

Report on an announced inspection of

HMP Winchester

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

11–15 July 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 good practice	55
Section 6. Appendices	61
Appendix I: Inspection team	61
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	63
Appendix III: Prison population profile	71
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	75

Glossary of terms

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

Introduction

Winchester prison has two main components: a traditional Victorian establishment and local prison holding up to 561 prisoners of varying age, category and status, and the smaller and adjacent West Hill site holding 129 sentenced category C prisoners. Winchester is a tough prison to run and a place that this inspectorate has been critical of in recent years. Following a particularly critical inspection in 2012 we returned just two years later, in 2014, because of our concerns. At that inspection we found a prison that had made slow and limited progress and a place that needed to refocus on the basics. We decided to return quickly again, announcing this inspection – as is our practice in these circumstances – six months before our arrival, in the hope that this might help to encourage improvement. Overall, during this inspection, we were pleased to find a prison that was doing much better, despite big challenges.

New prisoners were being treated reasonably well, although they were let down by some weak first night arrangements. Prisoner perceptions of their own safety were broadly in line with findings at comparable prisons and there were good initiatives to try to combat violence, although recorded levels had increased. Few incidents, however, were serious and violence on the West Hill site was low. Support for those at risk of self-harm was much weaker, and five prisoners had tragically taken their own lives since we last inspected, with a further self-inflicted death since this inspection. Addressing its failings in this respect should be a priority for the prison, as highlighted in one of our main recommendations. Security across the two sites was proportionate and the prison was doing some useful work to try to tackle the use of illicit drugs. There was emergent evidence to suggest the use of new psychoactive substances (NPS) may have reduced, with most positive drug tests indicating that cannabis was more prevalent.

Our other key concern in the area of safety was the appalling condition of the segregation unit, a basement facility we have described as bleak and oppressive. At our previous inspection we made a main recommendation that the segregation unit should be replaced with a modern, fit-for-purpose facility. While there was an emergent plan to relocate the unit, the recommendation had not been addressed so we have repeated it in this report.

At the time of the inspection Winchester had been operating a restricted daily routine for many months in the older part of the prison, mainly owing to problems with staffing levels and supervision. The situation was much better in West Hill. For a sizable minority this meant time out of cell could be as little as 45 minutes a day. This was a source of significant frustration for staff and prisoners, and was having a detrimental impact on almost all aspects of daily living in the prison, including access to work and learning, to basic amenities and to communication with family and other support networks. Addressing this issue is again a priority we have highlighted in our recommendations.

Environmentally there was a contrast between the mostly reasonable conditions in West Hill (although these had deteriorated since our last inspection) and some poor conditions in the main prison. The condition of cells needed improvement and overcrowding needed to be reduced. Access to certain basic kit and amenities also remained problematic. We were told that the response of the maintenance contractor to environmental and maintenance issues was often inadequate. Some improvements were starting to happen around the promotion of equality but these were embryonic and much more needed to be done. An important step forward was the clear evidence of improvement in staff culture, and on both sites most prisoners felt respected by staff. Our own observations supported this view, although staff appeared to us to be very stretched, which inevitably placed limits on the effectiveness of the support they could provide.

Across both sites we found the provision of work, learning and skills to be improved and it was now reasonably good. Education and work places were available for about 75% of the population but around 30% were unemployed. The quality of education and work on offer was generally good with a good focus on functional and employability skills and most engaged prisoners able to make progress.

Our colleagues in Ofsted judged that all of the learning and skills and work provision was 'good' against all their assessments, which was better than we normally see in local prisons.

Outcomes in resettlement were similarly reasonable across both sites. The lack of a useful analysis of need was an omission but we found much better offender management and supervision than we normally see with some good outcomes evident. Demand for resettlement services was high and our observations suggested earlier intervention may assist, but again across most resettlement pathways provision was good. An exception was accommodation, where recent changes to how outcomes were being recorded suggested there may be a significant shortfall to be addressed. The function of West Hill would also have benefited from greater clarity. It had no specific resettlement remit, although the prisoners in the unit had greater expectations of the support the unit ought to be able to offer them.

Winchester continues to make progress – some of it very significant – notably in activity and resettlement. Some big challenges to improve safety remain and the limited access to time out of cell was undermining much that the prison could offer. Improvements to the environment and access to the basics of daily living also remained priorities. The prison had a cohesive and decent management team and progress in staff culture was commendable. We hope this report and the recommendations it makes will help encourage and sustain the momentum we have seen.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

September 2016

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Winchester is a category B local male prison, with a separate category C unit known as West Hill. It also holds young adults and is designated as a resettlement prison.

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

Public

Region/Department

South West

Number held

624

Certified normal accommodation

Local prison wings: 361

West Hill site: 108

Total: 469

Operational capacity

Local prison wings: 561

West Hill site: 129

Total: 690

Date of last full inspection

17–21 February 2014

Brief history

HMP Winchester was built in 1846 and is a typical Victorian prison of radial design. A separate unit was built in 1963, which in became an adult male training unit in 2005. This West Hill site has two residential units, West Hill unit and the smaller, newer, Hearn unit.

Short description of residential units

On the local prison site:

A wing: remand and convicted prisoners; includes the induction and first night unit.

B wing: remand and convicted prisoners.

C wing: provides detoxification and the integrated dug treatment system for remand and convicted prisoners. It also provides induction and first night support for prisoners undergoing detoxification only.

D wing: remand and convicted vulnerable prisoners.

On the West Hill site:

West Hill and Herne unit are both used to accommodate category C and D prisoners.

Name of governor/director

David Rogers

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service provider

Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust

Learning and skills providers

Milton Keynes College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

John Tainton

Community rehabilitation company (CRC)

Catch 22 on behalf of 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
 - **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 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

S1 Reception processes were reasonable, with an appropriate focus on vulnerability, and peer supporters provided good support and advice. First night arrangements were weak and most prisoners were placed in grubby, ill-equipped cells, and many felt unsafe. Levels of violence had increased and were relatively high on the main site, although incidents were mostly low level. Violent incidents were rare at West Hill. Arrangements to manage violence and make the prison safer were good. Levels of self-harm on the main site were high and arrangements to support those at risk were not good enough. Drug availability was similar to that at other prisons and supply reduction arrangements were good. The number of adjudications and level of use of force were high. The segregation unit was bleak and oppressive. Substance misuse arrangements were good. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good on West Hill against this healthy prison test.**

S2 At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Winchester were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill against this healthy prison test. We made 27 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 14 of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and 11 had not been achieved.

S3 Most prisoners said that they were treated well by escort staff. However, many experienced unnecessary and long waits in court cells after their morning court appearance, not arriving at the prison until the evening, which limited first night support and risk assessment. Video-link was used well to reduce the number of escorts needed for court appearances.

S4 The reception area was busy, especially in the evenings, which meant that some prisoners waited there too long before being located to a wing. Improvements to the reception environment had been made but some facilities, including holding rooms, remained inadequate. Staff welcomed new arrivals, and all new prisoners had the opportunity to disclose concerns about vulnerability and self-harm. Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) provided valuable information about the prison but those arriving late did not have the chance to meet wing staff, settle in or receive additional support before being locked up for the night.

S5 Few new prisoners were located on the dedicated induction wing as spaces there were not managed effectively. Most were located wherever there were spaces available. Cells were ill-prepared and too many new prisoners did not have access to some basic items such as a kettle, television or pillow. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at other local prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had felt safe on their first night.

S6 Induction was fairly comprehensive. On the main site, Insiders provided a good level of information and were responsive to prisoners' needs. Induction for vulnerable prisoners was cancelled too often.

S7 On the main site, around a quarter of prisoners said that they currently felt unsafe, which was in line with the proportion at comparator prisons and at the time of the previous inspection. A smaller proportion of the prisoners on the West Hill site said that they felt unsafe, although they reported relatively high levels of victimisation from other prisoners. On the main site, recorded levels of bullying, assaults and fights had increased considerably

and were all higher than at similar prisons, although many were low level and few were serious. There were few violent incidents at West Hill. Good communication across the prison ensured effective identification of incidents. Measures to analyse, monitor and manage violence were good and action was taken to make the prison safer.

- S8 The level of self-harm had increased sharply and was now far higher than at other local prisons. Despite this, there was little analysis of data or trends to inform a local strategy. A new safer custody continuous improvement plan was in an early stage of development. There had been five self-inflicted deaths on the main site since the previous inspection but action taken to address Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations were not included or reviewed to ensure that they were embedded in practice.
- S9 Some complex prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide were managed well. However, in too many cases there were significant weaknesses in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management processes for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm – for example, actions not being completed before closure, poor care planning and a lack of multidisciplinary attendance at reviews.
- S10 Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) felt well supported but sometimes experienced a delay in being taken to those in crisis. Access to the Samaritans telephone was problematic as many of the handsets had been lost or broken.
- S11 Security arrangements across both sites, including visits restrictions and prisoner movement, were mostly proportionate. The prison was sighted on the major threats presented by drugs, mobile phones and violence. The high number of intelligence reports received was analysed quickly, with immediate actions identified to address emerging or apparent threats, although too few suspicion-led searches were completed on time. There was too little analysis of available data to identify trends and hotspots of illicit activity.
- S12 In our survey, similar numbers of prisoners on the main and West Hill sites to those at comparator prisons and at the time of the previous inspection said that illegal drugs were easily available, but more alcohol availability was reported, particularly on the West Hill site. The random mandatory drug testing positive rate over the previous six months had been relatively low but too few suspicion tests were completed. The prison had been testing for new psychoactive substances (NPS; 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) for five months, with only one positive test returned. Recent trends showed less NPS use, and prisoners mainly tested positive for cannabis. There was a detailed supply reduction action plan, which was updated regularly, and there was good information sharing between departments.
- S13 In our survey, prisoners were negative about the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme and we found that the shortage of televisions and restrictions in the regime had reduced the effectiveness of the scheme as there was little on offer to encourage improved behaviour.
- S14 The number of adjudications carried out was relatively high and had increased considerably. Some adjudications were low level and could have been managed more effectively using the IEP scheme.
- S15 The level of use of force had increased and was higher than in similar prisons. Use of force meetings analysed a wide range of data to identify trends but far too many dossiers were incomplete. Planned interventions were routinely video-recorded and the footage and

records we reviewed showed an appropriate focus on de-escalation of incidents. The special cell was rarely used and its governance was good.

- S16 The environment on the segregation unit was bleak and oppressive. There was no communal space and most cells were in poor condition, or damaged and out of use. The regime on the unit was poor and prisoners rarely came out of their cells, which potentially had a detrimental effect on prisoners' mental health. Segregation use was similar to that at comparator prisons, and most prisoners were held on the unit for short periods and returned to normal location.
- S17 Psychosocial support for prisoners with substance misuse issues was good and easily accessible to the whole population. A wide range of interventions had been introduced and prisoner engagement was high. Access to treatment was prompt, prescribing regimes were flexible and reviewed regularly, and prisoners were positive about the care they received. The levels of observation and monitoring had increased but not all prisoners were located appropriately on the treatment unit during stabilisation.

Respect

S18 *Living conditions on the main site were poor, with cramped cells, and broken furniture and windows. There was poor access to telephones, showers and sufficient clothing. Conditions at West Hill were better, but showers on both sites were dirty and poorly maintained. Prisoners had little confidence in the application and complaint systems. Staff–prisoner relationships had improved on the main site, and were good on both sites. Equality and diversity arrangements were weak and the needs of some prisoners with protected characteristics were not being met. Health services had improved and were good. The food provided was satisfactory. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill against this healthy prison test.***

S19 *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Winchester were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill against this healthy prison test. We made 31 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 12 of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and 16 had not been achieved.*

- S20 On the main site, some of the outside areas were littered with piles of rubbish thrown from cell windows. Most communal areas on the main site were reasonably clean, but many cells and showers were in a poor condition. Many cells were overcrowded, had broken windows, either lacked or had broken furniture, and had inadequately screened toilets. Prisoners struggled to get sufficient clothing, and laundry facilities were inadequate. Due to the limited time unlocked, access to showers and telephones was relatively poor.
- S21 On the West Hill site, external areas and gardens were pleasant and well maintained, but other areas had deteriorated. Communal areas were grimy, and showers and shared toilets were dirty and badly maintained. The cells on Hearn unit (one of the units on the West Hill site) were generally good.
- S22 Prisoners on both sites had little confidence in the application system and there was no quality assurance of replies. Consultation with prisoners did not take place regularly enough,

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.

- so issues raised by prisoners were not resolved promptly. Prisoner information desks, run by peer workers, were a useful initiative.
- S23 On both sites, most prisoners said that most staff were respectful. On the main site, relationships had improved and we observed a busy and stretched staff struggling to get things done. When staff had the time to engage, it was supportive and purposeful, and this was reflected in electronic case notes.
- S24 The strategic management of equality work had improved but not enough was done to ensure adequate provision. Equality action team meetings and action planning were better but did not engage sufficiently with all protected groups, and there was inconsistent provision of prisoner forums. Many discrimination incident report form responses were late. Some were poor and did not evidence an effective challenge of offensive behaviour. There had been some good initial analysis of data from the equality monitoring tool. However, adverse findings for black and minority ethnic and younger prisoners over two quarters had not yet been acted on effectively.
- S25 Around 15% of the population were from a black and minority ethnic background. Although some expressed dissatisfaction about their treatment during the inspection, our survey results for this group were generally positive against a broad range of questions.
- S26 There was insufficient support for foreign national prisoners and poor provision of professional telephone interpreting services, leaving some non-English-speaking prisoners feeling isolated.
- S27 There was no proactive wing care planning for prisoners with disabilities and there was evidence of some unmet need. An informal carer system left prisoners open to the risk of exploitation. The physical environment in the prison was unsuited to those with more severe mobility restrictions. There were insufficient dedicated activities for older prisoners, and provision for young adults was underdeveloped.
- S28 Faith provision was satisfactory. However, while there was some good pastoral care, there was insufficient input from the team for prisoners at risk of self-harm. There was a wide range of faith-based classes and groups, and good engagement with the prison's violence reduction work.
- S29 Prisoners had little confidence in the complaints system, and many responses were late and of inconsistent quality. There was little analysis of complaints data, so that systemic problems could be identified and addressed. There was insufficient legal services provision and little take-up of bail services.
- S30 Prisoners had mixed views about health provision but we found the quality of health services to be good overall. Partnership working and clinical governance were effective. There was an appropriate range of primary care services, with reasonable waiting times, although prisoners waited too long to see the optician and the podiatrist. The management of long-term conditions had improved, with an increase in the number of nurse-led clinics, regular reviews and a more systematic approach. Staff on the inpatient unit provided compassionate care for prisoners with complex health needs. There had been an increase in therapeutic activity on the unit, although the environment was poor. External hospital appointments were well managed but too many were rescheduled because of a lack of escort staff. The management of medicines was mostly good, with a robust approach to the prescribing and the reduction of tradable medicines. Some prisoners had experienced delays in receiving their medication. Medicine queues were not always supervised adequately.

- S31 Dental provision was satisfactory, although prisoners waited too long for an appointment. The integrated mental health provision was good, with improved access to psychological interventions and a range of therapeutic groups.
- S32 The quality of the food provided had improved, and was satisfactory, although most prisoners had to eat in their cells, often next to a toilet. The service of food was not always well supervised and some prisoners complained of favouritism.

Purposeful activity

S33 *On the main site, the amount of time out of cell was inadequate for most prisoners, having a detrimental impact on many areas of prison life, and was a source of considerable frustration. On the West Hill site, prisoners had far more freedom, and time unlocked. Across both sites, the management of learning and skills and work had improved and was good, with a suitable focus on functional and employability skills. At West Hill, prisoners attended a range of full-time work, but on the main site too many prisoners were unemployed. The quality of teaching and learning was good. Attendance and punctuality were good. Prisoners progressed well and achievements were mostly high. Library and PE facilities were good but there was inadequate access to PE on the main site. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill against this healthy prison test.***

S34 *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Winchester were not sufficiently good on either site against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and two had not been achieved.*

- S35 The amount of time out of cell was poor for most prisoners on the main site. A restricted regime had been running for many months leading up to the inspection. The few prisoners in full-time work had around eight hours unlocked each day, but part-time workers had around five hours and a significant minority of prisoners who were not in any activity had only 45 minutes a day out of their cell. At weekends, prisoners were regularly locked up for over 24 hours.
- S36 The regime varied from day to day, and changed during the day, depending on staffing levels, which was a source of frustration and confusion to prisoners and staff alike and had a detrimental impact on many aspects of prison life. Exercise times were short and held during association times. The regime on the West Hill site was much better; prisoners could leave their cells throughout the day, although they were often locked on their landing without full association.
- S37 The management of learning, skills and work had improved and was good. Managers used labour market intelligence well to identify and provide a wide range of relevant vocational training and work. Self-assessment and quality improvement planning ensured that the education curriculum was rightly focused on improving prisoners' English and mathematics skills.
- S38 Internal and external partnerships had developed successfully to provide good opportunities for prisoners to develop employability skills and opportunities for employment on release. Vocational training had improved for all except vulnerable prisoners. Some work areas failed to provide accredited qualifications.

- S39 On the main site, there were sufficient full- and part-time activity places for around 75% of the population, but around 30% were unemployed. At West Hill, there were sufficient places for all prisoners to work full time. Attendance was good across both sites.
- S40 Teaching, learning and assessment were good. Skilful and experienced tutors and trainers ensured that most learners made good progress and succeeded. Staff supported prisoners with additional learning needs well, and prisoners acting as peer mentors supported tutors and trainers well.
- S41 Attendance and punctuality were good in most work areas and on education and training programmes. Prisoners were enthusiastic, displayed a good attitude to learning and behaved respectfully.
- S42 Success rates on most programmes were high. Prisoners made good progress from their starting points to higher-level learning, but further improvement was needed on functional skills English level 1. Standards of prisoners' work were good, particularly in the vocational training areas.
- S43 On the main site, prisoners in our survey reported improved access to the library, although the prison's own data on usage were inadequate. The library offered good facilities and a wide range of books but no computer facilities for independent study. Staff actively engaged and involved prisoners in a range of initiatives that promoted literacy effectively but there was limited support for prisoners unable to read and write.
- S44 There was sufficient high-quality PE equipment on both sites, and those at West Hill were able to use the outdoor pitch on the main site. On the main site, prisoners could access PE only once a week, but access at West Hill was reasonably good. Accredited PE qualifications were available.

