?					
	Yes					91 (50%)
	No					25 (14%)
	Don't know					65 (36%)

Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	97 (54%)
	No	43 (24%)
	Don't know/ N/A	39 (22%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	108 (61%)
	No	9 (5%)
	Don't know/ N/A	61 (34%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend	35 (20%)
	Very easy	49 (28%)
	Easy	53 (30%)
	Neither	12 (7%)
	Difficult	7 (4%)
	Very difficult	4 (2%)
	Don't know	18 (10%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	158 (87%)
	No	22 (12%)
	Don't know	1 (1%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	1 (1%) 104 (61%) 65 (38%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	1 (1%) 65 (39%) 101 (60%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	129 (73%)
	No	28 (16%)
	Don't know	19 (11%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	33 (19%) 49 (28%) 91 (53%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	33 (20%) 54 (33%) 79 (48%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	42 (24%)
	No	134 (76%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	Don't know who they are	38 (22%)
	Very easy	20 (12%)
	Easy	34 (20%)
	Neither	47 (27%)

<i>Difficult</i>	19 (11%)
<i>Very difficult</i>	14 (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>	2 (1%)
	Yes	80 (45%)
	No	86 (49%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (5%)
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>	2 (1%)
	Yes	84 (48%)
	No	80 (46%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (5%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	12 (7%)
	No	165 (93%)
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>	126 (73%)
	<i>Very well</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Well</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Badly</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	11 (6%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	138 (78%)
	No	38 (22%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	134 (74%)
	No	46 (26%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	72 (40%)
	No	107 (60%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Never</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	43 (24%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	48 (27%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	38 (21%)
	<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>	8 (5%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	71 (40%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	70 (40%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	27 (15%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	59 (33%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	48 (27%)
	<i>Neither</i>	24 (13%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	24 (13%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	15 (8%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?			
	<i>Yes</i>	92 (51%)		
	<i>No</i>	89 (49%)		
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?			
	<i>Yes</i>	33 (19%)		
	<i>No</i>	143 (81%)		
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	89 (52%)	<i>At meal times</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	20 (12%)	<i>At health services</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	24 (14%)	<i>Visits area</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	16 (9%)	<i>In wing showers</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	8 (5%)	<i>In gym showers</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	11 (6%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	22 (13%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	9 (5%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>At work</i>	21 (12%)	<i>In your cell</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>During movement</i>	28 (16%)	<i>At religious services</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>At education</i>	13 (8%)		
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?			
	<i>Yes</i>	60 (33%)		
	<i>No</i>	121 (67%)		
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)			
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	31 (17%)		
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	18 (10%)		
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)		
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	31 (17%)		
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i>	4 (2%)		
	<i>Medication</i>	4 (2%)		
	<i>Debt</i>	4 (2%)		
	<i>Drugs</i>	4 (2%)		
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	16 (9%)		
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	19 (10%)		
	<i>Your nationality</i>	14 (8%)		
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	8 (4%)		
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	1 (1%)		
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	3 (2%)		
	<i>Your age</i>	9 (5%)		

<i>You have a disability</i>	8 (4%)
<i>You were new here</i>	8 (4%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	19 (10%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	11 (6%)

Q8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?

Yes	70 (40%)
No	107 (60%)

Q8.7 If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	30 (17%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	40 (23%)
<i>Medication</i>	11 (6%)
<i>Debt</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Drugs</i>	1 (1%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	16 (9%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	23 (13%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	9 (5%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	10 (6%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	5 (3%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	4 (2%)
<i>You were new here</i>	11 (6%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	22 (12%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	2 (1%)

Q8.8 If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?

