

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Eastwood Park

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

7–18 November 2016

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



Crown copyright 2017

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information 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: hmpirisons.enquiries@hmpirisons.gsi.gov.uk

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

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	13
Section 1. Safety	21
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	59
Appendix I: Inspection team	59
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	61
Appendix III: Prison population profile	67
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	71

Glossary of terms

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

Introduction

Eastwood Park, a women's resettlement prison in Falfield, Gloucestershire, held around 400 women, 100 more than at the last inspection in November 2013. The prison housed women with varied circumstances, including those remanded by the courts, a number serving very long determinate sentences and a small group serving indeterminate sentences. It continued to hold a few young adults aged 18 to 21. However, most of the women spent relatively short periods at the prison before being released or moving on to another prison. The mother and baby unit was temporarily closed during the inspection, but was due to reopen again in January 2017. The prison's catchment area remained wide, and had been extended further following the closure of HMP Holloway to encompass nearly all the south-western quarter of England and Wales.

The population remained vulnerable; many women were a long way from home, which was a problem for the large number who had dependent children. Nearly half of the women had a disability, and over three quarters reported mental health or emotional well-being issues. Eighty-four per cent of women said they had various problems on arrival at the prison, and over half said this included issues with drugs, while over a third reported having alcohol problems. Levels of self-harm had increased and were overall relatively high. Many of the women continued to report a history of abuse, rape, domestic violence and involvement in prostitution. At our last inspection we found that outcomes were strong across the board and that women were held safely and respectfully.

The care provided to women newly received into the prison remained a strength, but we considered the prison to be less stable than previously. There had been three self-inflicted deaths in 2016, the first at Eastwood Park for many years. Levels of violence had increased, and while most problems were minor, and the number of serious violent incidents was not high, more women in our survey than previously and compared with similar prisons said they had felt unsafe at some time or that they had been victimised by other prisoners. Some processes to address minor antisocial behaviour concerns needed to be improved. On the other hand, care and support for the most vulnerable women in the population was generally strong, and good relationships and reliable access to time out of their cells and activities mitigated some of these problems. Issues with illegal drugs and the diversion of prescribed medications were generally well managed, and disciplinary processes were used proportionately. While we were concerned about the increases in disorder, and in particular recent self-inflicted deaths, we considered that overall the prison remained reasonably safe for most.

The living environment was generally decent, although we were disappointed to see our previous criticisms of the accommodation in residential unit 8 had not led to improvements. Health care provision was mixed and some aspects of clinical governance and primary care needed attention. However, reassuringly, the high levels of mental health need in the population were being matched with some very good interventions. Staff-prisoner relationships remained strong, although staffing shortages had led to some staff being very stretched and less able to take a proactive approach to interactions with the women in their care.

Work and activities were generally well managed and it was positive that there were sufficient purposeful activities for all women. Nevertheless, we again found that the allocation process was not always ensuring that women were quickly offered an activity. Speeding this process up would benefit the women concerned and help ensure the stability of the prison.

Resettlement provision remained reasonably good. The new 'through-the-gate' resettlement arrangements had made good progress, and all women had either a sentence or custody plan. However, more needed to be done to discuss these plans with women and to ensure they felt involved in the process. Like other women's local resettlement prisons, Eastwood Park had significant problems supporting women to find secure accommodation on release, and we considered that a more strategic response was required. More needed to be done to work with those who had experienced domestic violence or been involved in sex work, and to identify those who might have

been trafficked. Support in maintaining and developing contact with families was generally good, but many women had not had a visit while at the prison; the prison needed to explore the reasons behind this and offer support if appropriate. Nevertheless, some good practical assistance was available for women being released from the prison, and the Nexus programme was a positive initiative that addressed the risks of those serving longer sentences who had committed violent offences.

Overall, we still considered Eastwood Park to be a well-led, generally safe and decent prison, but an institution that was showing signs of being under strain. Staffing levels had not kept pace with the rise in the population nor with its increasing complexity. This had been recognised by the National Offender Management Service and the prison was included among 10 prisons that would be prioritised to receive additional resources and support over the coming months. Efforts to understand the recent self-inflicted deaths needed to continue, and urgent action should be taken to address any deficiencies. Similarly, the increase in violence needed to be addressed with renewed vigour, and aspects of the prison's activities and resettlement work required further work. Nevertheless, the prison had a good staff culture that underpinned decent and respectful relationships with the women held. The prison's committed leadership and staff group needed to galvanise their efforts to address challenges, capitalise on the opportunities presented by the forthcoming injection of additional resources, and build on the strengths of the institution.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

January 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

Eastwood Park is a closed women's resettlement prison.