Resettlement

S45 *Offender management arrangements were reasonably good. Prisoners had adequate contact with offender supervisors, and the offender assessment system (OASys) backlog was relatively small. The quality of OASys assessments and risk management plans was good and sentence plans were reasonable. Too many home detention curfew and recategorisation reviews were late. Public protection arrangements were satisfactory. Resettlement assessments were good. Most resettlement pathway provision was good, and work with children and families was excellent, but far too many prisoners were released without accommodation. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good across both sites against this healthy prison test.***

S46 *At the last inspection in 2014 we found that outcomes for prisoners in HMP Winchester were not sufficiently good on either site against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved, three had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

S47 The reducing reoffending strategy was not informed by a comprehensive needs analysis and did not identify the specific needs of the varied population. The purpose of the West Hill unit was confused and did not appear to be driven by progression and resettlement. Release on temporary licence was not used to support resettlement.

- S48 Offender management was reasonably good. Offender supervisor contact was adequate and in most cases offender supervisors encouraged and supported prisoners to achieve their sentence plan targets. The backlog of offender assessment system (OASys) assessments had been greatly reduced since the previous inspection, and was relatively small. These assessments were consistently good. Most sentence plans were reasonable, although some objectives were not specific enough and lacked sequencing. Risk management plans were generally good and based on a sound analysis. Home detention curfew boards drew on a wide range of information but prisoners were often released late.
- S49 Public protection arrangements were satisfactory. Initial screening processes were reasonable, monitoring was generally proportionate and reviews were timely. The interdepartmental risk management team meeting was effective and multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were adequate.
- S50 Some recategorisation reviews were not sufficiently timely and there was no routine input from external offender managers in the decision to recategorise prisoners to category D, which was inappropriate.
- S51 The demand for resettlement services was high, with around 30 prisoners released each week. Prisoners' immediate resettlement needs were identified and addressed on arrival and subsequent resettlement plans were good. Planning immediately before release was not as effective, as the community rehabilitation company (CRC) reviewed many prisoners too late to allow issues to be addressed.
- S52 The CRC had links with a wide range of accommodation providers across the private and public sectors but too many prisoners (around 30%) were released homeless. Prisoners had adequate help in finding employment, training and education on release. Skills action plans developed on induction were reasonable. However, there was limited access to job search resources and the number of prisoners released into employment or training on release was not monitored.
- S53 Health discharge arrangements, including those for prisoners with enduring mental health problems, were good. There were effective palliative and end-of-life arrangements. Prisoners with substance misuse issues were consistently provided with harm reduction information, and there were strong links with community agencies, which included 'through-the-gate' support.
- S54 A wide range of help was available to assist prisoners with basic finance and debt issues, alongside more complex debt management. Prisoners could open bank accounts before release.
- S55 Although many visitors complained of problems in booking visits by telephone, in other respects visits were managed efficiently. The visits hall lacked natural light and the fixed furniture was unwelcoming, but crèche facilities were good. Family engagement work, led by Spurgeons, was excellent and better than we normally see. There was a wide range of courses and family days, which were held regularly and met demand.
- S56 There had been no needs analysis to determine the need for offending behaviour programmes and only the Sycamore Tree restorative justice programme was available. Offender supervisors delivered some innovative one-to-one work to try to address this gap.
- S57 Support for military veterans in custody was extremely good.

Main concerns and recommendations

S58 Concern: First night arrangements were weak and most prisoners were placed in grubby, ill-equipped cells, and many felt unsafe.

Recommendation: All new prisoners should receive comprehensive first night support, including a thorough assessment of how they are feeling and their risk of self-harm; access to a well-prepared cell; provision of all basic items; and regular checks by staff during their first few nights.

S59 Concern: There had been five self-inflicted deaths in custody since the previous inspection and the number of self-harm incidents had increased and was high. Despite this, there was little analysis of data or trends to inform a local strategy. Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations were not monitored or embedded and the quality of ACCT documentation was too often poor.

Recommendation: A robust local strategy to reduce the levels of suicide and self-harm should be introduced.

S60 Concern: The segregation unit environment was poor, with no natural light and no communal space, and this had a negative effect on relationships between prisoners and staff on the unit, and on prisoners' mental health.

Recommendation: The segregation unit should be replaced with a modern, fit-for-purpose facility. (Repeated recommendation S50)

S61 Concern: There was insufficient awareness and management of the needs of prisoners with protected characteristics, and the basic social care needs of some prisoners had not been met.

Recommendation: Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (Repeated recommendation S52)

S62 Concern: A restricted regime had been running for many months. This limited the amount of time out of cell on the main site. Most prisoners who were in part-time work had about five hours unlocked, but a significant minority had only 45 minutes a day. All prisoners on the main site were regularly locked up for over 24 hours over the weekend.

Recommendation: An unrestricted core day which allows prisoners to have 10 hours out of their cells should be published and followed.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 As the establishment received prisoners directly from courts across a large geographical area, some prisoners had long journeys to the prison. Video-link was well used, which reduced the number of escorts needed for court appearances.
- I.2 Many prisoners experienced unnecessary and long waits in court cells after their morning court appearance before travelling to the prison. For example, in one case during the inspection, the court appearance concluded at 10.45am but the prisoner did not arrive at the prison until after 5pm.
- I.3 The vans we inspected were fairly clean and most prisoners said that they had been treated respectfully by escort staff. They were no longer handcuffed during disembarkation.
- I.4 There was a new format for the person escort record (PER); this included a clear focus on the risk of self-harm. Information contained in the PER was used appropriately by reception staff.

Recommendation

- I.5 **Prisoners should not remain in court cells for long periods waiting for transfer to prison.** (Repeated recommendation I.5)

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.6 The reception area was open throughout the day, and often late into the night, to manage the large number of prisoners arriving and leaving each day. Although there had been some improvements to reception processes, too many prisoners experienced long stays in reception, particularly in the evenings when reception was at its busiest. In our survey, only 34% of respondents said that they had been in reception for less than two hours. Almost all prisoners were strip-searched routinely in reception.
- I.7 Reception staff were respectful and welcoming. Some improvements had been made to the conditions in reception, and further work was planned. However, some of the facilities, including bare holding rooms, were inadequate; the room used to hold vulnerable prisoners before searching them was particularly oppressive. We were told that some prisoners had been carried up the stairs to the reception area because of the lack of disabled access (see also paragraph 2.25 and main recommendation S61). The shower in reception lacked privacy and was not used often.

- I.8** Reception processes were comprehensive and included checks on vulnerability and the risk of self-harm. However, some of these interviews were rushed and too focused on completion of the cell sharing risk assessment, rather than exploring prisoners' history and risks of self-harm.
- I.9** Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) were available in reception when needed, and a quiet room had been developed for them to work in. Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) provided valuable information about the prison.
- I.10** All new arrivals should have gone to the designated induction unit on A wing but spaces there were not managed effectively, and the unit was being used to hold prisoners at risk on other wings and some who refused to move on. As a result, new prisoners were located wherever there were spaces available.
- I.11** First night support for many new prisoners was further limited by their late arrival from court (see paragraph I.2), which meant that they did not have the opportunity to meet wing staff, settle in or receive additional support before being locked up for their first night. Not all night staff undertook checks on new arrivals. In our survey, fewer prisoners than at other local prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had felt safe on their first night (60% versus 70% and 74%, respectively).
- I.12** New prisoners were often located in poorly prepared cells and too many did not have access to basic items, such as a kettle, television or pillow. It took some prisoners over a week to obtain these items, and some told us that they had bought them from other prisoners, which added to debt problems for some.
- I.13** The induction programme was fairly comprehensive. On the main site, Insiders provided a good level of information clearly and were responsive to prisoners' needs. However, sessions were often interrupted by offender management unit (OMU) staff seeking to complete a basic custody screening tool assessment with individuals. Further and appropriate induction information was given following a move to the West Hill site. In our survey, fewer prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wing (D wing) than on the other wings had completed induction and we found that many of the weekly sessions on this wing had been cancelled.

Recommendation

- I.14 Induction sessions on the main site should not be interrupted, and sessions to vulnerable prisoners should be delivered as planned.**

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.15** In our survey, more prisoners on both the main and West Hill sites than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had felt unsafe at the establishment at some time. On the main site, around a quarter of prisoners said that they currently felt unsafe, which was in line with the proportion at comparator prisons and at the time of the previous inspection. A smaller proportion at West Hill said that they currently

felt unsafe, and, again, this was similar to the comparator and to the figure at the time of the previous inspection.

- I.16 More prisoners on the West Hill site than at other category C prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had been victimised by other prisoners (43% versus 27% and 22%, respectively), citing being new to Winchester, from a different part of the country, debts, medications or gang issues as the main reasons.
- I.17 The prison had implemented a range of measures to identify, record and address violence. Recorded levels of bullying, assaults and fights on the main site had increased considerably and were all higher than at similar prisons. There were few violent incidents at West Hill. There was good analysis of data, and this demonstrated that most incidents involved low-level violence or name calling and that few were serious. A monthly meeting reviewed the wide range of information and data collated each week in order to identify strategic objectives to make the prison safer.
- I.18 The zero-tolerance policy was well publicised, with notices across the prison and a monthly prisoner newsletter outlining the benefits of good behaviour, as well as the results of poor behaviour. Prisoner violence reduction representatives had been recruited to provide the first point of support and contact for prisoners but they had yet to be trained and most were unclear of what their role included.
- I.19 Good links across the prison ensured effective identification of incidents. Responses to violence were good and included close monitoring under the prison's violence management procedure, where individualised targets and restrictions were imposed.
- I.20 Support for victims was available and included one-to-one support, enhanced observations, mediation and, in extreme cases, relocation to the vulnerable prisoner wing. Most victims declined any direct support. In these cases, details of incidents were annotated on electronic case notes to alert wing and other staff of potential issues. Additionally, the managing chaplain visited each identified victim to offer further support informally.
- I.21 A weekly violence reduction meeting, chaired by the governor, reviewed all incidences of violence, damage and abuse. Immediate actions were identified, such as allocating body-worn cameras to prison officers working in specific hotspots, the relocation of specific prisoners, reviews of incentives and earned privileges (IEP) status, information sharing with the OMU, referral to the mental health in-reach team and also the reallocation of wing staff.
- I.22 Vulnerable prisoners told us that they felt safe on D wing and that almost all staff treated them respectfully. There was good awareness of the potential vulnerability of young prisoners on D wing, and there were clear guidelines on, and expectations about, their behaviour and interactions with other prisoners, although this was not included in the vulnerable prisoner policy.

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.23 There had been 209 recorded incidents of self-harm in the previous six months, which was far higher than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection.

- I.24** A monthly safer custody meeting was held but attendance was often poor. Some basic data were collected but little analysis was undertaken and there was no local strategy to manage self-harm or address the issues leading to periods of crisis (see main recommendation S59).
- I.25** There had been 14 deaths in custody since the previous inspection, including five self-inflicted deaths – all on the main site. Insufficient attention was given to ensuring that action taken as a result of the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) recommendations was embedded in practice. Although there was a health care improvement plan based on lessons learnt from the deaths in custody (see paragraph 2.53), there was no plan for the prison as a whole and we found that some of the PPO concerns had not been fully addressed (see main recommendation S59).
- I.26** A weekly review meeting was held to provide updates on prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents, and we found that some complex prisoners at risk of self-harm or suicide were managed well. However, overall, the quality of ACCT documentation was poor (see main recommendation S59) and some processes were weak. For example, actions were not always completed before closure of the ACCT, care planning was poor and there was a lack of multidisciplinary attendance at reviews. Mental health staff were not always consulted about progress made before closing the ACCT (see also paragraph 2.87) and there was too little evidence in records to show that staff had meaningful interactions with those on ACCTs.
- I.27** We were concerned that the lack of time out of cell (see section on time out of cell and main recommendation S62), at just 45 minutes a day for some prisoners, was having a detrimental effect on those in crisis, making it difficult for staff to involve them in meaningful and constructive activity or have regular interactions.
- I.28** Listeners felt well supported but told us that they sometimes experienced a delay in being taken to those in crisis. Access to the Samaritans telephone was problematic as many of the handsets had been lost or broken. The two Listener suites were well maintained by wing cleaners and staff but were bare and unwelcoming.

Recommendation

- I.29 Samaritans telephones should be easily accessible and in working order.**

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.30** The governor attended the local safeguarding adults board, which had provided guidance to the prison, including seconding a member of staff to the prison in 2015 to develop the current policy. This had included provision of a training programme to improve managers' awareness. The policy included a section on reporting concerns about potential abuse to the local authority safeguarding teams.

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

- I.31** The policy was not well publicised across the prison and there was limited awareness among wing officers. This was better among health services staff, and there was a clear process to address social care needs (see paragraph 2.58).

Recommendation

- I.32** **Wing officers should be more aware of the procedure for reporting suspicions of abuse to the local authority safeguarding teams.**

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.33** Security arrangements across both sites, including prisoner movement, were mostly proportionate and were focused on meeting the threats posed by drugs, mobile phone activity and violence. Our previous concerns about the inappropriate use of handcuffs and the unjustified imposition of closed visits had been addressed. However, the unnecessary strip-searching of all prisoners arriving from other prisons, and the lack of action to remove the many lines strung between cell windows to convey contraband, were a concern.
- I.34** The security department received approximately 500 intelligence reports (IRs) each month, which was high. These were analysed quickly to inform responses to emerging threats, although the response to requested searches and drug tests was inadequate; less than 50% of each were completed and there was little analysis of outcomes to assess the validity of intelligence.
- I.35** The monthly security meeting was well attended and considered a range of headline data. However, there was no wider examination of data to identify trends and hotspots of illicit activity across the prison, and no monitoring of the origin of IRs to ensure prison-wide involvement in security issues. Monthly security objectives were drawn up, communicated to all staff and reviewed regularly.
- I.36** With the exception of the monthly safer custody meeting, the security department was well represented at a wide range of meetings across the prison, to promote effective information sharing. There were good links to the local police, and the two onsite police liaison officers were well integrated into the security department, providing excellent two-way information sharing with local crime prevention teams.
- I.37** In our survey, on both sites, 40% of prisoners, which was a similar proportion to those at comparator prisons and at the time of the previous inspection, said that illegal drugs were easily available, but on the West Hill site more than elsewhere and than at the time of the previous inspection said that alcohol was easily available (41% versus 24% and 21%, respectively).
- I.38** The random mandatory drug testing positive rate was relatively low, averaging 6.1% in the previous six months. Finds and intelligence reports indicated that the use of new psychoactive substances (NPS; 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), and in particular 'spice', had been problematic earlier in the year.

The prison had started testing for NPS in February 2016, but only one positive result had been recorded so far, with most prisoners tested found positive for cannabis. .

- I.39** There was a proactive and integrated approach to drug supply reduction, with good information sharing between the security department and health and substance misuse services. The prison had developed a detailed action plan which covered measures to disrupt supply and initiatives to raise prisoner and staff awareness, and this was reviewed and updated regularly. Recent trends suggested a drop in the availability of NPS.

Recommendations

- I.40 Prisoners should only be subject to a strip-search when justified by an individual risk assessment.** (Repeated recommendation I.16)
- I.41 Suspicion-based searches and drug tests should be carried out as required and the outcomes monitored.**

Incentives and earned privileges⁴

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.42** At the time of the inspection, 64% of prisoners were on the standard level, 30% were on the enhanced level and 6% were on basic. In our survey, prisoners on both sites were negative about the fairness of the scheme, although their responses were similar to those at other prisons and at the time of the previous inspection. Only 35% on the main site and 48% of those in West Hill said that the different levels had encouraged them to improve their behaviour.
- I.43** In the previous six months, there had been a severe shortage of televisions, and this and restrictions in the regime (see section on time out of cell and main recommendation S62) had reduced the effectiveness of the IEP scheme as there was little on offer to encourage improved behaviour.

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.

Disciplinary procedures

- I.44** A total of 1,108 adjudications had been recorded in the previous six months, which was relatively high and had increased considerably since the previous inspection. The most

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

common offences were possession of an unauthorised article, and threatening and abusive behaviour. There had been some adjudications for minor infringements which could have been managed more effectively using the IEP scheme.

Recommendation

- I.45 The adjudication process should not be used for minor infringements which would be better dealt with using the incentives and earned privileges scheme.**

The use of force

- I.46** In the previous six months, force had been used 160 times, which was higher than elsewhere and than at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.47** Recording of use of force had moved to a completely electronic system but far too many dossiers were incomplete, with many officer and health care reports missing.
- I.48** The quarterly use of force meetings analysed a wide range of data to identify trends and also reviewed a small number of incidents. Planned interventions were routinely video-recorded, and the footage and records we reviewed showed an appropriate focus on de-escalation of incidents.
- I.49** Use of the special cell had reduced considerably and was now rare. Records of its use were comprehensive and demonstrated appropriate authority and oversight. There was a good level of monitoring and effective de-escalation, leading to prisoners being removed from special accommodation at the earliest opportunity.

Recommendation

- I.50 Managerial oversight should ensure that all use of force dossiers are completed to a satisfactory standard, including the full completion of injury to prisoner forms.**

Segregation

- I.51** The environment on the segregation unit, which was on the main site, was bleak and oppressive, partly because of its location in the basement, with very limited natural light. There was no communal space and cells were dirty and poorly furnished, and some in-cell toilets were filthy. During the inspection, four of the seven cells were out of use due to extensive damage by prisoners. There were broken observation panels on most cell doors and there had been unacceptable delays in repairing these and the other damage (see main recommendation S60).
- I.52** The daily regime on the unit was poor, and included a telephone call, a shower, access to a stock of library books and a 30-minute period of solitary exercise. The cage-like exercise yard was dirty and grim. There was no servery on the unit, so prisoners had meals served at their cell doors. This very limited time out of cell, combined with such an oppressive environment, had a detrimental impact on prisoners' well-being.
- I.53** Use of segregation was similar to that at other local prisons. Most prisoners were not held on the unit for long periods; in the previous six months, the average stay had been 5.7 days,

with only two prisoners staying for longer than 28 days, and there had been reasonable justification in both cases. Most prisoners were returned to normal location. Most segregation reviews were timely and multidisciplinary, but there was no evidence of any formal reintegration plans.

- I.54** The number of prisoners on ACCTs who had been held on the unit had increased, with 19 such prisoners held there in the previous six months. However, justification for these cases had been appropriate, and the exceptional circumstances overseen and approved by a governor.
- I.55** Segregation management meetings, chaired by the governor, took place bimonthly, were usually well attended and provided good analysis of data.