Not been victimised	85 (51%)
Yes	34 (20%)
No	49 (29%)

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
<i>The doctor</i>	12 (7%)	13 (7%)	44 (25%)	39 (22%)	52 (29%)	19 (11%)
<i>The nurse</i>	13 (8%)	25 (15%)	71 (41%)	31 (18%)	22 (13%)	10 (6%)
<i>The dentist</i>	20 (12%)	11 (6%)	34 (20%)	23 (13%)	47 (27%)	37 (22%)

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

	Not been	Very good	Good	Neither	Bad	Very bad
<i>The doctor</i>	7 (4%)	29 (16%)	69 (39%)	30 (17%)	21 (12%)	20 (11%)
<i>The nurse</i>	7 (4%)	29 (17%)	60 (36%)	34 (20%)	20 (12%)	17 (10%)
<i>The dentist</i>	19 (12%)	26 (16%)	48 (29%)	31 (19%)	19 (12%)	20 (12%)

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

Not been	5 (3%)
<i>Very good</i>	14 (8%)
<i>Good</i>	63 (37%)
<i>Neither</i>	28 (16%)
<i>Bad</i>	35 (20%)
<i>Very bad</i>	27 (16%)

Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	
	Yes	101 (57%)
	No	75 (43%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?	
	Not taking medication	75 (43%)
	Yes, all my meds	67 (38%)
	Yes, some of my meds	23 (13%)
	No	11 (6%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	61 (35%)
	No	114 (65%)
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)?	
	Do not have any emotional or mental health problems	114 (66%)
	Yes	33 (19%)
	No	25 (15%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	25 (14%)
	No	152 (86%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	22 (13%)
	No	154 (88%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	32 (18%)
	Easy	17 (10%)
	Neither	8 (5%)
	Difficult	7 (4%)
	Very difficult	7 (4%)
	Don't know	105 (60%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	13 (7%)
	Easy	16 (9%)
	Neither	11 (6%)
	Difficult	13 (7%)
	Very difficult	11 (6%)
	Don't know	113 (64%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	6 (3%)
	No	170 (97%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	4 (2%)
	No	172 (98%)

Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have a drug problem</i>	145 (86%)
	Yes	16 (9%)
	No	8 (5%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	<i>Did not / do not have an alcohol problem</i>	154 (91%)
	Yes	13 (8%)
	No	2 (1%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i>	143 (87%)
	Yes	21 (13%)
	No	1 (1%)

Section II: 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	12 (7%)	8 (5%)	44 (25%)	23 (13%)	62 (35%)	27 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training	32 (19%)	8 (5%)	28 (17%)	32 (19%)	40 (24%)	27 (16%)
	Education (including basic skills)	19 (11%)	12 (7%)	51 (30%)	34 (20%)	36 (21%)	16 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	38 (23%)	13 (8%)	41 (25%)	30 (18%)	25 (15%)	17 (10%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>						33 (19%)
	Prison job						131 (75%)
	Vocational or skills training						17 (10%)
	Education (including basic skills)						52 (30%)
	Offending behaviour programmes						35 (20%)
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?						
		Not been involved	Yes	No		<i>Don't know</i>	
	Prison job	25 (15%)	53 (31%)	74 (43%)		20 (12%)	
	Vocational or skills training	44 (33%)	41 (30%)	33 (24%)		17 (13%)	
	Education (including basic skills)	35 (23%)	58 (39%)	44 (29%)		13 (9%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes	39 (27%)	56 (38%)	36 (24%)		16 (11%)	
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>						13 (7%)
	Never						40 (23%)
	Less than once a week						65 (37%)
	About once a week						41 (23%)
	More than once a week						18 (10%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>						45 (25%)

	Yes	74 (41%)
	No	60 (34%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	48 (27%)
	0	32 (18%)
	1 to 2	25 (14%)
	3 to 5	63 (35%)
	More than 5	10 (6%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	33 (19%)
	0	27 (15%)
	1 to 2	44 (25%)
	3 to 5	42 (24%)
	More than 5	31 (18%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	5 (3%)
	0	9 (5%)
	1 to 2	6 (3%)
	3 to 5	9 (5%)
	More than 5	148 (84%)
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>	14 (8%)
	2 to less than 4 hours	28 (16%)
	4 to less than 6 hours	21 (12%)
	6 to less than 8 hours	39 (22%)
	8 to less than 10 hours	35 (20%)
	10 hours or more	28 (16%)
	Don't know	12 (7%)