Prison status

Public

Region

Southwest

Number held

397

Certified normal accommodation

394

Operational capacity

442

Date of last full inspection

11–22 November 2013

Brief history

Eastwood Park opened as a women's prison in March 1996 admitting prisoners from HMP Pucklechurch. The prison opened a mother and baby unit in 2004 and the Mary Carpenter Unit for 17-year-old girls in 2005. The Mary Carpenter Unit closed in 2013 and reopened as the Nexus Programme Unit in 2015. The Kinnon Unit, a substance misuse unit opened in 2009.

Short description of residential units

- 1 – first night and induction unit
- 2 – general unit
- 3 – general unit
- 4 – complex needs unit for women with mental health problems, a learning disability or in crisis
- 5 – enhanced and drug recovery community wing
- 6 – general unit
- 7 – low security enhanced unit for prison orderlies and women on release on temporary licence
- 8 – Kinnon Unit for those undergoing drug and alcohol detoxification, including a first night unit
- 9 – mother and baby unit, currently closed
- 10 – Nexus Programme Unit for women with personality disorders.

Units 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8 were considered closed units, offering a restricted regime. Units 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 were perceived as open units, where women had more freedom, although they were still contained within the prison's secure fence.

Name of governor/director

Suzy Dymond-White

Escort contractor

GEOAmey

Health service providers

Inspire Better Health – a partnership made up of:
Bristol Community Health (lead provider)
Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health NHS Trust (mental health)
Hanham Health (GP service)
and other sub-contractors

Learning and skills provider

Weston College

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Di Askwith

Community rehabilitation company (CRC)

Wales CRC

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	women, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely
Respect	women are treated with respect for their human dignity
Purposeful activity	women are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them
Resettlement	women are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

A4 The 2010 'Bangkok Rules'¹ sets out internationally agreed standards that should govern the treatment of women in prison. These standards are directly applicable to women's prisons in England and Wales. Since September 2014 we have Expectations which specifically address the outcomes we expect for women in prison.

A5 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for women 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 women are good.**
There is no evidence that outcomes for women are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for women are reasonably good.**
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for women in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for women are not sufficiently good.**
There is evidence that outcomes for women are being adversely affected in many areas

¹ United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders

or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of women. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.

- **outcomes for women are poor.**
There is evidence that the outcomes for women are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for women. Immediate remedial action is required.

A6 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 women.

A7 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with women; 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.

A8 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.

A9 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

A10 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follows five sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of and conditions for women 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 6 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.

A11 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and III respectively.

A12 Findings from the survey of women and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix IV of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with

other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.²

² 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 Delays after court hearings and long journeys to the prison caused women to arrive late and prevented some from settling in. Nevertheless, support on arrival and during women's first night was generally good. Women were more likely than at the last inspection to report feeling unsafe. The number of violent incidents had increased, although most were minor. More needed to be done to tackle antisocial behaviour. Good relationships offset some problems. There had been three self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection. Support for the many vulnerable women held was generally good, although there were weaknesses in some processes. Security arrangements were appropriate. The number of adjudications was high. Force was used frequently but proportionately. Unit-based segregation was managed well. Substance misuse support was generally good, although women were less positive than previously. **Outcomes for women were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2 At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for women in Eastwood Park were good against this healthy prison test. We made seven recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found one of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*
- S3 Women often waited for long periods in court cells before escort vehicles collected them for transfer to the prison. The prison's wide catchment area also meant that some women had long journeys to the prison, often in vehicles shared with male prisoners, and sometimes arrived late at the prison, preventing them from settling in.
- S4 Reception continued to be pleasant and welcoming and women were treated well. Reception interviews were not sufficiently private but focused appropriately on individual safety. Nevertheless, reception processes often took too long. Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) provided women with good support and comprehensive information. In our survey, almost three quarters of women said they felt safe on their first night. First night cells were adequately prepared, but basic items were sometimes missing. The induction programme was comprehensive but its delivery was not well coordinated and it was not always clear if women had completed all the necessary elements.
- S5 In our survey, more prisoners than at our previous inspection said they had felt unsafe at the prison. The number of assaults and fights had risen, but most incidents took place in the closed units and few were serious. Supportive relationships between most staff and prisoners and the amount of time women spent out of their cells facilitated access to staff. Incident investigations varied considerably, and some work was not good enough. Despite the increase in violent incidents, fewer investigations were being conducted than at our previous inspection and we were not confident that minor antisocial behaviour concerns were always addressed. Safer custody peer workers provided good emotional and practical support. However, we were not confident that the information they gathered was always appropriately managed. The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was generally used fairly and sensitively to encourage positive behaviour. Few were on the basic regime.
- S6 There had been three self-inflicted deaths since our previous inspection, all in the previous six months. The prison had begun promptly to investigate the reasons for the deaths, but reports and recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) investigations were still awaited. The population was extremely vulnerable and some women