Recommendation

- I.56** **Prisoners in the segregation unit should have access to a significantly improved regime.** (Repeated recommendation I.78)

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.57** The drug and alcohol strategy was well managed. A multi-agency committee met regularly to monitor and develop services, with a good level of partnership working within the prison.
- I.58** Phoenix Futures provided psychosocial support. Services were easily accessible to prisoners, with weekly drop-in sessions on all wings. Prisoners' contact with their key worker had become more regular and there was evidence of high-quality one-to-one work.
- I.59** The team delivered, and continued to develop, an impressive array of interventions, ranging from harm reduction to recovery-focused work, and prisoner engagement was high. Some modules were co-facilitated by other services, such as the mental health team.
- I.60** The peer support scheme had been extended to cover the West Hill site and the vulnerable prisoner unit. All prisoners could attend Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous meetings, as well as self-management and recovery training (SMART) groups, and service user consultation took place regularly.
- I.61** Drug- and alcohol-dependent prisoners were seen by a substance misuse nurse in reception, and treatment started promptly. Twenty-four-hour observation and monitoring of prisoners during their initial five days at the establishment had improved but an average of only 50% of those undergoing stabilisation/detoxification were located on the prison's designated stabilisation unit, which limited their access to any additional support.
- I.62** In the previous six months, 125 prisoners had required alcohol detoxification, and at the time of the inspection 84 were receiving opiate substitute treatment, with eight stabilising, 45 maintained and 31 reducing. Controlled drug administration on both sites was safe and appropriately private.
- I.63** Daily clinical meetings facilitated information sharing, and we saw good integrated working between the clinical and psychosocial services. Treatment regimes were flexible and based

on individual need, and joint reviews took place regularly. Prisoners spoke highly of the care and support they received.

- I.64** The substance misuse consultant also treated dual diagnosis patients (those with co-existing mental health and substance misuse problems) and their care was discussed and coordinated at weekly mental health team meetings. Good links with the primary health team helped to reduce the risk of prisoners diverting medication.

Recommendation

- I.65** **Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission.** (Repeated recommendation I.88)

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** On the main site, some external areas were littered with piles of rubbish thrown from cell windows. Most internal communal areas on the main site were reasonably clean, but the condition of many cells and some showers was poor. Much of this was due to the poor performance of the national facilities management contract. At the beginning of the inspection, 44 cell door observation panels on this site were damaged or missing. Many in-cell windows had been broken by prisoners because of insufficient ventilation. Thirty-two cells were out of use due to damage by water from leaking showers. A third of cells on this site were overcrowded, with insufficient or broken furniture, and many in-cell toilets were inadequately screened. In our survey, fewer prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons said that they were normally offered enough suitable clothing or clean bed linen each week. There was a shortage of prison-issue underwear and socks across both sites. The laundry facilities on the main site were poor; for example, washing machines on C wing were broken and there were no laundry facilities available on A, B or D wing. Some prisoners washed clothes in their cells.
- 2.2** The restricted prison regime on the main site (see section on time out of cell and main recommendation S62) had a significant impact on the amount of time that prisoners had to carry out their daily domestic tasks. Access to showers and telephones was particularly affected. For example, in our survey, far fewer prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they were able to have a shower each day (55% versus 74% and 84%, respectively).
- 2.3** On the West Hill site, external areas and gardens were pleasant and well maintained. The living conditions on the West Hill site were better than on the main site but had deteriorated, and the prison routinely struggled to get repairs completed owing to failings in the facilities management contract. Communal areas were grimy and facilities were inadequately maintained. Stairwells were grubby and some of the shared toilets on Alfred and Temple units were dirty and leaking. The showers on Alfred unit were filthy and on Temple unit there was a problem with blocked drains. Ventilation on the upper floors of the West Hill site was poor. Conditions on Hearn unit (one of the units on the West Hill site) were generally good, and prisoners valued the single-cell accommodation there.
- 2.4** The prisoner information desks (PIDs), run by peer workers, were a useful initiative, valued by many prisoners. PID workers provided a range of information and forms, including application forms, to other prisoners. However, access to PID workers and the information they held was limited by the restricted time out of cell for prisoners on the main site (see above). Prisoners on both sites had little confidence in the application system. Although applications were tracked to monitor response times, there was no quality assurance to ensure that issues were addressed appropriately and respectfully.
- 2.5** In the previous six months, consultation meetings with prisoners about their living conditions and facilities had been introduced. This was a good initiative but meetings had not taken place often enough, so issues raised by prisoners were not resolved promptly.

Recommendations

- 2.6 Prisoners should have access to sufficient and suitable clean clothing.**
- 2.7 Living conditions on the both sites should be improved. Cells, toilets and showers should be properly maintained.**
- 2.8 Prisoners' confidence in the application system should be improved and a quality assurance system should be introduced to ensure that issues are addressed appropriately and respectfully.**
- 2.9 Consultation with prisoners should be undertaken regularly.**

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.

- 2.10** In our survey, most prisoners, on both sites, said that most staff treated them respectfully, and on the main site relationships with staff had improved. More prisoners on the main site than in other local prisons said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem.
- 2.11** During the inspection, we saw many staff engaging positively with prisoners. Even though relationships had improved, the restricted regime on the main site was having an impact on the development of staff-prisoner relationships, limiting the amount of time that staff had to build rapport with prisoners and check on their wellbeing (see sections on time out of cell, and self-harm and suicide prevention, and main recommendation S62). It was sometimes a challenge for them to deal with even simple requests from prisoners during the busy domestic periods, and we observed busy and stretched staff struggling to get things done. When staff did have the time to engage, it was supportive and purposeful, and this was reflected in electronic case notes.

Equality and diversity

Expected outcomes:

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

Strategic management

- 2.12** The strategic management of equality work had improved. Equality action team meetings and action planning were better, but not enough was done to ensure adequate delivery of this

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

agenda. There was a good equality policy and a monthly equality action team meeting, chaired by the governor. Most meetings were attended by prisoner equality representatives but they were poorly attended by some key staff. Management champions had recently been appointed for each protected group. The equality action plan contained few future actions. There was little coverage in the plan for some groups, such as gay and younger prisoners (see main recommendation S61).

- 2.13** The equality officer had not been trained for the role, although the 10 prisoner equality representatives had, and those we spoke to felt well supported. Staff undertook a Civil Service e-learning equality training course but this was too basic to equip them to deal with the complex issues they could encounter.
- 2.14** There was inconsistent provision of prisoner forums for those from protected groups (see main recommendation S61). There were few links with outside agencies that could provide support for those from minority groups.
- 2.15** There had been some good initial analysis of data from the equality monitoring tool (EMT). However, adverse findings for black and minority ethnic and younger prisoners had not been acted on effectively (see below, and main recommendation S61).
- 2.16** A total of 53 discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) had been submitted in the previous six months. There was no external quality assurance of DIRFs, and the internal assurance was failing to address weaknesses in the process. Responses were not sufficiently timely and their quality was mixed, with some showing insufficient challenge of offensive behaviour.
- 2.17** Processes to identify current and new prisoners in protected groups were inadequate. New prisoners completed an equality questionnaire but this was administered by an induction orderly, which could have discouraged disclosure of sensitive issues.

Recommendations

- 2.18** **Monitoring data for all protected characteristics should be comprehensively compiled and analysed, and action should be taken to investigate all anomalies.** (Repeated recommendation 2.24).
- 2.19** **There should be appropriate oversight of the discrimination incident report form process to assure an effective response to discriminatory treatment and offensive behaviour.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.20** Around 15% of the population was from a black and minority ethnic background. There was a forum for black and mixed race, but not Asian, prisoners. Data from the EMT showed disproportionate treatment of black prisoners in relation to the adjudication process and the incentives and earned privileges scheme over the previous two quarters, and these data had not been acted on effectively (see main recommendation S61). Although some black and minority ethnic prisoners expressed dissatisfaction about their treatment during the inspection, our survey results for this group were generally positive across a broad range of questions.
- 2.21** Although our survey suggested a substantial population of about 60 Gypsy/Roma/Traveller prisoners, the prison was aware of only 18. There had been only one forum for this group in

the previous six months, and no engagement with outside support groups (see main recommendation S61).

- 2.22** At the time of the inspection, there were 49 foreign national prisoners, four of whom were being held under immigration powers. There had only been one forum for this group in previous six months (see main recommendation S61). These prisoners complained about the poor use of professional telephone interpreting services, leaving some of them feeling isolated, and we saw prisoners being used as interpreters in confidential interviews, such as those in reception.
- 2.23** Home Office immigration staff attended the prison fortnightly but access to independent legal representation was poor. No independent support groups visited the prison. There was a useful file of information for immigration detainees in the library, including Bail for Immigration Detainees fact sheets, although this information was available only in English. Immigration detainees were often only told that they were going to be detained shortly before the end of their sentence, and in a recent case on the day they were due to be released.
- 2.24** In our survey, prisoners with disabilities, particularly on the main site, reported more negatively than others across a number of areas, including safety and victimisation by other prisoners. Care for prisoners under the Care Act 2014 was effective (see paragraph 2.58). There was some good group-work for these and other prisoners accommodated in the health centre, such as mobility and stability classes, but these were not available elsewhere in the prison. Not all prisoners had care plans. There was an informal carer scheme but we were not assured that there was sufficient oversight of the scheme to prevent exploitation. Not all prisoners who needed one had a personal emergency evacuation plan. Wing staff were aware of obvious disabilities but less so about others, such as partial deafness or memory loss. We saw little evidence of proactive support for prisoners with disabilities. Some had been given disability aids but others had not. A number of cells lacked grab rails and toilet seats.
- 2.25** The prison's Victorian design made it particularly unsuited to prisoners with more severe mobility restrictions, with the education block and gym inaccessible to some. Two prisoners using a wheelchair, who were located on the vulnerable prisoner wing, could not go outside for fresh air owing to the lack of access, and the prison's reception area did not have disabled access, which meant that some prisoners had to be carried up the stairs (see main recommendation S61).
- 2.26** Older prisoners (aged 50 and over) made up 14% of the population, and there were 15 prisoners over the age of 69. Although older prisoners were generally more positive than others in our survey, provision for this group was limited.
- 2.27** There were 42 prisoners under the age of 21. There was a policy for younger prisoners but it had yet to be implemented, and provision was limited. No action had been taken in response to adverse data for this group from the EMT, and there had been only one consultation forum for them (see main recommendation S61).
- 2.28** There had been one forum in the previous six months for gay prisoners but little other dedicated provision. Arrangements for the care of transgender prisoners were good.

Recommendations

- 2.29** Appropriate use should be made of professional telephone interpreting services, and this should be monitored, to ensure that the needs of non-English-speaking prisoners are met and that none become isolated.
- 2.30** Prisoners with disabilities who need one should have a wing care plan and an appropriately supervised paid carer.

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.

- 2.31** Faith provision was satisfactory. The chaplaincy covered all the main religions and there was a wide range of faith-based groups and classes.
- 2.32** Although, in our survey, prisoners on the West Hill site were more negative about faith issues than those on the main site, we found no evidence that provision there was worse. Vulnerable prisoners were able to attend corporate worship with others, and their attendance was good.
- 2.33** The chapel, which was also used for Friday prayers, was pleasant but the multi-faith room was small and lacked natural light.
- 2.34** The team liaised well with the catering department about arrangements for the celebration of religious festivals, and prisoners commented favourably on those for Ramadan.
- 2.35** Prisoners we spoke to were positive about the support they received from the chaplaincy and described some good pastoral care. However, the team visited only about half of prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for those at risk of suicide or self-harm each week and there was little evidence of them attending ACCT reviews in the cases we sampled.
- 2.36** There was some good work on victim awareness. The team facilitated the Sycamore Tree course and the managing chaplain had been trained to undertake restorative justice interventions. There was some good engagement with the prison's violence reduction work.
- 2.37** There were good links with community faith groups for the main Christian religions but less so for other faiths. Some prisoners had been linked with community faith groups on release. However, the team saw less than half of prisoners due for release.

Recommendation

- 2.38** Chaplaincy staff should visit prisoners at risk of self-harm regularly, attend assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews and see all prisoners before release.

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.

- 2.39** In our survey, only 24% of prisoners on the main site and 13% on West Hill said that complaints were dealt with fairly, the latter being far worse than at comparator establishments. Even fewer on each site said that they were dealt with quickly (15% and 8%, respectively, both of which were lower than elsewhere).
- 2.40** A total of 609 complaints had been submitted in the previous six months, which was relatively few. The complaints log showed that 17% had been responded to late. There was little analysis of complaints data, so that systemic problems could be identified and addressed.
- 2.41** The quality of the responses we sampled was mixed. A few were detailed, helpful and respectful but too many were terse and often offered no apology when one was due.
- 2.42** Most complaints were about low-level issues, and evidenced the frustration that some prisoners were experiencing in getting things done.

Recommendation

- 2.43** **Any identified trends in complaints should be investigated. Information about upheld complaints should be included in the analysis.** (Repeated recommendation 2.44)

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.

- 2.44** There were no trained legal services staff to help prisoners with legal matters. In our survey, only 12% of prisoners on the main site and 6% on the West Hill site said that it was easy or very easy to get bail information. Offender supervisors provided a bail service to remand prisoners but take-up was low, with only eight cases being dealt with in the previous three months.
- 2.45** There were reasonable facilities for legal visits and good video-conferencing facilities, including a court video-link.
- 2.46** Staff were familiar with the correct procedure for handling Rule 39 mail (legal and confidential access correspondence). However, records of why letters were opened in error were frequently unclear.

Recommendation

- 2.47** Bail services for remand prisoners should be publicised and their effectiveness should be monitored.

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.

- 2.48** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁶ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies.

Governance arrangements

- 2.49** The CQC found no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- 2.50** Health services were commissioned by NHS England and had been provided by Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust (CNWL) since October 2014. Working relationships between the commissioner, prison and provider were good, with well-attended clinical governance and partnership board meetings, which covered essential areas. A new health and social needs assessment was under way at the time of the inspection.
- 2.51** Health services were provided throughout the day and night, with two qualified nurses available during the night. During the day, services were provided by a primary care team, a mental health team and an integrated substance misuse service. Experienced clinical managers were working hard to drive effective service delivery and improvement.
- 2.52** There were staff vacancies but the previous chronic staffing shortages had improved, with the use of regular agency staff and an ongoing recruitment campaign. Health services staff told us that they felt supported, with regular managerial and clinical supervision. Mandatory training was well managed and there was good access to professional development opportunities.
- 2.53** Effective overview of incidents, serious incidents and death-in-custody actions plans informed service delivery, and lessons learnt from these were shared with staff. There was a well-advertised confidential health care complaints system. The responses we sampled were timely, respectful and addressed the issues raised.
- 2.54** Health consultations and clinical care took place in the health centre and on the wings. Not all clinical rooms were compliant with infection control requirements, with damaged or inappropriate fixtures and fittings, and some did not meet NHS cleaning standards. An infection control audit conducted in May 2016 scored 75%; this was similar to the situation at the time of the previous inspection, and remedial action had been slow.

⁶ 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>.

- 2.55** Health services staff used an appropriate range of policies, including safeguarding, and the management of communicable diseases was effective.
- 2.56** Appropriately checked and well-equipped emergency bags were available to health services staff across the prison, and custody staff had access to two automated external defibrillators (AEDs). Twenty-eight per cent of custody staff had received first-aid training, with further training planned, and the prison ensured that first-aid-trained staff were on each shift. An AED awareness session had been delivered at a full prison staff meeting. Ambulances were called promptly in emergencies.
- 2.57** Older prisoners received appropriate health checks and had access to age-appropriate screening.
- 2.58** An occupational therapist and a social worker from Hampshire County Council worked collaboratively with CNWL to address prisoners' social care needs, and comprehensive assessments had been conducted. There were currently four prisoners receiving formal social care, with good care plans, all of whom were located on the inpatient unit. Further work was being undertaken to raise awareness of the safeguarding referral process within the prison (see sections on safeguarding, and equality and diversity)
- 2.59** Health promotion was delivered during consultations, and printed material was available which could be translated into other languages, but this was not well advertised. There was good smoking cessation support, with a proactive approach, as the prison was due to become smoke free. Access to immunisations and screening for blood-borne viruses was good. Barrier protection was not available.

Recommendation

- 2.60** **All clinical areas should be fully compliant with infection control guidelines.**
(Repeated recommendation 2.60)

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.61** During reception, prisoners received an initial health screening by a registered nurse and appropriate referrals were made. A follow-up health screening was completed, usually within 72 hours, and community liaison ensured continuity of care.
- 2.62** There was access to professional telephone interpreting services in reception for prisoners who required them, but these were not always used, and other prisoners were sometimes used to interpret, which was inappropriate as it compromised patient confidentiality (see paragraph 2.22 and recommendation 2.29).
- 2.63** In our survey, a similar number of prisoners on the main site to that at other local prisons and at the time of the previous inspection said that the overall quality of health services were good or very good. However, fewer prisoners on the West Hill site than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection answered this survey question positively (22% versus 42% and 30%, respectively).
- 2.64** There was an appropriate range of primary care services, with reasonable waiting times. GP provision had increased to nine sessions a week. The lead GP also provided governance and oversight, attending relevant meetings and providing supervision and support. Routine GP appointments were available within two days, and 'on the day' urgent appointments were

facilitated based on clinical need. Out-of-hours GP cover was provided to the same level as in the community.

- 2.65** The non-attendance rate for most clinics had decreased but was still too high and prisoners waited too long to see the optician and the podiatrist.
- 2.66** The management of long-term conditions had improved, with an increase in the number of nurse-led clinics, regular reviews and a more systematic approach. Other nurse-led clinics included triage and wound care.
- 2.67** Clinical records were held on SystmOne (the electronic clinical record) and those we sampled were good, with appropriate use of care plans and templates based on national clinical guidance.
- 2.68** Staff on the 15-bed inpatient unit provided compassionate care for patients with complex health needs. There had been an increase in therapeutic activity on the unit, with an occupational therapist providing daily group and individual sessions. The daily multidisciplinary meeting ensured good communication between members of the team. However, the environment on the unit was poor, with no adapted cells for prisoners with disabilities.
- 2.69** External hospital appointments were well managed but too many were rescheduled for various reasons, including a lack of escort staff. The service was working hard to alleviate this; a physiotherapist was due to start work at the prison and a contract had been agreed for sexual health services to provide sessions onsite, both of which would help to lower the number of external hospital visits.