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	48 (28%)
	No	123 (72%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	Yes	82 (46%)
	No	97 (54%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	Yes	52 (29%)
	No	125 (71%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	35 (20%)
	Very easy	7 (4%)
	Easy	23 (13%)
	Neither	13 (7%)
	Difficult	35 (20%)
	Very difficult	59 (34%)

<i>Don't know</i>	4 (2%)
-------------------	--------

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	1 (1%)
	Yes	160 (91%)
	No	14 (8%)
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>	15 (9%)
	No contact	41 (23%)
	Letter	65 (37%)
	Phone	55 (31%)
	Visit	64 (37%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	Yes	148 (86%)
	No	25 (14%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	1 (1%)
	Yes	153 (87%)
	No	22 (13%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	23 (13%)
	Very involved	50 (29%)
	Involved	48 (28%)
	Neither	17 (10%)
	Not very involved	21 (12%)
	Not at all involved	14 (8%)
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>	23 (13%)
	Nobody	60 (34%)
	Offender supervisor	73 (42%)
	Offender manager	42 (24%)
	Named/ personal officer	41 (23%)
	Staff from other departments	25 (14%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	23 (13%)
	Yes	87 (51%)
	No	34 (20%)
	Don't know	27 (16%)
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>	23 (13%)
	Yes	52 (30%)
	No	60 (35%)
	Don't know	38 (22%)

Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>			23 (13%)
	Yes			20 (12%)
	No			82 (48%)
	Don't know			47 (27%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?			
	Yes			14 (8%)
	No			70 (40%)
	Don't know			89 (51%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?			
	Yes			20 (12%)
	No			150 (88%)
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.)			
		Do not need help	Yes	No
	<i>Employment</i>	36 (22%)	17 (11%)	108 (67%)
	<i>Accommodation</i>	34 (21%)	19 (12%)	106 (67%)
	<i>Benefits</i>	34 (21%)	17 (11%)	108 (68%)
	<i>Finances</i>	33 (21%)	13 (8%)	108 (70%)
	<i>Education</i>	38 (23%)	27 (17%)	97 (60%)
	<i>Drugs and alcohol</i>	54 (36%)	19 (13%)	76 (51%)
Q13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?			
	Not sentenced			1 (1%)
	Yes			93 (57%)
	No			69 (42%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Full Sutton 2016