frequently self-harmed; around 50% of incidents could be attributed to less than 1% of the population in any given month. There were relatively few serious incidents, but investigations into those that occurred needed to improve. Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm showed women received some good day-to-day support, but multidisciplinary reviews and care maps were not used well enough. The Listener scheme (in which prisoners trained by the Samaritans provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) was now effective following problems during the summer. The prison had a formal safeguarding policy that had been used on three occasions to support women at risk.

- S7 Procedural security was proportionate. Physical security was good and free flow (allowing prisoners to move about the prison unescorted) was managed effectively. Dynamic security was good. The large number of intelligence reports (IRs) was managed and analysed well. Searching was intelligence-led. The security team worked well with other departments and shared information appropriately. More women than last time said illegal drugs were easily available. The mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate was relatively low. There was an integrated approach to tackling substance misuse challenges.

- S8 The number of adjudications was relatively high. Hearings were fair. In the paperwork we sampled, cautions or suspended punishments were seldom used and the approach was not tailored to the individual.

- S9 Force was used frequently but few incidents included the use of full control and restraint techniques. The samples of use of force documentation and videos of the few planned interventions we examined demonstrated that incidents were largely managed appropriately, although too much record keeping was incomplete. Reasonably good governance of use of force was otherwise in place.

- S10 The absence of a specific unit meant that segregation took place on the wing in a woman's cell. This had real advantages, particularly for those who were also vulnerable to self-harm. Segregated women were offered an hour out of their cell for domestic tasks and exercise. Record-keeping, oversight and accountability had improved since our last inspection and was now generally appropriate.

- S11 While the drug and alcohol team provided good quality support, caseloads were high and staffing shortages had meant that until very recently group work had been suspended. Women were still able to access a good drug recovery programme. Over half of women required drug or alcohol treatment on arrival. Women were appropriately monitored during stabilisation and detoxification. Access to treatment was prompt, and prescribing flexible. Fewer women than at the last inspection thought the support they received was helpful.