Recommendations

- 2.70** **The failure-to-attend rate for all clinics should continue to be monitored and appropriate remedial action taken to reduce it to less than 10%. (Repeated recommendation 2.73)**
- 2.71** **There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities. (Repeated recommendation 2.76)**

Pharmacy

- 2.72** Medicines were supplied in a timely manner by Lloyds pharmacy. There was a full-time locum pharmacist and a pharmacy technician onsite, and the advanced specialist pharmacist visited the prison two days a week.
- 2.73** Most medicines were stored appropriately, although the ambient temperature of the treatment room in C4 wing was too high for the storage of medicines, and refrigerator temperatures were not recorded consistently.
- 2.74** The medicines management committee met regularly and had excellent attendance from stakeholders, with meaningful discussions and analysis of prescribing data. Patients were involved in medicine reviews with the pharmacist or doctor, and there was good control of medicines liable to abuse. Patients receiving these were discussed at the prescribing review group, and their individual circumstances were considered. Training had been delivered to local community GPs on the potential issues of initiating treatment with these medicines in

patients who might later enter secure environments. This was an excellent initiative, promoting continuity of care and appropriate prescribing practices.

- 2.75** A range of patient group directions (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) and 'special sick' medicines (immediate health treatment without an appointment) were available. Administration of these and other supplies, and also in-possession risk assessments, were all recorded on SystemOne.
- 2.76** Medicines were administered three times daily on the main site, at 8.30am, 11.30am and 4.30pm; this meant that some medicines were given too close together. Night-time medicines were administered at 9pm directly to prisoners in their cell. Prisoners on both sites sometimes experienced delays in receiving their medication as it was not in the treatment room when they went to get it.
- 2.77** There was some crowding around hatches and consistent officer supervision was not always provided, compromising patient confidentiality and increasing the potential risk of diversion of medicines. It also meant that abusive behaviour by prisoners towards health services staff was not always challenged by officers. Staff were able to access the latest version of the British National Formulary electronically, and a prison-specific formulary (a list of medications used to inform prescribing) was in place.

Recommendations

- 2.78** **The ambient temperature in clinical rooms should be monitored daily and refrigerator temperatures checked regularly. Remedial action should be taken as required, to ensure that they are suitable for the provision of health services and the storage of medicines.**
- 2.79** **All medication should be administered at an appropriate time for maximum therapeutic effect and with sufficient officer supervision and privacy.** (Repeated recommendation 2.87)
- 2.80** **Supervision of queues at the medicine hatches should be improved.**

Good practice

- 2.81** *The delivery of training to GPs in the community, to raise awareness of key issues linked to inappropriate prescribing patterns of tradable medicines, promoted continuity of care and appropriate prescribing practices between the prison and community.*

Dentistry

- 2.82** Dental services were provided by Solent NHS Trust, and the provision was good. The dentist provided two and a half sessions a week, supported by a dental nurse. Prisoners were offered a range of treatments, equivalent to those in the wider community.
- 2.83** Staff absence had led to increased waiting times for appointments, which at the time of the inspection stood at approximately six weeks. However, urgent referrals could be seen promptly. Oral health promotion and advice were provided. The dental suite had recently been refurbished and was modern, spacious, met current infection control standards and had a separate decontamination room.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.84** The recently integrated mental health service provided both primary and secondary mental health services, with one referral pathway. A multidisciplinary mental health team, consisting of community psychiatric nurses, a psychiatrist, a psychologist and an occupational therapist, provided a good service. The team had a wide range of experience, were well established and had positive working relationships with the prison, and primary care and substance misuse teams. The team delivered mental health awareness training, and approximately 48% of custody staff had received it, with further training planned.
- 2.85** A range of treatments was delivered, including improving access to psychological therapies (IAPT) and group therapies such as 'hearing voices' and anxiety management. At the time of the inspection, the team caseload was approximately 121, and 39 prisoners with enduring and significant mental health problems were effectively managed under the care programme approach (CPA). The team was challenged by the lack of available private interview rooms on the wings, and the group room lacked confidentiality.
- 2.86** On average, the team received 82 referrals a month. Assessments were carried out promptly, with thorough risk assessments. Physical health checks were carried out to monitor prisoners who had been prescribed mood stabilisers, antipsychotic agents or stimulants.
- 2.87** A new process had recently been implemented to help to ensure that the team could attend ACCT case reviews but they were not always consulted before an ACCT was closed (see also paragraph 1.26). They responded promptly to all requests for emergency psychiatric first aid.
- 2.88** There had been 15 transfers under the Mental Health Act to secure mental health units in the previous six months, and they had all taken place within the specified timescales.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.89** The quality of the food provided had improved, and was satisfactory. In our survey, 25% of prisoners on the main site said that the food was good or very good, which was similar to the comparator but much better than at the time of the previous inspection (7%). Although prisoners on the West Hill site were more negative about the food than those on the main site, we found no evidence that the provision was different. However, most prisoners on the main site had to eat in their cells, often next to an unscreened toilet (see paragraph 2.1).
- 2.90** On both sites, meals were served too early. Service was not always well supervised, and some prisoners complained of favouritism and poor portion control because of this. Breakfast packs were meagre and issued on the evening before they were due to be eaten.
- 2.91** There were some basic consultation arrangements but there was insufficient analysis of the food survey responses.
- 2.92** The kitchen was new, clean and well equipped. By comparison, some serveries were in a poor state of repair and staff complained of considerable delays by the external contractor in repairing problems.

- 2.93** Prisoners working in the kitchen gained a food hygiene qualification, and three prisoners were undertaking more advanced training to equip them to work for Premier Inn on their release (see section on learning and skills and work activities).

Recommendation

- 2.94** **Serveries should be well maintained and supervision of the serving of meals should be improved, to ensure better portion control.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.95** A reasonable range of items was available through the prison shop. However, prisoners on the West Hill site were far more negative about the shop list than those at other category C prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection (19% versus 48% and 61%, respectively). Limited consultation about the range of goods was undertaken through the prisoner consultative meetings, and changes had been made when possible.
- 2.96** Orders could be made every Monday lunchtime, with items delivered the following Thursday to West Hill, and Friday on the main site. However, new arrivals to the main site could wait nine working days for access to their first full shop order if they arrived after Monday lunchtime. New prisoners could request emergency packs and pay the cost back over time.
- 2.97** Newspapers could be ordered easily and there was a choice of catalogues available to buy clothes and other items. The prison did not charge an administrative fee for catalogue orders.

Recommendations

- 2.98** **The more negative perceptions from prisoners on the West Hill site, relative to the main site, about the range of goods available through the prison shop should be explored and addressed.**
- 2.99** **Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival.** (Repeated recommendation I.17)

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.⁷

- 3.1** At the time of the inspection, the prison had run a restricted regime for many months. The few prisoners in full-time work on the main site had around eight hours unlocked each day, but the majority in part-time work had about five hours, and a significant minority who were not in work or education had only 45 minutes a day out of their cell. The regime varied from day to day, and also changed during the day, depending on staffing levels. At weekends, all prisoners on the main site were regularly locked up for over 24 hours without any time out of cell (see main recommendation S62). When we conducted our spot checks, we found around 22% of prisoners locked up.
- 3.2** In our survey, fewer prisoners on the main site than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they were able to take regular exercise outside. Exercise periods were not long enough and took place during association, which meant that prisoners had to choose between having time in the open air and carrying out other important daily activities, such as making telephone calls to their family or having a shower.
- 3.3** All of this was a source of considerable frustration to prisoners and staff, and had a detrimental impact on many areas of prison life on the main site. Although a fuller regime was in place during the inspection, this was unusual.
- 3.4** West Hill prisoners had far more freedom than those on the main site, and could leave their cells throughout the day, although they were often locked on their landing without access to full association.

⁷ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.5 Ofsted⁸ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Good

Achievements of prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work: Good

Quality of learning and skills and work provision, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment: Good

Personal development and behaviour: Good

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: Good

Management of learning and skills and work

3.6 The management of learning, skills and work had improved and was good. Prison senior managers had responded quickly and effectively to the recommendations from the previous inspection. They had made significant improvements: the range of vocational training had been increased and the number of activity places extended, including additional full-time places. The education provision for vulnerable prisoners had also improved but there was still too little vocational training to meet their needs. The electronic management systems for allocating prisoners to activities had improved and more prisoners were now engaged in purposeful activities.

3.7 Successful partnerships with external organisations and employers had been developed, which had resulted in a wide range of contract workshops. Managers used labour market intelligence well to identify and provide a range of relevant vocational training and work. There were good links with national hotel chains, which provided work placement and employment opportunities in release areas.

3.8 The provision of learning and skills by Milton Keynes College (MKC) was good. Prison managers and MKC senior staff worked well together to ensure that the focus of the education curriculum remained on improving prisoners' English and mathematics skills. Senior managers had extended successfully the processes for improving the quality of teaching, learning and assessment, to include areas not contracted to MKC. As a result, the quality of teaching, learning and assessment had improved across the prison.

3.9 The self-assessment report was comprehensive and linked to the quality improvement action plan. A wide range of staff and prisoners contributed to the process, and improvements had

⁸ 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>.

been made. For example, bonus payments for contract work and education and vocational training had been introduced. The partnerships across the prison were strong and effective. Prison managers collected an extensive amount of data, which they used to inform their decisions, scrutinise learners' performance and provide improved support where appropriate.

Recommendation

3.10 A better range of vocational training programmes for vulnerable prisoners should be developed.

Provision of activities

- 3.11** On the main site, there were sufficient full- and part-time purposeful activity places for about 75% of prisoners, and we found around 50% prisoners engaged in activity at any one time, which was an improvement from the 36% at the time of the previous inspection. However, too many prisoners were unemployed (30%). The number of full-time places on the West Hill site was sufficient for all of the prisoners there to be occupied full time in education, training or work.
- 3.12** MKC provided approximately 130 education places across both sites, most of which were part time. The range of programmes included English for speakers of other languages, English and mathematics, domestic cookery, information and communications technology, peer mentoring, art, citizenship, and equality and diversity. Employability training was provided in all workshops. In addition, prisoners participated in a wide range of enrichment activities, such as creative writing, introduction to mental health, and personal care and hygiene.
- 3.13** The variety and range of work and vocational training across the two sites had increased. On the main site, prison managers provided work that was appropriate for the population, most of whom stayed in the prison for only a few weeks. Opportunities included work as orderlies, information advisers, Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners), servery workers and cleaners. Prisoners from the West Hill site worked in the kitchen, the textile workshops, and in gardens and waste management, all of which were on the main site. Approximately 55 prisoners were engaged in commercial contract work in textiles and electrical assembly. Around 20 prisoners were engaged successfully in distance learning or Open University programmes.
- 3.14** Approximately 70 full-time vocational training places were offered, in hospitality and catering, horticulture, waste management, industrial cleaning, barbering and carpentry. The vocational training was well planned to meet prisoners' resettlement needs, focusing effectively on areas where there was potential for gaining employment on release, such as hospitality and catering. At the time of the inspection, a small amount of vocational training was not formally accredited to national awards, and in carpentry was limited to a level 1 qualification.
- 3.15** There was a good induction to learning and skills and all prisoners had their immediate needs identified by experienced and qualified staff from the National Careers Service provider, Centre for British Teachers. Prisoners who needed it were given a thorough initial assessment of their English and mathematics skills levels. A useful electronic database clearly identified prisoners' progress through induction into labour allocation. Staff ensured that prisoners who missed induction sessions, particularly the access to activities programme, were followed up on the wings and given alternative appointments. This resulted in high attendance rates in activities. Prison staff managed and monitored the allocation process well; prisoners were allocated to activities as soon as possible and waiting lists were short.

Recommendation

- 3.16 All prisoners' practical skills developed in vocational training should be accredited to nationally recognised awards and they should be able to achieve qualifications that are most likely to help them to find jobs on release, typically at level 2.**

Quality of provision

- 3.17** Teaching, learning and assessment had improved and were good, although were less effective in the small number of mixed-ability sessions, where the range of abilities was too wide to enable tutors to provide effective challenge for everyone. Skilful and experienced tutors and trainers ensured that most prisoners made good progress by providing interesting and stimulating activities that met their needs. Tutors helped prisoners to develop their understanding, knowledge and skills effectively. A few prison staff had achieved a teaching qualification and worked well in partnership with MKC staff, teaching on hospitality and catering programmes in the kitchens.
- 3.18** Prisoners developed their speaking and listening skills particularly well. Most tutors were enthusiastic about their subjects and motivated prisoners. However, in a small minority of sessions, tutors did not challenge the more able prisoners sufficiently, to enable them to progress at a faster pace. Prisoners' verbal and written feedback about the quality of teaching and learning was positive.
- 3.19** Tutors supported individual prisoners well. They promoted equality and diversity well through themed projects, and supported prisoners' development of English and mathematics skills in the workshops. The teaching, training and coaching we observed in vocational training and employability training were good. Staff supported prisoners with additional learning needs well, and prisoners acting as peer mentors supported tutors and trainers well.

Recommendations

- 3.20 The impact of mixed-ability learning sessions on learners' success should be monitored and suitable alternative arrangements made where needed.**
- 3.21 Tutors and trainers should ensure that more able learners are sufficiently challenged to achieve their full potential.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.22** Attendance and punctuality had improved considerably and were good in most work areas and on education and training programmes. Prison staff monitored absences well and teaching and training staff identified quickly the reasons for absences.
- 3.23** Prisoners were highly motivated and enthusiastic about learning and skills, and were respectful towards prison, teaching and training staff, and to each other. Those working in the workshops showed a good work ethic.
- 3.24** Prisoners behaved well and took pride in their work. They often organised and participated in charity fundraising activities, such as supporting members of the armed services, demonstrating good communication and planning skills. Many prisoners stated that this had increased their self-confidence and self-esteem.

- 3.25** The information, advice and guidance provided was effective, enabling prisoners to make well-informed choices about their next steps in learning or work.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.26** Prisoners' achievement of qualifications had improved and was good. During the previous two years, most prisoners had achieved their intended qualifications.
- 3.27** Levels of achievement in progression awards in English and mathematics were high overall. Achievement rates in full functional skills mathematics qualifications at levels 1 and 2, and English at level 2 were also high. Success rates for the small number of prisoners who took full functional skills English at level 1 were too low. Most prisoners made good progress from their starting points within and between levels, and there were no significant variations in achievement between different groups of prisoners. Standards of written and practical work were good.
- 3.28** Prisoners in work and vocational training were able to develop good employability skills, although some of the electrical assembly work was mundane and repetitive. In carpentry and contract workshops, work was produced to commercial standards for external companies.

Recommendation

- 3.29** **Success rates for prisoners' full functional skills in English at level 1 should improve.**

Library

- 3.30** The library service was provided by Hampshire County Council. Staff actively engaged and involved prisoners in a range of initiatives that, for those who could already read and write, promoted literacy effectively but there was limited support for prisoners unable to read and write. Two-thirds of the experienced and qualified library staff were on long-term sick leave and this had affected the amount of support offered by staff for the 'Turning Pages' programme (a mentoring scheme to help prisoners learn to read).
- 3.31** Orderlies provided good support on the main site, and a single orderly contributed effectively to the running of the service at West Hill. Library staff visited the West Hill site occasionally during the week to provide further support.
- 3.32** The library accommodation on both sites was adequate but on the main site provided little space for private study or research, and no computer facilities. The book stock on both sites was adequate for the population, with a wide range of fiction and non-fiction, books in languages other than English and audio books. An appropriate range of legal books and Prison Service Instructions was readily available. The stock was replenished regularly.
- 3.33** In our survey, more prisoners on the main site than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they visited the library regularly and that it housed a wide enough range of materials to meet their needs; on the West Hill site, these figures were in line with the comparators and with those at the time of the previous inspection. The prison's own data on library usage were inadequate and unclear.

Recommendation

- 3.34** More support should be provided for prisoners who are unable to read or write, to ensure that they are able to develop these skills.

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.

- 3.35** PE facilities were reasonably good on both sites. They included a sports hall, outdoor sports pitch and weights room on the main site. At West Hill, there was a sports hall filled with a wide range of equipment and an artificial outside pitch; the latter was unusable, for health and safety reasons, but arrangements had been made for prisoners to access the outdoor facilities on the main site. There was a small range of cardiovascular equipment on the Hearne unit.
- 3.36** Prison data showed that only 34% of prisoners on the main site and 60% at West Hill attended PE at least once a week. In our survey, only 4% of respondents on the main site said that they accessed the gym more than three times a week, which was far lower than the comparator of 24% and than at the time of the previous inspection. The lack of access was caused by the restricted regime in place (see section on time out of cell), which meant that too many prisoners were unable to access the gym more than once a week. The corresponding survey results on the West Hill site were similar to those in other category C prisons and at the time of the previous inspection. There was evening and weekend gym access for prisoners in full-time work and training, and specific sessions were provided for older and vulnerable prisoners (see paragraph 2.26).
- 3.37** The prison induction prepared prisoners well for safe and healthy use of the gym equipment and raised awareness of healthy living. PE staff had good links with health services staff and supported prisoners with disabilities and health conditions to complete prescribed exercise regimes.
- 3.38** Accredited PE qualifications were available. A good partnership with the Prince's Trust had been developed and offered a successful accredited football coaching qualification that included first aid and safe lifting.

Recommendation

- 3.39** All prisoners should have access to the gym at least three times a week.

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

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

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

Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.

- 4.1 The reducing reoffending strategy was up to date and focused appropriately on the resettlement pathways. Although offender management was an integral part of the strategy, it did not mention the specific populations at the establishment, such as young adults, vulnerable prisoners or the category C population held on the West Hill site. The needs analysis which informed the strategy was not sufficiently comprehensive as it was based on prisoner survey data only and did not draw on offender assessment system (OASys) data to inform, for example, identification of the offending behaviour needs of prisoners.
- 4.2 Bimonthly reducing reoffending strategy meetings were held, chaired by a senior manager. Attendance was reasonably good, including a representative from the offender management unit (OMU).
- 4.3 The purpose of the West Hill and Herne units was unclear and, despite their claims, they were not well enough driven by resettlement. In reality, West Hill operated as a standard category C unit, while Herne was referred to by staff as an 'enhanced unit'. Prisoners located on the West Hill site had expectations of accessing interventions to support progression and resettlement, such as accredited programmes and release on temporary licence (ROTL), and were frustrated by their lack of availability.

Recommendation

- 4.4 **The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis, reflecting the population at Winchester, and should clarify the role of West Hill in delivering resettlement opportunities.**

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.