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

Key to tables

		HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
	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		184	673	184	176
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	1%	1%	1%	1%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	0%	0%	0%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	10%	12%	10%	15%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	13%	7%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	30%	31%	30%	31%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	4%	3%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	21%	22%	21%	23%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	6%	9%	6%	5%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	27%	30%	27%	22%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	9%	7%	13%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	36%	44%	36%	39%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	35%	40%	35%	41%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	66%	66%	66%	67%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	44%	47%	44%	46%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	11%	9%	11%
2.4	Was the van clean?	63%	60%	63%	66%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	69%	72%	69%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64%	60%	64%	58%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	43%	47%	43%	39%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	5%	7%	5%	5%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	62%	75%	62%	74%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	66%	48%	66%	72%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	69%	75%	69%	66%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	66%	59%	60%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
When you first arrived:				
3.4 Did you have any problems?	76%	68%	76%	62%
3.4 Did you have any problems with loss of property?	33%	25%	33%	31%
3.4 Did you have any housing problems?	3%	3%	3%	2%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	1%	0%	2%
3.4 Did you have any problems contacting family?	33%	25%	33%	23%
3.4 Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	1%	1%	0%
3.4 Did you have any money worries?	14%	14%	14%	11%
3.4 Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	16%	20%	9%
3.4 Did you have any physical health problems?	18%	14%	18%	11%
3.4 Did you have any mental health problems?	23%	16%	23%	14%
3.4 Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	10%	8%	10%	10%
3.4 Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	34%	22%	34%	18%
For those with problems:				
3.5 Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	37%	37%	37%	35%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6 Tobacco?	49%	50%	49%	47%
3.6 A shower?	29%	19%	29%	32%
3.6 A free telephone call?	14%	20%	14%	20%
3.6 Something to eat?	57%	40%	57%	59%
3.6 PIN phone credit?	23%	13%	23%	30%
3.6 Toiletries/ basic items?	48%	40%	48%	49%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued				
When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7 The chaplain or a religious leader?	47%	41%	47%	56%
3.7 Someone from health services?	50%	61%	50%	60%
3.7 A Listener/Samaritans?	20%	23%	20%	30%
3.7 Prison shop/ canteen?	27%	18%	27%	28%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8 What was going to happen to you?	44%	42%	44%	50%
3.8 Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	25%	34%	25%	36%
3.8 How to make routine requests?	35%	34%	35%	39%
3.8 Your entitlement to visits?	28%	28%	28%	34%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
3.8 Health services?	35%	43%	35%	47%
3.8 The chaplaincy?	37%	38%	37%	44%
3.9 Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	66%	71%	73%
3.10 Have you been on an induction course?	81%	89%	81%	88%
For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11 Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	42%	46%	42%	45%
3.12 Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	82%	76%	82%	83%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody				
In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1 Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	46%	59%	46%	59%
4.1 Attend legal visits?	45%	54%	45%	56%
4.1 Get bail information?	6%	9%	6%	10%
4.2 Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	53%	58%	53%	49%
4.3 Can you get legal books in the library?	61%	66%	61%	55%
For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4 Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	81%	83%	81%	86%
4.4 Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	94%	97%	95%
4.4 Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	84%	74%	84%	89%
4.4 Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	92%	72%	92%	93%
4.4 Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	52%	46%	52%	53%
4.4 Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	64%	65%	64%	68%
4.4 Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	32%	24%	32%	34%
4.5 Is the food in this prison good/very good?	51%	18%	51%	32%
4.6 Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	64%	49%	64%	57%
4.7 Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	50%	55%	50%	51%
4.8 Are your religious beliefs are respected?	54%	50%	54%	47%
4.9 Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	61%	59%	61%	61%
4.10 Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	57%	53%	57%	53%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints				
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	87%	86%	87%	90%
For those who have made an application:				
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	62%	55%	62%	61%
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	39%	42%	39%	51%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	73%	72%	73%	69%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	35%	30%	35%	32%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	41%	37%	41%	46%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	24%	26%	24%	33%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	31%	27%	31%	34%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	45%	54%	45%	54%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	43%	48%	37%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	4%	7%	8%
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?	44%	31%	44%	22%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	80%	78%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	74%	75%	74%	73%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	40%	36%	40%	37%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	31%	28%	31%	23%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	96%	88%	96%	93%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	63%	66%	63%	60%
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	51%	54%	51%	55%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	25%	19%	23%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	33%	39%	33%	37%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	14%	17%	18%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	10%	10%	10%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	4%	1%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	23%	17%	26%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	7%	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	6%	2%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	2%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	6%	9%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	10%	9%	10%	8%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.5 Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	5%	8%	5%
8.5 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	6%	4%	5%
8.5 Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.5 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	4%	2%	5%
8.5 Victimised you because of your age?	5%	4%	5%	4%
8.5 Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	6%	4%	5%
8.5 Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	4%	4%	3%
8.5 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	10%	10%	11%
8.5 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	4%	6%	5%
SECTION 8: Safety continued				
8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?	40%	49%	40%	48%
Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	19%	17%	18%
8.7 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	7%	5%	6%
8.7 Sexually abused you?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7 Threatened or intimidated you?	23%	24%	23%	24%
8.7 Victimised you because of medication?	6%	6%	6%	8%
8.7 Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7 Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.7 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	9%	9%	8%
8.7 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	13%	11%	13%	11%
8.7 Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	6%	5%	5%
8.7 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	6%	6%	4%
8.7 Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	2%	0%	2%
8.7 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.7 Victimised you because of your age?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.7 Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	6%	2%	4%
8.7 Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	4%	6%	5%
8.7 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	11%	13%	10%
8.7 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	3%	1%	2%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8 Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	41%	51%	41%	54%
SECTION 9: Health services				
9.1 Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	32%	38%	32%	34%
9.1 Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	56%	60%	56%	53%
9.1 Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	26%	23%	26%	19%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	58%	46%	58%	34%
9.2	The nurse?	56%	61%	56%	49%
9.2	The dentist?	51%	54%	51%	77%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	46%	40%	46%	37%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	57%	56%	57%	53%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	89%	78%	89%	87%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	35%	34%	35%	29%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	57%	58%	57%	60%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	14%	16%	14%	14%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	13%	15%	13%	12%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	21%	28%	17%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	16%	14%	16%	15%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	3%	5%	3%	5%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	2%	6%	2%	5%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	67%	67%	67%	67%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	87%	67%	87%	73%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	96%	82%	96%	79%
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	30%	42%	30%	30%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	22%	31%	22%	27%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	38%	50%	38%	40%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	33%	22%	33%	25%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	75%	67%	75%	71%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	10%	15%	10%	11%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	30%	34%	30%	28%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	20%	18%	20%	13%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	86%	89%	86%	76%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	36%	40%	36%	40%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	67%	79%	67%	64%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	45%	46%	45%	63%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	77%	89%	77%	69%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	51%	56%	51%	69%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	74%	80%	74%	65%
	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?	52%	50%	52%	61%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	54%	33%	34%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	41%	52%	41%	39%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	41%	33%	41%	47%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	29%	41%	42%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	84%	81%	84%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	16%	14%	16%	18%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	28%	36%	28%	31%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	46%	50%	46%	41%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	29%	31%	29%	29%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	17%	18%	17%	18%
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?	92%	90%	92%	92%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	26%	29%	26%	26%
13.2	Contact by letter?	41%	42%	41%	40%
13.2	Contact by phone?	34%	22%	34%	35%
13.2	Contact by visit?	40%	37%	40%	38%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	86%	85%	86%	90%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	87%	87%	87%	87%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	65%	51%	65%	57%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	40%	41%	40%	35%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	48%	38%	48%	53%
13.6	Offender manager?	28%	27%	28%	28%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	27%	20%	27%	26%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	16%	22%	16%	20%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Key to tables		HMP Full Sutton 2016	High security prisons comparator	HMP Full Sutton 2016	HMP Full Sutton 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	59%	53%	59%	57%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	35%	33%	35%	39%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	14%	12%	14%	12%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	8%	7%	8%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	12%	13%	12%	13%
	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?	14%	18%	14%	10%
13.12	Accommodation?	15%	17%	15%	15%
13.12	Benefits?	14%	15%	14%	13%
13.12	Finances?	11%	14%	11%	13%
13.12	Education?	22%	21%	22%	17%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	20%	22%	20%	24%
	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?	57%	57%	57%	63%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP Full Sutton 2016