Respect

- S12 *Living conditions were reasonably good except in residential unit 8 which had extensive graffiti. The applications process was not effective. Staff-prisoner relationships were very good. Some aspects of equality and diversity work were underdeveloped, although most outcomes appeared equitable. Faith provision was reasonable overall. The management of complaints against staff required attention. Legal rights support was reasonable. Health provision was in transition and some aspects needed to improve. A significant number of women had mental health problems; mental health provision was good. Catering arrangements were reasonable, but options for ordering items from catalogues were limited. **Outcomes for women were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S13 *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for women in Eastwood Park were good against this healthy prison test. We made 19 recommendations in the area of respect.³ At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, eight had been partially achieved, four had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*
- S14 Outdoor areas remained very pleasant and well maintained. Residential accommodation was variable but mostly decent and generally clean. However, too many cells in residential unit 8 were neglected and had extensive graffiti. Many women had in-cell showers and communal facilities were reasonably clean and maintained. The applications system had deteriorated. Many women said they did not receive replies and responses were not tracked. There was a backlog of applications for access to women's stored personal property. Cell call bell response times were not monitored and far fewer women than previously and compared with similar prisons said call bells were answered quickly enough, which was a concern.
- S15 Staff-prisoner relationships were generally very good. In our survey, most women said that staff treated them with respect. We saw some excellent interactions between staff and women and many staff were aware of the needs and circumstances of the women in their care. Most women in our survey said there was a member of staff who would help them with a problem.
- S16 Some equality and diversity processes required improvement. However, outcomes for women with protected characteristics continued to be generally positive. Equalities officers were keen to progress diversity work, but frequent redeployment had an impact on their ability to do so. The diversity and equality action team meeting was well attended and focused on meeting the needs of those with protected characteristics. Monitoring information was presented at the meeting and there was evidence that some action and follow-up took place, but some discrepancies were not investigated. Investigations and responses to some discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) were inadequate, and oversight needed to improve. DIRFs were not freely available on all the wings.
- S17 Black and minority ethnic, gay and bisexual and older women were generally positive about their experiences of staff and were concerned about the same issues as others, although there were some differences. For example, in our survey, black and minority ethnic and gay and bisexual women were more likely to say they had been victimised by other women. Some support had been offered to women who were from Gypsy, Romany or Traveller groups. Support for the prison's small number of foreign national women was limited. Many women had disabilities, and in our survey, many were more negative about their treatment than others. However, women we spoke to received good support. The provision for older women was very good. A weekly group for the small number of younger adults was also

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

held. Support for transgender people was generally appropriate. The mother and baby unit was temporarily closed but pregnant women were offered appropriate support. The chapel and multi-faith rooms were peaceful and clean. Provision for all faiths and pastoral support were good. The committed chaplaincy was integrated into prison life.

- S18 The number of complaints had risen since our previous inspection, but was not excessive. Many were answered reasonably, but some, particularly those alleging inappropriate behaviour by staff, were not sufficiently respectful. Access to legal services was reasonable.
- S19 The health care provider had identified and started to address some deficiencies in local clinical governance systems. Severe staffing shortages had curtailed health service provision, including secondary health assessments and nurse-led clinics, although the position was improving. The range of primary care services was appropriate, but the lack of a confidential application process restricted women's access.
- S20 Medications management was generally good, but the women received medication, including methadone, without photographic identification, which created a risk of diversion and errors. Dental services were generally good.
- S21 Mental health provision was also good overall. In our survey, 79% of women, more than the comparator and last time said they had emotional well-being or mental health problems. Residential unit 4 provided women with severe mental health needs with good care, although some of them needed a secure hospital bed to receive the best treatment rather than being in a prison. Arrangements for assessing and providing care for women with social care needs were appropriate.
- S22 Catering arrangements were generally good but women felt the food had deteriorated since our last inspection. The food we tasted was reasonably good but the prison recognised the need to provide a more balanced diet, including fewer carbohydrates. Canteen arrangements were reasonable, but new arrivals waited too long before they could obtain a full order. Consultations had led to changes in the range of canteen goods available and there were specific items for black and minority ethnic women. Opportunities to order from catalogues were limited.

Purposeful activity

S23 *Time out of cell was reasonably good. Ofsted assessed the learning and skills provision as good overall. There were more activity places than previously and they were sufficient for the population. Prisoners were not allocated to activities quickly enough. Managers had developed a range of provision that met women's needs, although some gaps were still evident. Behaviour was good, although attendance needed to be more consistent. Achievements in most areas were high, but not in English and maths for a small minority. The library and PE provision were both reasonably good.*
Outcomes for women were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

S24 *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for women in Eastwood Park were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that three of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, four had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.*