- 4.5 Offender management was reasonably good. Offender supervisors had manageable caseloads, at around 30–40 prisoners each. Typically, contact between offender supervisors and the prisoners in their care peaked around specific events, such as recategorisation, transfers and sentence planning meetings, but, overall, offender supervisor contact was adequate. In the sample we looked at, in most cases offender supervisors encouraged and supported prisoners to achieve their sentence plan targets.

- 4.6** Additional hours had been provided to help to reduce the previously large backlog of OASys assessments, and at the time of the inspection only 35 were late. The prison was responsible for completing 26 of these, and external offender managers were responsible for the remaining nine. However, data were not collated on the number of prisoners moving on from Winchester without a current OASys assessment, so it was not possible to determine the impact that this was having on the size of the backlog.
- 4.7** The OASys assessments we looked at were timely and consistently good. The quality of the sentence plans we saw was reasonable. Objectives were generally outcome focused, but in some cases were too generalised and in others there was little evidence of sequencing. There was good attendance by offender managers at sentence planning meetings, in person or by telephone link. This reflected the efforts made to invite local offender managers into the prison more generally, and to cultivate these relationships.
- 4.8** Risk of serious harm screenings, and the subsequent full analyses, were good. Risk management plans were good in most cases we inspected, and some were among the best we have seen.
- 4.9** Weekly home detention curfew (HDC) boards were attended by an offender supervisor. Prisoners were also invited to attend. Documentation demonstrated that decisions were informed by a wide range of information from relevant departments. Data collected by the prison showed that some prisoners were released late, some several weeks beyond their HDC eligibility date.

Recommendations

- 4.10 All eligible prisoners should have a current offender assessment system (OASys) assessment.**
- 4.11 The number of prisoners transferred without an OASys assessment should be monitored.**
- 4.12 All suitable prisoners should be released on their home detention curfew eligibility date.**

Public protection

- 4.13** Public protection arrangements were satisfactory. There was a designated public protection unit, which was responsible for screening all new arrivals for relevant issues, such as offences against children. This initial screening process was reasonable and monitoring was generally proportionate. At the time of the inspection, 17 prisoners were on mail and/or telephone monitoring. Reviews were timely and undertaken in discussion with other departments, including security.
- 4.14** The monthly interdepartmental risk management team meeting was effective. Representatives from a wide range of appropriate departments attended, including violence reduction staff. Minutes demonstrated that actions were followed through, and that governance was good.
- 4.15** Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were adequate, although some MAPPA F reports referred the reader to other documents which would not have been available routinely to all at a MAPPA meeting.

Categorisation

- 4.16** Initial categorisation was undertaken using the recognised standard algorithm, and was timely. Categorisation reviews utilised information from relevant departments, including wing officers, substance misuse services, and health care and security departments. However, the quality of wing information was poor in some cases, and in others it was not provided. In some cases, information was submitted so late that the review was delayed. There was no routine input from external offender managers in the decision to recategorise prisoners to category D, which was inappropriate.
- 4.17** Progressive transfers were usually undertaken relatively quickly for most of the population, including category B sex offenders. Reluctance by escort providers to escort prisoners singly was cited as the main barrier to a speedy transfer, and could cause delays of several months while they waited until there were several prisoners to take on one vehicle. There were 37 prisoners waiting for transfer at the time of the inspection.
- 4.18** Transfers to open establishments took place quickly. Of the seven category D prisoners held at the time of the inspection, five had been returned from open conditions and were waiting for reclassification by the parole board.

Recommendation

- 4.19 Recategorisation reviews should be timely, and informed by high-quality information from all relevant staff, including external offender managers in cases of recategorisation to category D.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.20** At the time of the inspection, there were 31 indeterminate sentence prisoners (ISPs) at the establishment, 24 of whom were serving a life sentence and seven were subject to an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP). ISPs were usually assigned to a probation offender supervisor. A helpful ISP information booklet was provided to sentenced prisoners, but those on remand were not contacted or provided with information or support.
- 4.21** A quarterly lifer forum, incorporating vulnerable prisoners, had been introduced in February 2016 and had met twice, although some ISPs told us that they were not aware of it. Two lifer family days were delivered each year.
- 4.22** Clothing parcels for life-sentenced prisoners could be sent in by family members twice a year.

Recommendation

- 4.23 Prisoners on remand and facing an indeterminate sentence should be given information and support.**

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.

- 4.24** Catch 22 delivered some resettlement services on behalf of Purple Futures Community Rehabilitation Company. The demand for resettlement services was high, with around 30 prisoners released each week.
- 4.25** Offender supervisors completed part 1 of the basic custody screening tool (BCST) during induction, and Catch 22 completed part 2 to develop a resettlement plan for all prisoners, including those on remand. Resettlement plans, developed from the BCST part 2, were good; they were detailed, utilised a range of information, including from P-Nomis (electronic case notes) and OASys assessments, and demonstrated good communication with other departments.
- 4.26** Catch 22 provided helpful support with identifying and addressing prisoners' initial needs, which mainly related to issues regarding housing benefit, maintenance/cancellation of tenancies and contacting banks. They saw prisoners at around six to seven weeks before release, but this was sometimes too late to ensure that all their needs were addressed before discharge (see section on accommodation). In two of the four cases we looked at, it was not yet clear what accommodation the prisoners would be released to; in both cases, the men were due to be released within a few days. One of these men had transferred into the prison three weeks earlier but had not been seen by Catch 22 until the first day of the inspection.

Recommendation

- 4.27 Prisoners should have their resettlement needs assessed 12 weeks before they are due for release, to enable identified needs to be addressed before discharge.**

Accommodation

- 4.28** Catch 22 had developed links with a wide range of accommodation providers across both the private and public sectors, and we saw cases where staff had clearly gone to great lengths to secure accommodation.
- 4.29** Despite this, too many prisoners were being released homeless. Local data collection systems had only recently been developed, so only two months of figures were available. These showed that 30% of prisoners (31 men) had been released homeless in May 2016, and 28% of prisoners (20 men) in June 2016. This was too high and of a significant concern.

Recommendation

- 4.30 Prisoners should have settled accommodation to go to when they are discharged.**

Education, training and employment

- 4.31** The quality of careers advice and guidance, provided by the National Careers Service and contracted to the Centre for British Teachers, required improvement. The provider had recently increased staffing levels and advisers had begun to work more effectively with prisoners.
- 4.32** Interviews with newly arrived prisoners were timely and identified their needs. Skills action plans drawn up during these interviews contained sufficient information to develop targets towards meeting their resettlement needs. However, these targets were often too general and in many cases did not identify English and mathematics support needs, despite initial assessment results indicating this need.
- 4.33** Advisers provided good pre-release support for dealing with disclosure and writing CVs but there was limited access to job search resources and insufficient use was made of the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) at West Hill to look for jobs. Advisers provided good support for prisoners to access help on release.
- 4.34** There were good links with local employers and, following employer fairs, several employers had offered work trials, work placements and jobs. However, it was too soon to measure the impact of these opportunities. Prisoners were unable to take part in ROTL at the time of the inspection.
- 4.35** The prison was unable to provide reliable data on those entering education, training or employment on release.

Recommendations

- 4.36 All prisoners should have access to the virtual campus, to research employment opportunities on release.**
- 4.37 Data on the number of prisoners being released into education, training or employment should be collected, to evidence outcomes.**

Health care

- 4.38** Prisoners on medication were given a week's supply on a risk-assessed basis, and a discharge summary before release.
- 4.39** Those with enduring mental health problems were managed using the care programme approach, with good liaison with community mental health teams.
- 4.40** There were good arrangements for patients with palliative or end-of-life needs, with effective links with local palliative care services.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.41** There was good joint working between the clinical and the psychosocial support teams (from Phoenix Futures) to ensure treatment continuation on release. Prisoners were consistently provided with harm reduction and overdose prevention information, and a pre-release group had been introduced.

- 4.42 On the West Hill site, a designated worker from Phoenix Futures contributed to sentence planning and worked closely with offender supervisors to address substance misuse and offending behaviour.
- 4.43 Support services for families were available, and strong links with community agencies and integrated offender management teams facilitated the throughcare of prisoners, including 'through-the-gate' support.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.44 Catch 22 was delivering some useful financial support, such as contacting banks and setting up payment plans to address debts with mobile phone companies, credit card companies and others. Prisoners were signposted to Citizens Advice staff, who attended the prison weekly, to help with more complex financial difficulties.
- 4.45 Prisoners in the last three months of their sentence could open a bank account with Santander. In order to allow time for processing applications, prisoners were required to have at least five weeks left to serve, which meant that some of those serving short sentences or transferring in to the establishment shortly before release were unable to use the service. In the previous three months, five prisoners had opened accounts before release.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.46 Visitors complained that it was difficult to book visits by telephone as the booking line was constantly engaged, but email booking, for those who could access it, was much easier.
- 4.47 The visitors centre, run by Spurgeons, was an attractive facility, with comfortable seating and a well-equipped play area. Visitors spoke highly of staff and volunteers working there. They also told us that most prison staff treated them with respect, that the visits process was efficient and that significant delays were rare. The visits session we observed started on time.
- 4.48 The visits hall lacked natural light and the fixed furniture was unwelcoming. Spurgeons supervised a well-equipped crèche during most visits. The provision of refreshments was limited to only hot and cold drinks, crisps, biscuits and chocolate.
- 4.49 Prisoners at the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme were entitled to only two visits a month, and the restricted regime (see section on time out of cell) left little time for many prisoners on the main site to telephone their partners and children.
- 4.50 The range of family support work by Spurgeons was excellent, and better than we normally see. It employed a manager and two family caseworkers to undertake one-to-one work with prisoners, and ran a range of parenting support and relationship programmes, a weekly peer support group and a Friday night homework club. Family days were held each month, and activities were planned to build on learning from the parenting courses. The provision of one-to-one work, courses and family days met demand.

Recommendation

- 4.51 **All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week.** (Repeated recommendation 4.67)

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.52** The offending behaviour needs of the population had not been identified through a needs analysis.
- 4.53** The Sycamore Tree restorative justice programme was delivered four times a year, with 20 places on each course. However, there were no accredited offending behaviour programmes, including for the category C population on the West Hill site and the Herne unit. Our case sample showed that some prisoners stayed at the establishment for extended periods, sometimes over three years, which was sufficient for offending behaviour work to be delivered. Offender supervisors delivered some innovative one-to-one work to try to address this gap but in half of the cases we inspected, insufficient offending behaviour work was being undertaken.

Recommendation

- 4.54** **A comprehensive analysis of prisoners' offending behaviour needs should be undertaken and used to develop an appropriate range of offending behaviour work for the population.**

Additional resettlement services

- 4.55** There were a number of military veterans at the establishment. Support for them was extremely good, and had been identified by the National Offender Management Service as an example of best practice.
- 4.56** In partnership with a local provider, a dedicated officer provided these prisoners with one-to-one support, information and guidance, and facilitated access to services, including peer workers, housing and mental health support.

Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations 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 All new prisoners should receive comprehensive first night support, including a thorough assessment of how they are feeling and their risk of self-harm; access to a well-prepared cell; provision of all basic items; and regular checks by staff during their first few nights. (S58)
- 5.2 A robust local strategy to reduce the levels of suicide and self-harm should be introduced. (S59)
- 5.3 The segregation unit should be replaced with a modern, fit-for-purpose facility. (S60, repeated recommendation S50)
- 5.4 Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (S61, repeated recommendation S52)
- 5.5 Prisoners should be unlocked for at least 10 hours a day. (S62)

Recommendation

To NOMS

Residential units

- 5.6 Living conditions on the both sites should be improved. Cells, toilets and showers should be properly maintained. (2.7)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.7 Prisoners should not remain in court cells for long periods waiting for transfer to prison. (1.5, repeated recommendation 1.5)

Early days in custody

- 5.8 Induction sessions on the main site should not be interrupted, and sessions to vulnerable prisoners should be delivered as planned. (1.14)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.9** Samaritans telephones should be easily accessible and in working order. (1.29)

Safeguarding

- 5.10** Wing officers should be more aware of the procedure for reporting suspicions of abuse to the local authority safeguarding teams. (1.32)

Security

- 5.11** Prisoners should only be subject to a strip-search when justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.40, repeated recommendation 1.16)
- 5.12** Suspicion-based searches and drug tests should be carried out as required and the outcomes monitored. (1.41)

Discipline

- 5.13** The adjudication process should not be used for minor infringements which would be better dealt with using the incentives and earned privileges scheme. (1.45)
- 5.14** Managerial oversight should ensure that all use of force dossiers are completed to a satisfactory standard, including the full completion of injury to prisoner forms. (1.50)
- 5.15** Prisoners in the segregation unit should have access to a significantly improved regime. (1.56, repeated recommendation 1.78)

Substance misuse

- 5.16** Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission. (1.65, repeated recommendation 1.88)

Residential units

- 5.17** Prisoners should have access to sufficient and suitable clean clothing. (2.6)
- 5.18** Prisoners' confidence in the application system should be improved and a quality assurance system should be introduced to ensure that issues are addressed appropriately and respectfully. (2.8)
- 5.19** Consultation with prisoners should be undertaken regularly. (2.9)

Equality and diversity

- 5.20** Monitoring data for all protected characteristics should be comprehensively compiled and analysed, and action should be taken to investigate all anomalies. (2.18, repeated recommendation 2.24).
- 5.21** There should be appropriate oversight of the discrimination incident report form process to assure an effective response to discriminatory treatment and offensive behaviour. (2.19)

- 5.22** Appropriate use should be made of professional telephone interpreting services, and this should be monitored, to ensure that the needs of non-English-speaking prisoners are met and that none become isolated. (2.29)
- 5.23** Prisoners with disabilities who need one should have a wing care plan and an appropriately supervised paid carer. (2.30)

Faith and religious activity

- 5.24** Chaplaincy staff should visit prisoners at risk of self-harm regularly, attend assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews and see all prisoners before release. (2.38)

Complaints

- 5.25** Any identified trends in complaints should be investigated. Information about upheld complaints should be included in the analysis. (2.43, repeated recommendation 2.44)

Legal rights

- 5.26** Bail services for remand prisoners should be publicised and their effectiveness should be monitored. (2.47)

Health services

- 5.27** All clinical areas should be fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.60, repeated recommendation 2.60)
- 5.28** The failure-to-attend rate for all clinics should continue to be monitored and appropriate remedial action taken to reduce it to less than 10%. (2.70, repeated recommendation 2.73)
- 5.29** There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities. (2.71, repeated recommendation 2.76)
- 5.30** The ambient temperature in clinical rooms should be monitored daily and refrigerator temperatures checked regularly. Remedial action should be taken as required, to ensure that they are suitable for the provision of health services and the storage of medicines. (2.78)
- 5.31** All medication should be administered at an appropriate time for maximum therapeutic effect and with sufficient officer supervision and privacy. (2.79, repeated recommendation 2.87)
- 5.32** Supervision of queues at the medicine hatches should be improved. (2.80)

Catering

- 5.33** Serveries should be well maintained and supervision of the serving of meals should be improved, to ensure better portion control. (2.94)

Purchases

- 5.34** The more negative perceptions from prisoners on the West Hill site, relative to the main site, about the range of goods available through the prison shop should be explored and addressed. (2.98)

- 5.35** Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival. (2.99, repeated recommendation 1.17)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.36** A better range of vocational training programmes for vulnerable prisoners should be developed. (3.10)
- 5.37** All prisoners' practical skills developed in vocational training should be accredited to nationally recognised awards and they should be able to achieve qualifications that are most likely to help them to find jobs on release, typically at level 2. (3.16)
- 5.38** The impact of mixed-ability learning sessions on learners' success should be monitored and suitable alternative arrangements made where needed. (3.20)
- 5.39** Tutors and trainers should ensure that more able learners are sufficiently challenged to achieve their full potential. (3.21)
- 5.40** Success rates for prisoners' full functional skills in English at level 1 should improve. (3.29)
- 5.41** More support should be provided for prisoners who are unable to read or write, to ensure that they are able to develop these skills. (3.34)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.42** All prisoners should have access to the gym at least three times a week. (3.39)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.43** The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis, reflecting the population at Winchester, and should clarify the role of West Hill in delivering resettlement opportunities. (4.4)

Offender management and planning

- 5.44** All eligible prisoners should have a current offender assessment system (OASys) assessment. (4.10)
- 5.45** The number of prisoners transferred without an OASys assessment should be monitored. (4.11)
- 5.46** All suitable prisoners should be released on their home detention curfew eligibility date. (4.12)
- 5.47** Recategorisation reviews should be timely, and informed by high-quality information from all relevant staff, including external offender managers in cases of recategorisation to category D. (4.19)
- 5.48** Prisoners on remand and facing an indeterminate sentence should be given information and support. (4.23)

Reintegration planning

- 5.49** Prisoners should have their resettlement needs assessed 12 weeks before they are due for release, to enable identified needs to be addressed before discharge. (4.27)
- 5.50** Prisoners should have settled accommodation to go to when they are discharged. (4.30)
- 5.51** All prisoners should have access to the virtual campus, to research employment opportunities on release. (4.36)
- 5.52** Data on the number of prisoners being released into education, training or employment should be collected, to evidence outcomes. (4.37)
- 5.53** All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (4.51, repeated recommendation 4.67)
- 5.54** A comprehensive analysis of prisoners' offending behaviour needs should be undertaken and used to develop an appropriate range of offending behaviour work for the population. (4.54)

Example of good practice

Health services

- 5.55** The delivery of training to GPs in the community, to raise awareness of key issues linked to inappropriate prescribing patterns of tradable medicines, promoted continuity of care and appropriate prescribing practices between the prison and community. (2.81)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Jonathan Tickner	Inspector
Beverly Alden	Inspector
Fionnula Gordon	Inspector
Deri Hughes-Roberts	Inspector
Tim McSweeney	Researcher
Anna Fenton	Researcher
Heidi Webb	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Maureen Jamieson	Health services inspector
Simon Denton	Pharmacist
Gary Turney	Care Quality Commission inspector
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted inspector
Diane Koppitt	Ofsted inspector
Chris Dearnley	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Griffiths	Offender management inspector
Iolo Madoc Jones	Offender management inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2014, some prisoners were held in court cells for too long waiting for escorts to the prison. Reception processes were reasonable but there was a lack of first night support. There were high levels of violence, and overall management of this area was poor. People at risk of self-harm were reasonably well cared for but there were weaknesses in responses to emergencies. Security was well managed. Substantial inroads had been made into reducing drug use. Adjudications were carried out for legitimate reasons but exploration of evidence was not always adequate. Use of force was high but it was legitimate in the examined cases. Use of special cells was not subject to sufficient governance. Segregation was not usually used for long periods but the regime and environment were unacceptably poor. Substance use services had improved and were generally good. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