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		54	128	37	142
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	100%	97%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	7%	12%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			86%	15%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	3%	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	60%	4%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	32%	16%	28%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	9%	3%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	28%	39%	30%	37%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	69%	51%	67%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	28%	49%	30%	46%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	61%	73%	54%	73%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	44%	66%	41%	63%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	82%	74%	83%	74%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	45%	52%	43%	53%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	57%	77%	60%	75%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	81%	86%	80%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	35%	50%	38%	48%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	71%	85%	78%	83%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	98%	92%	98%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	58%	50%	65%	50%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	45%	52%	49%	51%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54%	68%	57%	66%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	43%	53%	46%	51%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	56%	43%	57%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	59%	66%	59%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	90%	81%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	71%	74%	65%	76%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	35%	49%	44%	45%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	50%	50%	48%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	5%	11%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	83%	64%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in prison?	66%	78%	60%	78%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	25%	33%	17%	34%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	98%	94%	97%	95%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	63%	46%	57%	49%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	30%	13%	27%	16%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	43%	29%	36%	33%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	16%	20%	16%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	21%	4%	22%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	17%	8%	28%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	15%	5%	17%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	8%	4%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	55%	33%	58%	35%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	35%	18%	36%	20%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	21%	4%	28%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	31%	6%	47%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	10%	3%	17%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	4%	2%	5%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	36%	22%	34%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	54%	57%	50%	58%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	66%	44%	61%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	33%	35%	42%	33%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	28%	35%	26%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	68%	78%	74%	76%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	8%	11%	15%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	29%	41%	27%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	22%	20%	26%	18%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39%	30%	28%	35%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	61%	34%	72%	34%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	48%	38%	47%	39%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	82%	85%	89%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	12%	17%	12%	17%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	54%	43%	53%	45%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36%	26%	36%	27%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses HMP Full Sutton 2016 BME prisoners to last time