- S25 Time out of cell remained good for women in the open units and reasonably good in the closed units. Some regime curtailments took place during staff shortages, but they were managed appropriately.
- S26 After a period of slow progress, the prison's leaders and managers had improved the provision of activities. The number of work spaces had increased and employer and voluntary sector links had been strengthened. Curriculum planning ensured that the range of opportunities on offer met women's needs. Management of the college provision remained good, with effective relationships between the college and the prison's managers. However, the prison's leaders now had to ensure that the provision was further developed strategically and that the highest standards were set. The prison's own self-assessment successfully identified key areas for improvement. However, managers did not analyse data sufficiently to monitor or improve outcomes for learners.
- S27 The provision of English and maths was still not sufficient to meet the identified needs of the prison's population, despite having been increased. There were sufficient spaces to occupy the population, but many women waited too long to receive their induction into activities. No accredited learning was delivered in work. The pay policy did not encourage women to attend education.
- S28 The quality of teaching, learning and assessment was good for most women attending education and vocational training. In most classes, English and maths skills were well promoted. Teachers were well informed about women's barriers to learning and used the information to ensure learning assistants and mentors provided good support. Tutors assisted women well, although the college did not offer specialist additional learning support.
- S29 Women appreciated the opportunity to re-engage with education and enjoyed their learning, which significantly boosted their confidence and self-esteem. Those in vocational training confidently explained the work processes they were following. Women worked enthusiastically, developed skills quickly and behaved well. Respect between staff and other prisoners was good. Women improved their English and maths skills in all areas, except in work. Attendance at education and vocational training had not been consistently high in the six months prior to the inspection. However, during the inspection week, attendance was good. Most women arrived punctually for the very short education day.
- S30 Achievements on most educational and vocational courses were very high. However, learners achieved lower level English and maths qualifications. Managers needed to use data better to identify outcomes for different groups of women. The limited data presented by the college showed that a small minority of women progressed to a higher level of training, and a few achieved several qualifications while at the prison. Women had planned access to the library, but those working full-time were not allocated a session. The stock range was reasonable.
- S31 Women had access to well-maintained physical education (PE) facilities and a wide range of sports and fitness activities. No accredited sports or fitness qualifications were offered. The well-being event (a day-long event for both staff and prisoners aiming to provide advice and information about personal well-being) was excellent. Links with the health care department were good. The use of data to monitor and evaluate the use of PE facilities by different groups of women was not sufficient to inform improvements.

Resettlement

- S32 *The prison had a good understanding of the complexities of the population. Community rehabilitation company (CRC) work had progressed reasonably well and several strong partnerships had been developed. Case management work was not coordinated well enough. Nevertheless, most women had their needs identified through a sentence or resettlement plan, but levels of contact were not sufficient. Public protection work was appropriate. Some reasonable 'through-the-gate' support was offered, although many women in our survey said they did not know whom to approach for help. Women required more support for domestic violence and sex work issues. Children and families work was reasonable overall. The Nexus programme was a promising development for women with serious offending behaviour. **Outcomes for women were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S33 *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for women in Eastwood Park were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that eight of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and three had not been achieved.*
- S34 The prison's reducing reoffending strategy demonstrated an understanding of the population's resettlement needs. There were clear development targets. The CRC resettlement team was reasonably well established and although many staff were relatively new, they were well managed and focused on developing effective services. Good community links had been established in the main release areas, and it was encouraging that services were developing elsewhere to meet needs across the prison's huge catchment area. Offender management was appropriately structured to meet the population's needs, although the redeployment of offender supervisors was problematic. Despite much good resettlement work, casework was not integrated well enough.
- S35 Most offender assessment system (OASys) documents were up to date, and all women, including those on remand, had a resettlement plan. Most resettlement and sentence plans we reviewed were good. Despite this, in our survey fewer women than at comparator prisons said they had a named offender supervisor or a sentence plan. Many women we spoke to during the inspection did not appear to have been involved in drawing up resettlement plans and were not aware of their content. Although there were some examples of offender supervisors and CRC staff interacting with women supportively and proactively, in too many cases offender supervisor contact was either informal or sporadic.
- S36 Public protection arrangements were generally robust and systems well managed. Multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) work was good although the formal identification of MAPPA levels prior to release required further attention. Allocation processes were effective although prison overcrowding meant some women were held a long way from their home area.
- S37 The number of indeterminate prisoners had risen, primarily because of the introduction of the Nexus programme for women with personality disorders. The prison appropriately monitored the progress of this group through monthly inter-departmental risk management team meetings.
- S38 The wide geographical catchment area and churn in the population meant that reintegration work was complex. There was some confusion over how CRC staff and offender supervisors worked together and who was responsible for ensuring information was shared with community-based providers. Referrals to external providers were not consistently followed

up. Despite women having release plans, many we spoke to said they did not know what they were or what support was available.