All violent incidents should be fully investigated and systematic action taken to address bullying and support victims. A local violence reduction policy should be introduced. All data relating to violence should be collated and analysed to identify trends, and followed up with rigorous remedial action. (S48)

Achieved

Analysis of data for disciplinary procedures, use of force and segregation should be rigorous and effectively used to reduce the number of adjudications, the use of force and the throughput in the segregation unit. (S49)

Achieved

The segregation unit should be replaced with a modern, fit-for-purpose facility. (S50)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, S59)

Recommendations

Prisoners should not remain in court cells for long periods waiting for transfer to prison. (I.5)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, I.5)

The escort contractor should plan inter-prison transfers to guarantee the arrival at the designated prison on the same day. (I.6)

Not achieved

Prisoners should only be handcuffed during disembarkation when justified by an individual risk assessment. (I.7)

Achieved

Prisoners should only be subject to a strip-search when justified by an individual risk assessment. (1.16)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.41)

Prisoners should receive purchases from a full range of prison shop goods within one week of arrival. (1.17)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.99)

Night staff should introduce themselves to new arrivals and check on their well-being during the night. (1.18)

Not achieved

Induction should effectively engage and inform prisoners of key information. (1.19)

Achieved

There should be a specific policy to manage the vulnerable prisoner population, and abusive behaviour directed at them, especially during exercise, should be challenged. (1.27)

Achieved

Prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures should only be held in segregation in exceptional circumstances which should be regularly reviewed and adequately recorded. (1.35)

Achieved

Care suites should be properly furnished and equipped to provide an appropriately supportive environment. (1.36)

Partially achieved

All night staff should be adequately trained in emergency response procedures, and all should carry anti-ligature knives. (1.37)

Partially achieved

Closed visits should only be imposed in direct response to trafficking activity or intelligence. (1.48)

Achieved

Suspicion testing should be conducted in a timely manner, and completions and results monitored. (1.49)

Not achieved

Staff should understand and consistently implement the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) policy. In particular, all prisoners on entry level should be reviewed after 14 days and behaviour improvement targets should be specific to the individual. (1.57)

Achieved

Adjudication hearings should examine charges thoroughly and paperwork should be quality checked by a senior manager. (1.62)

Achieved

Investigations should be conducted into every incident in which a baton is drawn. (1.67)

Achieved

Prisoners should be placed in special accommodation only in exceptional circumstances and be removed at the earliest opportunity. Records should thoroughly explain the justification for the measure. (1.68)

Achieved

All instances of segregation, regardless of location, should be appropriately authorised and subject to management oversight. (I.76)

Not achieved

All cells in the segregation unit should contain furniture or be classified as special accommodation. (I.77)

Not achieved

Prisoners on the segregation unit should have access to a significantly improved regime. (I.78)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, I.57)

Staff should build meaningful relationships to support prisoners while in segregation. (I.79)

Achieved

Action should be taken to ensure that all prisoners requiring drug or alcohol support and treatment should be located on the relevant wing during the first five days of their admission. (I.88)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, I.66)

The psychosocial service should be adequately resourced to ensure delivery of integrated clinical reviews and timely key-working sessions. (I.89)

Achieved

There should be sufficient peer workers to provide substance use support across both sites in line with local operational policies and protocols. (I.90)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2014, residential units were generally clean but cells were not sufficiently furnished and cell call bell responses were too slow. Staff–prisoner relationships were mixed. Personal officer arrangements had yet to take effect. The strategic management of diversity was weak and there were serious gaps in provision. Faith provision was good. Complaint responses were generally polite. Legal services were adequate. Health services were improving but significant shortcomings remained. Prisoners were critical of the food provided but shop provision was good. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on the main site and reasonably good at West Hill against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The specific needs of the young adult population should be identified and met. In particular, they should be helped with the transition to a mixed-age population and provided with adequate social and/or pastoral support, including through the use of support groups. (S51)

Not achieved

Governance and management oversight of diversity should be prioritised to ensure that the needs of all prisoners from minority groups are identified, assessed and met, and that any negative perceptions of particular groups are understood. (S52)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, S60)

Recommendations

Cells should have clean, adequately screened toilets, adequate furniture and sufficient natural light. (2.9)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be provided with sufficient clothing of adequate quality and the facility to launder their own clothes. They should not be penalised for washing and drying clothes in their cells. (2.10)

Not achieved

The timeliness and quality of responses to prisoner applications should be monitored and improvements made where required. (2.11)

Not achieved

Cell call bells should be answered promptly and response times monitored. (2.12)

Not achieved

There should be an effective system for ensuring that prisoners know whom to ask for help with problems, for checking on their well-being and for supporting them in achieving progress. (2.19)

Achieved

Monitoring data for all protected characteristics should be comprehensively compiled and analysed, and action should be taken to investigate all anomalies. (2.24)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.18)

Links should be established with external community groups and agencies to help provide support to minority groups in the establishment. (2.25)

Not achieved

The diversity officer and prisoner equality representative should be suitably trained and supported to fulfil their roles. (2.26)

Partially achieved

Prisoners with disabilities should have appropriately adapted facilities and a multidisciplinary care plans if needed. A paid carer scheme should also be established. (2.34)

Not achieved

Dedicated support forums and prisoner representatives should be introduced for prisoners from every protected characteristic group. (2.35)

Not achieved

Links with external community faith groups should be established to support effective reintegration after release. (2.40)

Partially achieved

Any identified trends in complaints should be investigated. Information about upheld complaints should be included in the analysis. (2.44)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.43)

The legal services provided should meet the needs of the population, and prisoners should be told about them during the induction process. (2.49)

Not achieved

All clinical areas should be fully compliant with infection control guidelines. (2.60)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.60)

A designated senior health lead to develop health services for older prisoners and those with disabilities should be identified. (2.61)

Achieved

Prisoners should have prompt access to confidential nurse assessment clinics, provided by trained staff who can provide appropriate treatment using evidence-based triage algorithms to ensure consistency. (2.72)

Achieved

The failure-to-attend rate for all clinics should be monitored and appropriate remedial action taken to reduce it to less than 10%. (2.73)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.70)

Prisoners with life-long conditions should receive regular reviews which generate an evidence-based care plan from appropriately trained and supervised staff. (2.74)

Achieved

The inpatient unit should offer adequate care-planned therapeutic and constructive activities to residents, in a satisfactory environment, and only prisoners with a clinical need should be admitted. (2.75)

Partially achieved

There should be adapted cells and shower facilities on the inpatient unit to enable appropriate dignity and care for men with disabilities. (2.76)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.71)

Prisoners should be fully involved in prescribing reviews. (2.83)

Achieved

A wider range of medicines should be available to prisoners without the need to see the doctor, either on 'special sick' or as patient group directions. (2.84)

Achieved

The reordering of medicines should be managed effectively, to ensure continuity of care. (2.85)

Achieved

The draft in-possession policy should be implemented, and risk assessments should be reviewed regularly and be available for the prescriber to see at the time of prescribing. (2.86)

Achieved

All medication should be administered at an appropriate time for maximum therapeutic effect and with sufficient officer supervision and privacy. (2.87)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 2.79)

The dental surgery should fully comply with dental regulation HTMI-05. (2.93)

Achieved

Prison staff should have regular mental health awareness training. (2.98)

Achieved

Prisoners should have timely access to a full range of care-planned support for mild and moderate mental health problems, including counselling, clinical psychology and group therapies. (2.99)

Achieved

There should be no administration charge for catalogue orders. (2.111)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2014, time out of cell had improved but too many prisoners were under-occupied. The quality of leadership and management of learning and skills was inconsistent. There was limited vocational training. The quality of teaching and learning in education classes was good but weaker in vocational training. With the exception of a few education classes, attendance at activities was poor. Library provision was reasonable. PE provision was adequate. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on either site against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

There should be more activity places, including full time activity, to purposefully occupy prisoners. Participation, attendance and achievements should be monitored, and attendance at activities, especially vocational training and work should be improved. (S53)

Achieved

Recommendations

The core day should be adhered to and information regarding timings made freely available to prisoners. (3.5)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be given the opportunity for one hour of exercise in the open air every day. (3.6)

Not achieved

The operational management of the non-Offender Learning and Skills Service (OLASS) provision should be improved, to ensure effective supervision and support to delivery staff. (3.13)

Achieved

The session observation scheme across work and vocational training provision should be further developed and consistently applied. (3.14)

Achieved

Prisoners at West Hill should not be transferred as a result of overcrowding drafts mid-way through courses. (3.15)

Achieved

Employability skills, including English and mathematics, should be prioritised and recorded for all activities. (3.20)

Achieved

The quality of teaching, learning and assessment should be improved to a consistently high level across all of the provision. (3.27)

Achieved

All staff should strongly promote the development of literacy and numeracy skills, as well as good health and safety awareness, in the workshops. (3.28)

Partially achieved

Success rates in English for speakers of other languages, Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy, English and mathematics courses should be improved. (3.34)

Achieved

Library services should be developed through formal liaison with other departments and analysis of patterns of library use. (3.40)

Achieved

Prisoners should have consistently good access to a wide range of group recreational sports and games. (3.47)

Achieved

More accredited courses should be made available in the gym. (3.48)

Achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2014, the strategic management of resettlement was developing but lacked sufficient focus on offender management. There was insufficient attention to the needs of short-term prisoners. There were some shortcomings in public protection work. Assessment of resettlement needs on arrival and discharge had deteriorated. Resettlement pathway support work was generally reasonable and provision for children and families was good. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good on either site against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

All eligible prisoners should have an OASys assessment and a review within the required timescales. (S54)

Not achieved

Recommendations

The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis and focus more on the importance of offender management, with an action plan setting out priorities. (4.9)

Partially achieved

Release on temporary licence processes should ensure that contributions from all relevant key personnel are included and considered, and that an appropriate level of governance and authority is applied. (4.10)

No longer relevant

All relevant prisoners should have timely and regular contact with their offender supervisor. (4.21)

Achieved

Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) processes should be improved to ensure timely identification before release, ensuring the involvement of offender managers where appropriate. (4.28)

Achieved

Prisoners facing an indeterminate sentence should be given information and support and, after sentencing, should be able to access family days. (4.38)

Not achieved

Resettlement needs should be comprehensively assessed and planned for on arrival and again before release. (4.42)

Achieved

The number of homeless prisoners helped to find accommodation on release should be monitored to demonstrate effectiveness. (4.45)

Achieved

The links made with employers should be fully exploited to provide more opportunities for release on temporary licence and improve employment prospects for prisoners. (4.51)

Achieved

A health care discharge summary should be sent prisoners' GP or be given to the prisoner before release, and all prisoners should receive information and assistance to access community health services on release. (4.54)

Achieved

There should be adequate debt advice provision to meet the needs of prisoners. (4.60)

Achieved

All prisoners should be able to have at least one visit a week. (4.67)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.51)

Appendix III: 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	17	384	64.3
Recall	4	66	11.2
Convicted unsentenced	10	59	11.1
Remand	11	69	12.8
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	4	0.6
Total	42	582	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	22	137	25.5
Less than six months	4	57	9.8
six months to less than 12 months	2	40	6.7
12 months to less than 2 years	4	78	13.1
2 years to less than 4 years	9	135	23.1
4 years to less than 10 years	1	77	12.5
10 years and over (not life)	0	27	4.3
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	7	1.1
Life	0	24	5
Total	42	582	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	18	
Under 21 years	42	6.7
21 years to 29 years	783	29.3
30 years to 39 years	194	31.1
40 years to 49 years	118	18.9
50 years to 59 years	54	8.7
60 years to 69 years	18	2.9
70 plus years	15	2.4
Please state maximum age here:	91	
Total	624	100

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	35	534	91.2
Foreign nationals	6	45	8.2
Not stated	1	3	0.6
Total	42	582	100

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	19	127	23.4
Uncategorised sentenced	5	28	5.3
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	39	6.3
Category C	0	380	60.9
Category D	0	7	1.1
Other	18 (YOI CLOSED)	1 (YOI CLOSED)	3
Total	42	582	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White	28	503	85.1
British	26	454	76.9
Irish	0	3	0.5
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	18	2.9
Other white	2	28	4.8
Mixed	3	18	3.4
White and black Caribbean	2	10	1.9
White and black African	1	4	0.8
White and Asian	0	0	0
Other mixed	0	4	0.6
Asian or Asian British	4	15	3
Indian	1	3	0.6
Pakistani	1	2	0.5
Bangladeshi	0	3	0.5
Chinese	0	0	0
Other Asian	2	7	1.4
Black or black British	7	41	7.7
Caribbean	1	17	2.9
African	4	12	2.6
Other black	2	12	2.2
Other ethnic group	0	2	0.3
Arab	0	1	0.2
Other ethnic group	0	1	0.2
Not stated	0	3	0.5
Total	42	582	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	0	0
Church of England	2	97	15.9
Roman Catholic	7	92	15.9
Other Christian denominations	7	65	11.5
Muslim	7	31	6.1
Sikh	0	4	0.6
Hindu	0	1	0.2
Buddhist	0	11	1.8
Jewish	0	2	0.3
Other	2	3	0.8
No religion	16	274	46.5
Total	42	582	100

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)	Not available		
Total			

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	9	1.4	88	14.7
1 month to 3 months	5	0.8	126	20.2
3 months to six months	6	1	109	17.5
six months to 1 year	0	0	85	13.6
1 year to 2 years	0	0	29	4.6
2 years to 4 years	0	0	7	1.1
4 years or more	0	0	1	0.2
Total	20	3.2	445	71.3

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	0	0
Total	0	0	0%

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	7	1.1	51	8.2
1 month to 3 months	9	1.4	51	1
3 months to six months	5	0.8	27	8.2
six months to 1 year	1	0.2	6	4.3
1 year to 2 years	0	0	2	0.3
2 years to 4 years	0	0	0	0
4 years or more	0	0	0	0
Total	22	3.5	137	22

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

Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

Prisoner survey methodology

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

Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment.⁹ 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 22 June 2016 the prisoner population at HMP Winchester was 503 on the main site and 125 on the West Hill site. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 202 prisoners on the main site. All prisoners were offered a questionnaire on the West Hill site.

On the main site, we received a total of 173 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 86%. This included one questionnaire that was completed via interview. Three respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 26 questionnaires were not returned.

⁹ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 7%. 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	25
B	50
C	41
D	50
Healthcare	6
Segregation	1

On the West Hill site, we received a total of 77 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 62%. Fourteen respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 34 questionnaires were not returned.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
Hearn	20
Alfred	28
Temple	13
Wykeham	16

Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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 differences¹⁰ 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 for the main site:

- The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2016 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 33 local prisons since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2016 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Winchester in 2014.

¹⁰ 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 responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- 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.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner wing (D) and the responses of prisoners on A, B and C wings.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of prisoners on the Induction wing (A) and the responses of prisoners on B, C and D wings.

The following comparative analyses are presented for the West Hill site:

- The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2016 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 36 category C training prisons since April 2012.
- The current survey responses from HMP Winchester in 2016 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Winchester in 2014.
- 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 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.

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?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	46 (27%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	51 (30%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	31 (18%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	21 (12%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	6 (4%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	102 (60%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	43 (26%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	16 (10%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	29 (18%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	28 (17%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	13 (8%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Life</i>	8 (5%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>No</i>	156 (92%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	166 (98%)
	<i>No</i>	4 (2%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	164 (96%)
	<i>No</i>	6 (4%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	<i>White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i>	128 (74%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i>	1 (1%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>White - other</i>	18 (10%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 6 (3%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i>	3 (2%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i>	6 (3%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Black or black British - other</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> 1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Arab</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i>	0 (0%)	<i>Other ethnic group</i> 4 (2%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</i>	1 (1%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	<i>Yes</i>		15 (9%)
	<i>No</i>		153 (91%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	<i>None</i>	62 (37%)	<i>Hindu</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Church of England</i>	42 (25%)	<i>Jewish</i> 0 (0%)
	<i>Catholic</i>	32 (19%)	<i>Muslim</i> 9 (5%)
	<i>Protestant</i>	2 (1%)	<i>Sikh</i> 2 (1%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i>	9 (5%)	<i>Other</i> 8 (5%)
	<i>Buddhist</i>	3 (2%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	<i>Heterosexual/ Straight</i>		159 (96%)
	<i>Homosexual/Gay</i>		0 (0%)
	<i>Bisexual</i>		6 (4%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		61 (36%)
	<i>No</i>		108 (64%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	<i>Yes</i>		10 (6%)
	<i>No</i>		158 (94%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	<i>Yes</i>		59 (35%)
	<i>No</i>		111 (65%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	<i>Yes</i>		74 (43%)
	<i>No</i>		97 (57%)

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>	126 (74%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	37 (22%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (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>	126 (75%)
	Yes	23 (14%)
	No	17 (10%)
	Don't remember	1 (1%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	126 (74%)
	Yes	6 (4%)
	No	36 (21%)
	Don't remember	2 (1%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	117 (68%)
	No	42 (24%)
	Don't remember	13 (8%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	128 (76%)
	No	38 (22%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well	62 (36%)
	Well	71 (41%)
	Neither	26 (15%)
	Badly	6 (3%)
	Very badly	4 (2%)
	Don't remember	3 (2%)
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	114 (67%)
	Yes, I received written information	3 (2%)
	No, I was not told anything	45 (26%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here, did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	138 (81%)
	No	28 (16%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	57 (34%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	103 (61%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	132 (78%)
	No	29 (17%)
	Don't remember	9 (5%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?		
	<i>Very well</i>		30 (18%)
	<i>Well</i>		69 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i>		40 (24%)
	<i>Badly</i>		20 (12%)
	<i>Very badly</i>		7 (4%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>		2 (1%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Loss of property</i>	27 (16%)	<i>Physical health</i> 45 (27%)
	<i>Housing problems</i>	45 (27%)	<i>Mental health</i> 55 (33%)
	<i>Contacting employers</i>	11 (7%)	<i>Needing protection from other prisoners</i> 13 (8%)
	<i>Contacting family</i>	80 (48%)	<i>Getting phone numbers</i> 69 (42%)
	<i>Childcare</i>	6 (4%)	<i>Other</i> 16 (10%)
	<i>Money worries</i>	48 (29%)	<i>Did not have any problems</i> 22 (13%)
	<i>Feeling depressed or suicidal</i>	52 (31%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	<i>Yes</i>		41 (25%)
	<i>No</i>		99 (61%)
	<i>Did not have any problems</i>		22 (14%)
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Tobacco</i>		126 (75%)
	<i>A shower</i>		20 (12%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i>		36 (21%)
	<i>Something to eat</i>		111 (66%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i>		91 (54%)
	<i>Toiletries/ basic items</i>		114 (68%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i>		7 (4%)
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	<i>Chaplain</i>		66 (40%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i>		103 (62%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i>		50 (30%)
	<i>Prison shop/ canteen</i>		30 (18%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i>		39 (23%)
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>		68 (42%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i>		57 (35%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i>		68 (42%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i>		64 (40%)
	<i>Health services</i>		67 (41%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i>		61 (38%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i>		50 (31%)

Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	101 (60%)
	No	57 (34%)
	Don't remember	10 (6%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	22 (13%)
	Within the first week	91 (55%)
	More than a week	44 (27%)
	Don't remember	9 (5%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	22 (13%)
	Yes	70 (42%)
	No	62 (37%)
	Don't remember	12 (7%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	24 (14%)
	Within the first week	64 (38%)
	More than a week	67 (40%)
	Don't remember	14 (8%)

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?	13 (8%)	38 (23%)	21 (13%)	39 (24%)	32 (20%) 19 (12%)
	Attend legal visits?	18 (11%)	57 (36%)	24 (15%)	15 (9%)	15 (9%) 29 (18%)
	Get bail information?	8 (5%)	11 (7%)	24 (16%)	24 (16%)	31 (20%) 56 (36%)
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					18 (11%)
	Yes					85 (51%)
	No					64 (38%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	Yes					73 (44%)
	No					15 (9%)
	Don't know					78 (47%)

Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:		
		Yes	No
			Don't know
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	59 (35%)	110 (64%) 2 (1%)
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	93 (55%)	75 (44%) 1 (1%)
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	102 (61%)	61 (36%) 5 (3%)
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	89 (53%)	76 (45%) 4 (2%)
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	18 (11%)	138 (82%) 13(8%)
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	66 (39%)	99 (59%) 4 (2%)
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	16 (10%)	120 (71%) 32 (19%)
Q4.5	What is the food like here?		
	<i>Very good</i>		6 (4%)
	<i>Good</i>		36 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>		45 (27%)
	<i>Bad</i>		40 (24%)
	<i>Very bad</i>		41 (24%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?		
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>		14 (8%)
	<i>Yes</i>		69 (41%)
	<i>No</i>		85 (51%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?		
	<i>Yes</i>		97 (57%)
	<i>No</i>		33 (19%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		41 (24%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?		
	<i>Yes</i>		75 (44%)
	<i>No</i>		19 (11%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>		76 (45%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?		
	<i>Yes</i>		76 (44%)
	<i>No</i>		16 (9%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i>		80 (47%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?		
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>		34 (20%)
	<i>Very easy</i>		22 (13%)
	<i>Easy</i>		48 (28%)
	<i>Neither</i>		13 (8%)
	<i>Difficult</i>		10 (6%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>		12 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i>		33 (19%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	<i>Yes</i>	116 (68%)
	<i>No</i>	46 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	8 (5%)

Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	12 (8%)	54 (34%)	94 (59%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	12 (8%)	34 (22%)	110 (71%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes			76 (45%)
	No			49 (29%)
	Don't know			45 (26%)
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints. (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)	<i>Not made one</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	60 (37%)	24 (15%)	77 (48%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	60 (37%)	15 (9%)	89 (54%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes			47 (29%)
	No			113 (71%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	Don't know who they are			68 (41%)
	Very easy			12 (7%)
	Easy			21 (13%)
	Neither			31 (19%)
	Difficult			22 (13%)
	Very difficult			10 (6%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is	21 (13%)
	Yes	67 (41%)
	No	56 (34%)
	Don't know	19 (12%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	Don't know what the IEP scheme is	21 (13%)
	Yes	57 (35%)
	No	68 (41%)
	Don't know	19 (12%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	18 (11%)
	No	145 (89%)

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>	131 (82%)
	<i>Very well</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Well</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Neither</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Badly</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	2 (1%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	<i>Yes</i>	116 (73%)
	<i>No</i>	44 (28%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	<i>Yes</i>	119 (73%)
	<i>No</i>	45 (27%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	<i>Yes</i>	48 (28%)
	<i>No</i>	121 (72%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Never</i>	34 (20%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	61 (35%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	33 (19%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	9 (5%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	100 (60%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	30 (18%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	23 (14%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	100 (65%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>Neither</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	2 (1%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	93 (56%)
	<i>No</i>	73 (44%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	43 (26%)
	<i>No</i>	123 (74%)

Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Never felt unsafe	73 (45%)	At meal times 27 (16%)
	Everywhere	23 (14%)	At health services 18 (11%)
	Segregation unit	10 (6%)	Visits area 15 (9%)
	Association areas	53 (32%)	In wing showers 44 (27%)
	Reception area	25 (15%)	In gym showers 15 (9%)
	At the gym	11 (7%)	In corridors/stairwells 23 (14%)
	In an exercise yard	33 (20%)	On your landing/wing 41 (25%)
	At work	11 (7%)	In your cell 31 (19%)
	During movement	33 (20%)	At religious services 9 (5%)
	At education	10 (6%)	
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?		
	Yes		57 (34%)
	No		112 (66%)
Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)		28 (17%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)		24 (14%)
	Sexual abuse		6 (4%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated		41 (24%)
	Having your canteen/property taken		23 (14%)
	Medication		17 (10%)
	Debt		12 (7%)
	Drugs		11 (7%)
	Your race or ethnic origin		6 (4%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs		5 (3%)
	Your nationality		8 (5%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others		6 (4%)
	You are from a traveller community		4 (2%)
	Your sexual orientation		5 (3%)
	Your age		7 (4%)
	You have a disability		10 (6%)
	You were new here		14 (8%)
	Your offence/ crime		10 (6%)
	Gang related issues		15 (9%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?		
	Yes		68 (40%)
	No		102 (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>	32 (19%)
<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	11 (6%)
<i>Sexual abuse</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	33 (19%)
<i>Medication</i>	18 (11%)
<i>Debt</i>	5 (3%)
<i>Drugs</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i>	9 (5%)
<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	8 (5%)
<i>Your nationality</i>	8 (5%)
<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i>	11 (6%)
<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	3 (2%)
<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	2 (1%)
<i>Your age</i>	6 (4%)
<i>You have a disability</i>	12 (7%)
<i>You were new here</i>	19 (11%)
<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	6 (4%)
<i>Gang related issues</i>	10 (6%)

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

<i>Not been victimised</i>	77 (49%)
<i>Yes</i>	22 (14%)
<i>No</i>	58 (37%)

Section 9: Health services**Q9.1 How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:**

	<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
The doctor	12 (7%)	9 (5%)	29 (18%)	16 (10%)	49 (30%)	50 (30%)
The nurse	15 (9%)	13 (8%)	46 (28%)	22 (14%)	33 (20%)	33 (20%)
The dentist	31 (19%)	2 (1%)	12 (7%)	3 (2%)	37 (23%)	79 (48%)

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

	<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
The doctor	22 (13%)	23 (14%)	39 (23%)	22 (13%)	31 (19%)	30 (18%)
The nurse	17 (10%)	20 (12%)	52 (32%)	21 (13%)	22 (14%)	30 (19%)
The dentist	63 (40%)	8 (5%)	18 (11%)	16 (10%)	16 (10%)	37 (23%)

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

<i>Not been</i>	15 (9%)
<i>Very good</i>	18 (11%)
<i>Good</i>	29 (17%)
<i>Neither</i>	23 (14%)
<i>Bad</i>	37 (22%)
<i>Very bad</i>	44 (27%)

Q9.4 Are you currently taking medication?

<i>Yes</i>	105 (63%)
<i>No</i>	62 (37%)

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

<i>Not taking medication</i>	62 (37%)
<i>Yes, all my meds</i>	21 (13%)
<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>	31 (19%)
<i>No</i>	53 (32%)

Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?	
	Yes	85 (51%)
	No	81 (49%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?	
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>	81 (52%)
	Yes	35 (22%)
	No	41 (26%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	64 (39%)
	No	100 (61%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	37 (22%)
	No	128 (78%)
Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy	40 (24%)
	Easy	27 (16%)
	Neither	9 (5%)
	Difficult	3 (2%)
	Very difficult	6 (4%)
	Don't know	82 (49%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy	16 (10%)
	Easy	19 (11%)
	Neither	15 (9%)
	Difficult	10 (6%)
	Very difficult	8 (5%)
	Don't know	100 (60%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	17 (10%)
	No	148 (90%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	12 (7%)
	No	154 (93%)
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>	90 (57%)
	Yes	43 (27%)
	No	25 (16%)
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>	128 (78%)
	Yes	24 (15%)
	No	13 (8%)

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>	105 (66%)
	Yes	42 (26%)
	No	12 (8%)

Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	21 (13%)	10 (6%)	29 (17%)	22 (13%)	50 (30%)	35 (21%)
	Vocational or skills training	31 (20%)	5 (3%)	32 (20%)	19 (12%)	27 (17%)	43 (27%)
	Education (including basic skills)	18 (11%)	17 (11%)	69 (43%)	19 (12%)	18 (11%)	20 (12%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	52 (34%)	3 (2%)	19 (12%)	18 (12%)	27 (17%)	36 (23%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)						
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>					51 (32%)	
	Prison job					72 (45%)	
	Vocational or skills training					12 (8%)	
	Education (including basic skills)					42 (26%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes					10 (6%)	
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?						
		<i>Not been involved</i>	Yes	No	<i>Don't know</i>		
	Prison job	44 (32%)	35 (25%)	47 (34%)	12 (9%)		
	Vocational or skills training	60 (50%)	24 (20%)	26 (22%)	9 (8%)		
	Education (including basic skills)	39 (29%)	47 (35%)	39 (29%)	11 (8%)		
	Offending behaviour programmes	60 (49%)	28 (23%)	24 (20%)	10 (8%)		
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					17 (10%)	
	Never					28 (17%)	
	<i>Less than once a week</i>					43 (26%)	
	<i>About once a week</i>					72 (44%)	
	<i>More than once a week</i>					3 (2%)	
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?						
	<i>Don't use it</i>					40 (25%)	
	Yes					68 (43%)	
	No					52 (33%)	
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?						
	<i>Don't want to go</i>					27 (17%)	
	0					48 (30%)	
	1 to 2					81 (50%)	
	3 to 5					5 (3%)	
	<i>More than 5</i>					1 (1%)	

Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	29 (18%)
	<i>0</i>	48 (30%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	60 (37%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	4 (2%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>0</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>	74 (46%)
	<i>More than 5</i>	63 (39%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	87 (54%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	25 (15%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (4%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	29 (18%)
	<i>No</i>	136 (82%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	90 (57%)
	<i>No</i>	68 (43%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	67 (41%)
	<i>No</i>	95 (59%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	39 (23%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Easy</i>	34 (20%)
	<i>Neither</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	30 (18%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	29 (17%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (2%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	43 (27%)
	<i>Yes</i>	81 (50%)
	<i>No</i>	38 (23%)

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>	81 (50%)
	<i>No contact</i>	34 (21%)
	<i>Letter</i>	20 (12%)
	<i>Phone</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Visit</i>	26 (16%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	60 (38%)
	<i>No</i>	97 (62%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	43 (27%)
	<i>Yes</i>	26 (16%)
	<i>No</i>	89 (56%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	132 (84%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Involved</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Neither</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	6 (4%)
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>	132 (86%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	5 (3%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	132 (84%)
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (4%)
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>	132 (83%)
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (6%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	132 (83%)
	<i>Yes</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>No</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (9%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	62 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	87 (55%)

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

Yes	15 (10%)
No	142 (90%)

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

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	32 (21%)	33 (22%)	87 (57%)
Accommodation	28 (19%)	34 (23%)	89 (59%)
Benefits	28 (19%)	47 (32%)	73 (49%)
Finances	29 (21%)	20 (14%)	91 (65%)
Education	35 (25%)	28 (20%)	79 (56%)
Drugs and alcohol	39 (27%)	57 (39%)	50 (34%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i>	43 (27%)
Yes	54 (34%)
No	61 (39%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester 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 Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	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		173	6,058	173	165
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	7%	6%	7%	9%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	75%	68%	75%	53%
1.3	Are you on recall?	14%	10%	14%	8%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	16%	20%	16%	19%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	4%	3%	4%	5%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	8%	13%	8%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	97%	98%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	96%	97%	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.)	15%	25%	15%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9%	5%	9%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	5%	13%	5%	6%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	4%	3%	4%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	36%	25%	36%	20%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	5%	6%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	33%	35%	31%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	43%	54%	43%	54%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	22%	23%	22%	23%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	56%	39%	56%	52%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	13%	8%	13%	16%
2.4	Was the van clean?	68%	57%	68%	64%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	76%	74%	76%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	77%	67%	77%	71%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	67%	63%	67%	73%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	3%	2%	2%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81%	78%	81%	89%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	34%	40%	34%	29%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	78%	78%	78%	71%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	62%	59%	52%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	87%	77%	87%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	16%	16%	16%	13%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	27%	22%	27%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	7%	5%	7%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	48%	34%	48%	39%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	3%	4%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	29%	24%	29%	23%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	31%	24%	31%	27%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	27%	18%	27%	17%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	33%	24%	33%	21%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	8%	8%	8%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	42%	32%	42%	29%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	29%	31%	29%	33%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	75%	79%	75%	82%
3.6	A shower?	12%	29%	12%	15%
3.6	A free telephone call?	22%	54%	22%	26%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	70%	66%	66%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	54%	51%	54%	53%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	68%	57%	68%	59%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	40%	45%	40%	42%
3.7	Someone from health services?	62%	66%	62%	68%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	30%	31%	30%	42%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	18%	21%	18%	20%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	42%	41%	42%	37%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	36%	35%	46%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	42%	34%	42%	34%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	40%	33%	40%	33%
3.8	Health services?	41%	43%	41%	48%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	38%	39%	38%	42%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	70%	60%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	87%	74%	87%	88%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	49%	49%	49%	50%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	86%	74%	86%	81%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	31%	36%	31%	36%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	47%	51%	47%	43%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%	17%	12%	20%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	51%	42%	51%	42%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	44%	35%	44%	29%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	35%	50%	35%	33%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	55%	74%	55%	84%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	61%	67%	61%	68%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	53%	51%	53%	70%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	11%	25%	11%	15%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	39%	57%	39%	44%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	10%	20%	10%	14%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25%	21%	25%	7%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	47%	41%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	57%	53%	57%	49%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	49%	44%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	44%	50%	44%	52%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	41%	44%	41%	41%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints				
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	68%	72%	68%	74%
For those who have made an application:				
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	36%	48%	36%	55%
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	24%	33%	24%	44%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	45%	49%	45%	47%
For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	24%	28%	24%	35%
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	15%	23%	15%	37%
5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	29%	21%	29%	23%
5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	20%	18%	20%	16%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme				
6.1 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	41%	40%	41%	43%
6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	35%	39%	35%	42%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	10%	11%	7%
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?	25%	36%	25%	21%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff				
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	73%	72%	73%	63%
7.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	67%	73%	68%
7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	27%	29%	18%
7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	15%	17%	15%	10%
7.5 Do you have a personal officer?	40%	34%	40%	23%
For those with a personal officer:				
7.6 Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	62%	67%	62%	53%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	56%	47%	56%	43%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	26%	22%	26%	21%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	34%	31%	34%	34%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:					
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	13%	17%	17%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	14%	9%	14%	11%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	2%	4%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	24%	17%	24%	19%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	14%	8%	14%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	10%	5%	10%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	7%	4%	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	5%	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	3%	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%	4%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	2%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	1%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	4%	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	6%	8%	13%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	6%	6%	6%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9%	5%	9%	5%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	40%	33%	40%	34%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	19%	12%	19%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	6%	7%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	19%	13%	19%	16%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	11%	6%	11%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	3%	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	4%	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	3%	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	3%	7%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	3%	7%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	5%	11%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	3%	5%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	6%	3%	6%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	28%	34%	28%	25%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	23%	21%	23%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	36%	42%	36%	52%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	9%	8%	9%	8%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	43%	40%	43%	41%
9.2	The nurse?	50%	51%	50%	57%
9.2	The dentist?	27%	29%	27%	31%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	31%	35%	31%	37%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	63%	52%	63%	51%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	50%	59%	50%	58%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	51%	41%	51%	45%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	46%	42%	46%	38%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	39%	33%	39%	38%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	23%	21%	23%	20%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	38%	40%	34%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	21%	18%	21%	9%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	10%	10%	10%	6%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	7%	8%	7%	6%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	63%	56%	63%	68%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	65%	53%	65%	61%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	78%	76%	78%	88%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	23%	31%	23%	24%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	24%	29%	24%	22%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	53%	44%	53%	45%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	14%	17%	14%	11%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	45%	43%	45%	38%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	8%	8%	8%	1%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	26%	23%	26%	20%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	6%	7%	6%	5%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	68%	68%	68%	65%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	37%	40%	37%	30%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	50%	56%	50%	45%
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?	41%	44%	41%	32%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	71%	66%	71%	60%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	48%	50%	48%	47%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	51%	53%	51%	50%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	45%	40%	45%	42%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	46%	28%	46%	32%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	43%	32%	43%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	4%	24%	4%	9%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	15%	41%	15%	25%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	39%	42%	39%	59%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	6%	9%	6%	9%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	18%	31%	18%	18%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	57%	49%	57%	50%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	41%	34%	41%	36%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	29%	35%	29%	30%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Winchester 2016	Local prisons comparator	HMP Winchester 2016	HMP Winchester 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	68%	61%	68%	60%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	43%	43%	43%	59%
13.2	Contact by letter?	25%	28%	25%	14%
13.2	Contact by phone?	12%	13%	12%	14%
13.2	Contact by visit?	33%	36%	33%	26%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	38%	30%	38%	22%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	23%	33%	23%	24%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	32%	54%	32%	50%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	55%	46%	55%	32%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	23%	31%	23%	42%
13.6	Offender manager?	23%	25%	23%	52%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	19%	11%	19%	5%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	23%	18%	23%	0%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	36%	53%	36%	45%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	32%	28%	32%	62%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	18%	31%	18%	38%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	7%	6%	9%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	10%	11%	10%	5%
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?	28%	26%	28%	18%
13.12	Accommodation?	28%	32%	28%	26%
13.12	Benefits?	39%	34%	39%	39%
13.12	Finances?	18%	21%	18%	18%
13.12	Education?	26%	27%	26%	20%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	53%	40%	53%	45%
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?	47%	45%	47%	40%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Winchester 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
	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		25	147
1.3	Are you sentenced?	68%	76%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	16%	7%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	96%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	32%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	28%	37%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	37%	34%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	76%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	68%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	60%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	75%	89%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	71%	61%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	61%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	86%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	29%	32%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	32%	35%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	37%	58%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	4%	12%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	25%	25%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	28%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	48%	59%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	44%	45%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	76%	67%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	40%	46%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	28%	44%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	24%	37%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	28%	8%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	63%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	66%	74%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	16%	15%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	28%	43%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	59%	55%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24%	26%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	24%	36%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	25%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	8%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	8%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	4%	6%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	52%	38%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	24%	19%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	24%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	16%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	12%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	12%	6%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	24%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	45%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	52%	65%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	48%	52%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	48%	39%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	44%	46%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	8%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	28%	26%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	7%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	46%	46%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	4%	4%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	12%	16%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	24%	42%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	0%	7%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	66%	56%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	32%	43%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability and age over 50) HMP Winchester 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		61	108		31	140
1.3	Are you sentenced?	72%	76%		93%	70%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	7%	8%		0%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	97%		100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	96%		100%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	12%	17%		7%	17%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	12%	7%		3%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	7%		3%	6%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?				52%	32%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	10%	4%		23%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	35%		67%	28%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	80%	76%		74%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	73%	65%		68%	66%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	77%		83%	77%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	59%	58%		66%	58%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	100%	80%		86%	87%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	67%	60%		57%	63%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	46%	67%		55%	62%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	90%		81%	88%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	21%	38%		30%	32%