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

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners 2016	Black and minority ethnic prisoners 2012
	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		54	54
1.3	Are you sentenced?	98%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	16%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	95%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	60%	62%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	9%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	28%	42%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	54%	47%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	28%	26%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	61%	47%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	44%	47%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	82%	81%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	45%	62%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	57%	61%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	87%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	35%	53%
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	71%	75%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	89%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners 2016	Black and minority ethnic prisoners 2012
	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	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	58%	50%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	45%	24%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	54%	33%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	43%	32%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	40%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	70%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	79%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	71%	63%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	35%	41%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	37%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	66%	61%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in at prison?	66%	58%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	25%	9%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	98%	93%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	63%	63%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	30%	33%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	43%	42%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	28%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you at been here? (By prisoners)	21%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	17%	11%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	15%	11%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	2%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners 2016	Black and minority ethnic prisoners 2012
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	55%	65%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	35%	41%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	21%	24%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	31%	26%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	10%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	4%	4%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	21%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	54%	46%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	43%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	33%	21%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	27%	15%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	68%	79%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	8%	17%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	45%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	22%	11%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	39%	36%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	61%	73%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	48%	44%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	82%	83%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	12%	11%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	54%	48%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36%	38%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses HMP Full Sutton 2016 Muslim prisoners to last time

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

		Muslim prisoners 2016	Muslim prisoners 2012
	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		37	38
1.3	Are you sentenced?	97%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	12%	8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	95%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	86%	89%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	30%	46%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	51%	47%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	30%	37%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	54%	41%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	41%	46%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	83%	84%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	43%	51%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	63%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	86%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	38%	57%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Muslim prisoners 2016	Muslim prisoners 2012
	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?	78%	78%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	65%	55%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	49%	21%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	57%	37%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	46%	22%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	43%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	66%	82%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	65%	68%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44%	39%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	64%	58%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in at prison?	60%	57%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	17%	2%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	97%	92%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	57%	61%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	27%	37%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	36%	30%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	20%	19%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you at been here? (By prisoners)	22%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	28%	8%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	17%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	8%	6%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Muslim prisoners 2016	Muslim prisoners 2012
	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?	58%	66%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	36%	44%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	28%	17%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	47%	36%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	17%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	5%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	16%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	50%	46%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	44%	42%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	42%	11%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	35%	16%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	74%	82%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	15%	13%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	41%	42%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	26%	11%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	28%	27%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	72%	76%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	47%	42%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	89%	89%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	12%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	53%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36%	34%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability and age over 50) HMP Full Sutton 2016