- S39 Visitors and women told us that it could be difficult to book visits and that weekend visits were often over-subscribed. Visits we observed were relaxed, searching was appropriate and the visits hall was pleasant. Women appreciated children's visits and regular family days. Workers from national charity PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust) undertook family liaison work and offered some good support, particularly to women from South Wales. There was an active official prison visitors' scheme but over a quarter of women had not received a visit while at the prison. Support for women with families who could not visit the prison required improvement.
- S40 There was no overarching strategy or coordination of support for women who had experienced domestic violence or who had been involved in sex work. One programme was being delivered, and some good links with community-based support services were developing, but more needed to be offered.
- S41 All prisoners were offered support to secure accommodation on release. Broadly this support was helpful, although in some cases, staff were unable to offer more than a referral to a homelessness agency in the community. Figures suggested as many as 25% of all those released only received such a referral. This significant issue, largely outside the prison's control, required a national response.
- S42 The release on temporary licence programme was well managed and women were allocated promptly to a work placement, where they continued developing their skills. Careers service advisers delivered a good service that led to relevant skills action plans.
- S43 Arrangements to ensure continuity of health care prior to release or transfer were good. A dedicated throughcare worker supported women with mental health and substance misuse needs. Continuity of substance misuse care was improving and joint working to ensure appropriate treatment was available post-release was good.
- S44 Finance benefit and debt support was broadly appropriate if somewhat limited. Some basic debt management support was available and a short group work programme had been introduced.
- S45 There were no formally accredited offending behaviour programmes. Some victim awareness work was undertaken through the chaplaincy and education department. The Nexus Programme Unit, which worked with women with personality disorders, was a promising initiative.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S46 Concern: The number of violent incidents had risen. In our survey, more women than previously or than in comparator prisons said they felt victimised by others, while fewer than at the previous inspection or compared with similar prisons said a member of staff had checked on them in the previous week. Levels of vulnerability in unit 8 were particularly acute and we were not confident staffing levels there were sufficient. Formal systems for managing antisocial behaviour were being used less frequently than previously, despite the increase in the number of incidents. Some incident investigations were insufficient.

Recommendation: The prison should ensure that women are safe from victimisation, that they feel supported, that antisocial behaviour is consistently challenged and that investigations into serious incidents involving violence or self-harm identify opportunities for improvement.

- S47 Concern: In our survey, only 3% of women said it was very easy for their family and friends to visit the prison, while 52% said it was difficult or very difficult. At the time of the inspection, over a quarter of the population had not received a visit. The prison had not been aware that this was the case and the reasons needed exploring.

Recommendation: The prison should develop a strategic approach to support women to maintain contact with their families, particularly those far from home. Skype and other technology, all-day visits and flexible accumulated visiting orders should be considered to this end.

- S48 Concern: Accommodation outcomes for women once they left Eastwood Park were at best unclear, and for many, likely to have been poor. The prison's broad catchment area, the large number of women serving short sentences and arriving at the prison with housing problems as well as the national shortage of accommodation were important factors. The prison's data suggested around a quarter of all women leaving Eastwood Park did so without suitable identified accommodation, which was far too many, and it was not clear what happened to them when they were back in the community. The prison was not unique in having problems finding suitable accommodation for prisoners, and similar issues have arisen in other women's prisons inspected.

Recommendation: NOMS should ensure accommodation services for women at Eastwood Park are sufficient to support women into stable accommodation on release.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 Women were often held for a long time in courts after their hearing before travelling to the prison. The wide geographical area covered by Eastwood Park meant that many women had long journeys and arrived at the prison well into the evening. Half of the previous 50 receptions arrived at the prison after 6pm, which left them with little time to settle in on their first night.
- I.2 Vans were clean and in our survey women were positive about their treatment during the journey and most said they felt safe. However, women were still being escorted on the same vans as men. There were no delays in getting women off the escort van once at the prison and they were not handcuffed.
- I.3 The video link was now being used more frequently for court hearings and solicitor or offender manager interviews and on some occasions, inter-prison contact with family members (see main recommendation S47 and paragraph 4.33).