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	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	32%	35%	52%	31%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	52%	56%	68%	52%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	14%	9%	32%	6%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	22%	48%	20%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	39%	44%	40%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	62%	52%	71%	53%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	47%	44%	58%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	38%	54%	42%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	71%	66%	90%	64%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	42%	42%	46%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	40%	41%	74%	33%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	34%	34%	36%	35%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	14%	9%	0%	13%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	73%	71%	89%	69%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	72%	72%	81%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	13%	14%	22%	14%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	43%	38%	43%	39%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	70%	49%	36%	60%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	34%	21%	14%	28%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	43%	28%	19%	37%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	28%	23%	10%	28%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	3%	3%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	5%	3%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	3%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	17%	0%	10%	5%

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	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	41%	10%	46%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	20%	20%	7%	22%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	6%	0%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	5%	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	5%	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	17%	2%	3%	8%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	25%	22%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	33%	38%	36%	36%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	74%	55%	78%	60%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	74%	39%	36%	54%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	31%	46%	26%	44%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	36%	50%	40%	46%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	7%	8%	3%	9%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	23%	27%	26%	27%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	4%	8%	3%	7%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	43%	49%	58%	44%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	4%	4%	3%	4%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	7%	19%	3%	18%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	32%	42%	58%	35%
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%	6%	17%	3%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	53%	60%	52%	58%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	36%	46%	26%	45%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester 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

		Induction wing (A)	All other wings (B, C and D)
	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		25	141
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	9%	6%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	83%	73%
1.3	Are you on recall?	17%	13%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	21%	16%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	9%	2%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	8%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	5%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	4%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	36%	34%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	9%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	41%	32%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	44%	44%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	40%	19%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	92%	72%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	60%	68%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	71%	82%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Induction wing (A)	All other wings (B, C and D)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	44%	32%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	77%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	60%	60%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	84%	88%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	16%	16%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	36%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	7%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	40%	50%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	0%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	24%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	21%	33%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	24%	28%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	28%	33%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	9%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	16%	46%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	76%	77%
3.6	A shower?	21%	11%
3.6	A free telephone call?	36%	20%
3.6	Something to eat?	72%	66%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	72%	53%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	68%	70%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Induction wing (A)	All other wings (B, C and D)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	52%	38%
3.7	Someone from health services?	68%	62%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	40%	29%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	12%	20%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	33%	46%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	33%	37%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	54%	41%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	41%	40%
3.8	Health services?	59%	40%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	54%	36%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	75%	58%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	86%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	88%	86%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	31%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	30%	50%
4.1	Get bail information?	25%	11%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	59%	49%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	50%	45%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	36%	33%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	52%	56%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	63%	61%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	52%	53%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	12%	8%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	28%	42%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	24%	7%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	21%	25%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	42%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	56%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	40%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	48%	44%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	40%	43%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Induction wing (A)	All other wings (B, C and D)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	68%	68%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	48%	45%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	33%	29%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	21%	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?	21%	44%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	30%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	21%	9%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	87%	71%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	79%	72%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	50%	23%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	21%	14%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	44%	38%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Induction wing (A)	All other wings (B, C and D)
	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 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	41%	58%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	27%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	33%	35%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	17%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	29%	12%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	4%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	26%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	13%	14%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	9%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	9%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9%	9%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Induction wing (A)	All other wings (B, C and D)
	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 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	37%	41%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	20%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	17%	20%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	9%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	14%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	9%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	6%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	30%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	57%	32%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	0%	8%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	61%	64%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	43%	52%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	52%	37%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	14%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	43%	39%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	13%	22%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	11%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	8%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Induction wing (A)	All other wings (B, C and D)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	25%	22%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	30%	22%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	59%	53%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	26%	13%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	30%	48%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	13%	6%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	30%	27%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	9%	6%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	30%	49%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	41%	43%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	5%	4%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	13%	15%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	52%	38%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	5%	6%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	26%	15%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	45%	59%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	30%	44%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	22%	31%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	38%	37%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	15%	7%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester 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

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (D)	All other wings (A, B and C)
	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		50	116
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	4%	8%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	86%	69%
1.3	Are you on recall?	16%	13%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	12%	18%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	4%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	96%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	12%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	4%	11%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	4%	6%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	11%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	46%	30%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	12%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	55%	25%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	22%	54%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	14%	25%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	68%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	84%	76%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	60%	69%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	88%	77%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (D)	All other wings (A, B and C)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	26%	37%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	82%	77%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	73%	54%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	94%	84%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	12%	18%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	27%	27%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	9%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	44%	50%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	4%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	27%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	46%	25%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	27%	28%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	40%	29%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	19%	4%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	44%	40%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	70%	80%
3.6	A shower?	6%	15%
3.6	A free telephone call?	6%	30%
3.6	Something to eat?	66%	68%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	48%	59%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	76%	67%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (D)	All other wings (A, B and C)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	37%	42%
3.7	Someone from health services?	66%	61%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	40%	27%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	19%	19%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	42%	45%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	42%	35%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	42%	44%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	35%	42%
3.8	Health services?	37%	45%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	31%	42%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	52%	64%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	80%	90%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	92%	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?	37%	29%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	38%	51%
4.1	Get bail information?	10%	14%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	29%	59%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	42%	47%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	40%	31%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	66%	51%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	73%	56%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	86%	40%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	14%	6%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	55%	34%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	12%	9%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	34%	20%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	50%	38%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	72%	51%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	45%	44%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	42%	46%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	42%	43%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (D)	All other wings (A, B and C)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	90%	59%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	54%	42%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	16%	36%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	16%	21%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	68%	28%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	42%	32%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	16%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	94%	64%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	82%	70%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	30%	26%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	16%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	45%	37%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (D)	All other wings (A, B and C)
	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 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	64%	52%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	28%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	46%	29%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	24%	14%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	17%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	8%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	38%	19%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	16%	13%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	10%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	6%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	10%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	8%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	10%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	14%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	11%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (D)	All other wings (A, B and C)
	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 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	47%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	21%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	9%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	25%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	6%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	7%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	27%	20%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	39%	34%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	9%	6%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	74%	59%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	56%	49%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	20%	47%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	28%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	28%	45%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	10%	25%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	4%	12%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	6%	7%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Vulnerable prisoner wing (D)	All other wings (A, B and C)
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	29%	20%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	24%	23%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	59%	52%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	10%	17%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	42%	47%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	4%	9%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	31%	26%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	4%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	63%	39%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	42%	42%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	6%	3%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	0%	22%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	59%	32%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	9%	5%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	18%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	54%	58%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	35%	45%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	27%	31%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	52%	30%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	9%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	6%	9%

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Winchester (West Hill) 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 Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
	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		77	6,391	77	101
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	0%	1%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	9%	7%	11%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	25%	6%	25%	24%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	2%	9%	2%	7%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	2%	9%	2%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	99%	98%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	98%	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%	25%	15%	14%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	10%	4%	10%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	13%	2%	6%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	4%	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	22%	21%	22%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	6%	2%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	32%	38%	32%	34%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	57%	51%	57%	54%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	31%	45%	31%	21%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	60%	74%	60%	43%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	0%	8%	0%	13%
2.4	Was the van clean?	47%	62%	47%	63%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	67%	79%	67%	82%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	77%	73%	77%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	66%	60%	66%	72%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	2%	14%	2%	9%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	76%	86%	76%	92%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	38%	54%	38%	43%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	80%	85%	80%	82%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	49%	76%	49%	61%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	81%	61%	81%	65%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	24%	18%	24%	8%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	24%	12%	24%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	8%	2%	8%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	32%	18%	32%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	2%	2%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	26%	13%	26%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	15%	20%	18%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	28%	13%	28%	13%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	24%	17%	24%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	5%	5%	5%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	47%	16%	47%	26%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	22%	36%	22%	30%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	75%	75%	75%	66%
3.6	A shower?	15%	28%	15%	22%
3.6	A free telephone call?	23%	42%	23%	33%
3.6	Something to eat?	60%	55%	60%	66%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	65%	51%	65%	55%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	55%	47%	55%	55%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisoners comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	27%	53%	27%	40%
3.7	Someone from health services?	47%	70%	47%	61%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	27%	33%	27%	47%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	10%	24%	10%	17%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	34%	50%	34%	53%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	35%	40%	35%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	21%	44%	21%	45%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	24%	39%	24%	39%
3.8	Health services?	38%	52%	38%	44%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	24%	48%	24%	45%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	58%	82%	58%	76%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	90%	91%	97%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	44%	60%	44%	56%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	89%	84%	89%	99%
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?	32%	45%	32%	34%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	38%	47%	38%	38%
4.1	Get bail information?	6%	14%	6%	13%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	63%	39%	63%	38%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	37%	42%	37%	40%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	65%	67%	65%	70%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	92%	89%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	67%	72%	67%	74%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	74%	66%	74%	90%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	27%	35%	27%	32%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	57%	69%	57%	65%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	9%	24%	9%	25%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	16%	31%	16%	16%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	19%	48%	19%	61%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	38%	57%	38%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	32%	52%	32%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	34%	59%	34%	50%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	26%	50%	26%	48%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints				
5.1 Is it easy to make an application?	74%	81%	74%	80%
For those who have made an application:				
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	39%	57%	39%	66%
5.2 Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	18%	40%	18%	41%
5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?	36%	60%	36%	50%
For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	13%	34%	13%	44%
5.4 Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	8%	29%	8%	43%
5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	31%	19%	31%	18%
5.6 Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	17%	30%	17%	31%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme				
6.1 Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	55%	49%	55%	53%
6.2 Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	45%	48%	49%
6.3 In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	8%	4%	4%
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?	14%	37%	14%	50%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff				
7.1 Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	74%	80%	74%	75%
7.2 Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	73%	74%	73%	82%
7.3 Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	22%	30%	22%	28%
7.4 Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	14%	21%	14%	17%
7.5 Do you have a personal officer?	85%	64%	85%	68%
For those with a personal officer:				
7.6 Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	63%	63%	63%	81%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	50%	36%	50%	29%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	15%	15%	5%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	43%	27%	43%	22%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	12%	22%	12%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	8%	13%	7%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	1%	4%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	24%	16%	24%	12%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	10%	7%	10%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	11%	4%	11%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	10%	4%	10%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	9%	4%	9%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	11%	4%	11%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	3%	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	11%	4%	11%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	3%	1%	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	2%	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	11%	3%	11%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	15%	5%	15%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	14%	4%	14%	4%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued				
8.6 Have you been victimised by staff here?	28%	29%	28%	28%
Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7 Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	13%	11%	13%	10%
8.7 Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	4%	9%	3%
8.7 Sexually abused you?	4%	1%	4%	0%
8.7 Threatened or intimidated you?	16%	12%	16%	14%
8.7 Victimised you because of medication?	11%	4%	11%	1%
8.7 Victimised you because of debt?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.7 Victimised you because of drugs?	5%	2%	5%	1%
8.7 Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	4%	5%	4%
8.7 Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	3%	5%	2%
8.7 Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	1%
8.7 Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	7%	3%	7%	2%
8.7 Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	7%	1%	7%	0%
8.7 Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	5%	1%	5%	0%
8.7 Victimised you because of your age?	8%	2%	8%	1%
8.7 Victimised you because you have a disability?	4%	3%	4%	6%
8.7 Victimised you because you were new here?	9%	4%	9%	4%
8.7 Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	8%	4%	8%	1%
8.7 Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	2%	4%	2%
For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8 Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	24%	40%	24%	19%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	16%	29%	16%	25%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	33%	50%	33%	53%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	5%	14%	5%	16%
	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?	31%	47%	31%	39%
9.2	The nurse?	24%	56%	24%	44%
9.2	The dentist?	19%	43%	19%	35%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	22%	42%	22%	30%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	64%	49%	64%	47%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	77%	83%	77%	93%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	36%	32%	36%	31%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	56%	50%	56%	25%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	35%	25%	35%	22%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	20%	16%	20%	21%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	47%	41%	47%	37%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	41%	24%	41%	21%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	9%	10%	9%	7%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	7%	4%	8%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	74%	61%	74%	61%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	58%	64%	58%	61%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	88%	76%	88%	87%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities				
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1 A prison job?	63%	47%	63%	66%
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	37%	41%	37%	51%
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	59%	56%	59%	75%
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	23%	25%	41%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	84%	59%	84%	74%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	20%	16%	20%	17%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	18%	22%	18%	26%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	28%	12%	28%	17%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	95%	83%	95%	95%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	40%	43%	40%	49%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	89%	74%	89%	79%
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?	44%	57%	44%	51%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	92%	79%	92%	86%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	53%	58%	53%	50%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	88%	70%	88%	81%
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?	51%	50%	51%	56%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	37%	43%	37%	43%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	36%	46%	36%	40%
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	45%	33%	45%	44%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	66%	53%	66%	43%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	14%	65%	14%	51%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	24%	17%	24%	37%
SECTION 12: Friends and family				
12.1 Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	31%	34%	31%	36%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	63%	42%	63%	53%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	20%	24%	22%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	43%	28%	43%	42%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2016	HMP Winchester (West Hill) 2014
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	77%	82%	77%	77%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	50%	36%	50%	33%
13.2	Contact by letter?	13%	35%	13%	28%
13.2	Contact by phone?	11%	25%	11%	14%
13.2	Contact by visit?	35%	32%	35%	48%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	63%	75%	63%	77%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	40%	63%	40%	51%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	68%	53%	68%	59%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	51%	47%	51%	28%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	38%	37%	38%	53%
13.6	Offender manager?	11%	26%	11%	21%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	13%	12%	13%	26%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	13%	15%	13%	18%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	66%	62%	66%	55%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	13%	19%	13%	20%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	17%	28%	17%	32%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	6%	5%	4%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	15%	16%	15%	22%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	27%	34%	27%	43%
13.12	Accommodation?	33%	37%	33%	43%
13.12	Benefits?	44%	39%	44%	46%
13.12	Finances?	20%	28%	20%	24%
13.12	Education?	32%	34%	32%	36%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	45%	43%	45%	49%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	51%	55%	51%	49%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Winchester (West Hill) 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
	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		11	65
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11%	0%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	11%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	11%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	23%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	35%	31%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72%	80%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	35%	72%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	72%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	11%	57%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	89%	78%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	63%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	72%	54%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	100%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	17%	33%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	56%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	89%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	26%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	11%	18%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	11%	21%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	35%	38%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	30%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	28%	33%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	65%	75%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	11%	40%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	44%	56%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	28%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	72%	73%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	81%	71%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	11%	14%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	83%	85%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	35%	52%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	0%	19%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	31%	44%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	19%	23%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	19%	10%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	12%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	0%	5%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	17%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	11%	18%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	0%	18%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	28%	33%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	35%	68%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	17%	37%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	19%	50%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	65%	87%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	28%	18%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	17%	18%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	17%	29%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	44%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	65%	42%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	72%	66%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	0%	17%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	19%	23%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	44%	67%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	0%	29%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Winchester (West Hill) 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		17	60	12	64
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	2%	0%	2%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%	90%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	97%	90%	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.)	8%	17%	0%	18%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	18%	8%	16%	10%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	2%	0%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			42%	18%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	3%	10%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	31%	32%	32%	31%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	58%	84%	83%	77%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	39%	73%	56%	67%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	81%	89%	77%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	40%	52%	65%	46%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	92%	77%	90%	79%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	48%	47%	50%	48%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	44%	61%	65%	56%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	90%	100%	89%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	39%	30%	42%	28%

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	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	60%	67%	89%	60%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	81%	92%	100%	87%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	21%	29%	17%	29%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	8%	19%	38%	13%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	13%	20%	17%	19%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	39%	38%	42%	36%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	24%	33%	68%	26%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	31%	34%	32%	32%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	54%	78%	65%	75%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	25%	38%	56%	31%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	50%	56%	69%	52%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	57%	46%	65%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	5%	0%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	72%	100%	69%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	73%	100%	68%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	18%	13%	32%	11%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	89%	83%	90%	82%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	75%	44%	35%	53%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	27%	12%	12%	16%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	54%	40%	19%	48%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	40%	19%	0%	28%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	21%	9%	0%	13%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	13%	3%	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	21%	2%	0%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	25%	7%	19%	10%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	21%	2%	0%	6%

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	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	21%	31%	17%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	17%	11%	18%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	13%	3%	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	13%	3%	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	13%	2%	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	13%	6%	11%	8%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	13%	2%	0%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	25%	14%	28%	13%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	33%	33%	43%	30%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	91%	56%	100%	58%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	65%	29%	19%	39%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	54%	45%	35%	50%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	91%	81%	83%	84%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	14%	20%	0%	24%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	14%	19%	11%	20%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	35%	26%	17%	29%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	40%	35%	28%	39%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	13%	53%	0%	52%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	60%	67%	83%	63%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	8%	17%	31%	11%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	25%	22%	28%	23%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	60%	64%	50%	66%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	25%	24%	17%	26%