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

		Consider themselves to have a disability		Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Prisoners aged 50 and over		Prisoners under the age of 50	
	Any percentage highlighted in 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		48	132			58	122		
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	99%			100%	99%		
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	8%			7%	7%		
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	100%			100%	99%		
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	100%			100%	99%		
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	15%	35%			14%	37%		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	3%			0%	4%		
1.1	Are you Muslim?	12%	24%			3%	30%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?					39%	21%		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	17%	3%			9%	6%		
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	42%	33%			35%	35%		
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	64%	64%			77%	57%		
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	45%	42%			48%	40%		
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	67%	71%			77%	64%		
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	62%	57%			73%	51%		
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	91%	70%			69%	81%		
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	56%	48%			56%	48%		
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	61%	75%			82%	65%		
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	81%			78%	82%		
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	45%			55%	40%		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	79%	82%			89%	78%		
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	99%			95%	98%		

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Prisoners aged 50 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				Prisoners under the age of 50
	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	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	42%	57%	46%	56%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	44%	53%	53%	48%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	73%	61%	66%	64%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	61%	46%	60%	46%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	57%	53%	65%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59%	61%	65%	59%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	90%	91%	85%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	70%	75%	72%	74%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	40%	47%	41%	47%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	48%	45%	49%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	14%	5%	2%	9%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	84%	76%	86%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in at prison?	74%	75%	84%	69%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	33%	29%	45%	24%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	93%	96%	97%	95%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	54%	49%	32%	60%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	22%	17%	8%	23%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	36%	32%	27%	36%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	19%	16%	16%	17%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you at been here? (By prisoners)	13%	7%	3%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	13%	10%	2%	15%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	8%	0%	12%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	6%	5%	5%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	15%	1%	9%	2%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability		Prisoners aged 50 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				Prisoners under the age of 50
	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?	40%	39%	26%	47%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	24%	22%	20%	24%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	10%	2%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	9%	15%	0%	19%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	4%	6%	0%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	4%	2%	5%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	9%	0%	2%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	41%	29%	43%	26%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	51%	58%	64%	51%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	89%	46%	78%	48%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	60%	26%	24%	40%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31%	27%	20%	31%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	72%	78%	70%	77%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	13%	9%	10%	10%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	33%	28%	20%	34%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	19%	21%	15%	22%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	35%	32%	39%	30%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	19%	49%	19%	52%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	29%	46%	30%	47%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	81%	86%	75%	87%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	4%	19%	19%	14%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	35%	50%	41%	49%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	23%	31%	16%	36%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Full Sutton 2016 E wing comparator

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

		E wing	Other main population wings (A, F & G)
	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		24	48
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	98%
1.3	Are you on recall?	4%	0%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	0%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	8%	4%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	6%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	41%	39%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	8%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	29%	36%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	12%	11%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	33%	31%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	57%	47%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	78%	67%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	68%	71%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	52%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	39%	35%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	53%	50%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	61%	71%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	47%	65%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	53%	49%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	Other main population wings (A, F & G)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	74%	83%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	39%	44%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	53%	31%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	8%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	22%	19%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	8%	17%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	13%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	0%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	39%	44%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	43%	52%
3.6	A shower?	26%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	8%	25%
3.6	Something to eat?	69%	56%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	22%	27%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	69%	46%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	36%	39%
3.7	Someone from health services?	28%	39%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	9%	19%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	23%	25%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	35%	44%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	4%	22%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	31%	31%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	22%	24%
3.8	Health services?	26%	29%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	Other main population wings (A, F & G)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.8	The chaplaincy?	22%	39%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	68%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	83%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	74%	83%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	22%	40%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	37%	50%
4.1	Get bail information?	0%	2%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	43%	55%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	35%	55%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	63%	89%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	100%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	79%	81%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	92%	89%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	59%	69%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	79%	71%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	39%	33%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	37%	56%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	61%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	33%	37%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	41%	48%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	67%	50%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	61%	54%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	71%	74%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	17%	19%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	20%	19%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	39%	51%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	60%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	8%	4%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	Other main population wings (A, F & G)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	59%	71%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	17%	35%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	12%	31%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	100%	96%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	55%	44%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	11%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	21%	19%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	8%	6%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	0%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	4%	9%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	12%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	8%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	4%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	57%	35%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	26%	15%

Key to tables

		E wing	Other main population wings (A, F & G)
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	19%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	26%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	26%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	45%	59%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	29%	17%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	39%	36%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	31%	32%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	4%	15%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	4%	11%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	18%	23%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	4%	13%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	0%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	0%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	22%	16%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	22%	6%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E wing	Other main population wings (A, F & G)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	28%	22%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	36%	31%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	88%	72%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	0%	9%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	39%	31%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	26%	26%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	22%	26%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	22%	40%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	61%	62%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	47%	48%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	92%	94%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	12%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	4%	22%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	55%	56%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	37%	45%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	12%	25%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	81%	89%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	20%	4%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	10%	9%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Full Sutton 2016 VP wing comparator

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	B, C & D wings	A, E, F & G wings
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned	102	72
SECTION 1: General information		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3 Are you sentenced?	100%	99%
1.3 Are you on recall?	0%	1%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	0%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	12%	6%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	7%	7%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	99%	100%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	99%	100%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	21%	40%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	4%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	11%	34%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	11%	0%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	35%	11%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	3%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	41%	32%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	24%	50%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	62%	70%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	69%	70%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	59%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	47%	37%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	72%	51%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction		
3.1 Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	63%	68%
3.2 When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	59%
3.3 Were you treated well/very well in reception?	65%	50%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B, C & D wings	A, E, F & G wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	70%	80%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	22%	42%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	5%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	0%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	26%	38%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	18%	10%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	17%	20%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	17%	14%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	22%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	16%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	25%	42%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	44%	49%
3.6	A shower?	31%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	10%	20%
3.6	Something to eat?	55%	61%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	22%	25%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	44%	54%
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	49%	39%
3.7	Someone from health services?	59%	36%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	22%	16%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	29%	24%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	45%	41%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	31%	16%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	35%	31%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	32%	23%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B, C & D wings	A, E, F & G wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
3.8	Health services?	40%	27%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	41%	33%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	70%	73%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	83%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	87%	80%
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?	55%	34%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	46%	46%
4.1	Get bail information?	8%	2%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	52%	52%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	71%	48%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	87%	81%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	100%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87%	80%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	94%	90%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	45%	65%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	60%	74%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	30%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	50%	50%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	69%	56%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	36%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	63%	46%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	65%	56%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	61%	57%
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	87%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	73%	73%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	29%	18%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	38%	20%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	45%	47%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	41%	57%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	6%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B, C & D wings	A, E, F & G wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	81%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	80%	67%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	47%	29%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	35%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	96%	97%
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	51%	47%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	12%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	40%	20%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	7%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	15%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	23%	7%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	12%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	13%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	9%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	17%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	3%
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	36%	42%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	19%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	1%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B, C & D wings	A, E, F & G wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	24%	19%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	7%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	8%	18%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	17%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	0%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	37%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	56%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	29%	21%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	71%	37%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	36%	32%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	15%	11%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	16%	9%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	33%	22%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	21%	10%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	0%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	0%
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	40%	18%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	31%	12%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	48%	24%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	37%	33%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	B, C & D wings	A, E, F & G wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	78%	77%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	14%	6%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	28%	33%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	18%	26%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	40%	24%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	46%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	28%	61%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	35%	48%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	83%	93%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	21%	11%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	37%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	38%	56%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	19%	42%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	14%	21%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	86%	87%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	9%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	14%	9%