Recommendations

- I.4 **Women should be held in court cells for the minimum possible period and arrive at the prison with enough time left to settle in on the first night wing.**
- I.5 **Female and male prisoners should be transported separately.** (Repeated recommendation I.6)

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.6 Reception was busy but the area remained good and continued to be clean, bright and well organised. The atmosphere was relaxed and women were placed in well-decorated and welcoming waiting rooms. A wide range of information was displayed on notice boards, but it was only in English. Searching was proportionate and carried out respectfully.
- I.7 Reception staff were friendly but professional in their interactions with women. Individual interviews explored relevant issues, including childcare arrangements, their history of self-harm and any immediate safety concerns. However, they were not conducted in sufficient privacy. Some women spent too long in reception, often waiting for a health care assessment. In our survey, less than half of the women said they were in reception for less than two hours, which was lower than the comparator.

- 1.8** Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life) met all new arrivals and provided them with good support and comprehensive information, but there were no Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) in reception.
- 1.9** Women were given bedding, towels and an adequate amount of clothing and toiletries while in reception. They also had access to a phone and received a reception pack (containing items such as biscuits, sweets and orange juice). Women going to both residential units 1 and 8 could shower using the in-cell facilities. A reasonable stock of donated clothing was available for those needing it for court or for release.
- 1.10** In our survey, almost three quarters of women said they felt safe on their first night. First night accommodation in residential unit one had been refurbished and was now very good; rooms were clean and adequately furnished. First night accommodation in residential unit 8, which held women withdrawing from substance use was less welcoming and not all of it was adequately furnished (see paragraph 2.2). A few women did not receive all the basic equipment on their first night, for example, we met women who did not have a hot water flask or a television on their first night.
- 1.11** The large number of women arriving in the first night unit after 7.15pm did not have enough time to settle in properly or meet unit staff or other women. Women arriving after this time went straight to their rooms and were locked in for the night. (See also paragraph 1.1 and recommendation 1.4.)
- 1.12** The induction programme was comprehensive and started on the woman's second working day in prison. In our survey, fewer women than in other similar prisons said they had completed it. We found various elements of the induction were not well coordinated and attendance at each session was not tracked, which made it difficult to have an overview of who had done all the necessary elements.

Recommendation

- 1.13** The prison should track who has completed the whole induction programme to ensure all women participate in all relevant elements.

Safe and supportive relationships

Expected outcomes:

Safe and supportive relationships are encouraged. Everyone feels and is safe from victimisation (which includes verbal and racial abuse, theft, violence and assault or threats). Women are protected from victimisation through active and fair systems known to staff, women and visitors, and which inform all aspects of the regime. Any sanctions on behaviour are applied fairly, transparently and consistently.

- 1.14** In our survey, more women than in comparator prisons, and compared with our previous inspection said they had felt unsafe at Eastwood Park at some point. There had been 41 prisoner assaults, 23 assaults on staff and 26 fights in the previous six months, more than at our last inspection (taking into account a population increase of 25%). Women reported higher levels of need than previously and the prison held a relatively large number of women on very short sentences. Despite the population increase, the number of staff had not changed.

- I.15** In our survey, more women than at our previous inspection and than in comparator prisons said they had been victimised by other women. Only women in unit 8 reported significant victimisation by staff, and we considered these perceptions were likely to have been related to a very small number of individual staff. Generally, strong staff-prisoner relationships (see paragraph 2.10) and reasonable time out of cell (see paragraph 3.1), provided prisoners with the opportunity to seek help.
- I.16** Many violent and antisocial incidents took place in units 4 and 8, which housed the most vulnerable women. Few incidents were serious, and a small number of particularly troubled women were often responsible for several incidents. However, we found a number of women in unit 8 who felt unsafe and we thought supervision there was not always sufficient.
- I.17** Use of a local violence prevention protocol, which ensured women were locked up in the immediate aftermath of an incident, had declined since our previous inspection, despite the increase in the number of incidents. There were no longer any individual interventions to help perpetrators deal with their antisocial behaviour and in the previous six months, only 21 women (fewer than at our previous inspection) had been monitored for antisocial behaviour. Some incident investigations were not good enough and evidence gathering and analysis were insufficient. Staff focused on resolving and reporting incidents but the approach to identifying opportunities for improvement was weak.
- I.18** Four safer custody peer workers visited vulnerable women to offer emotional and practical support. The initiative was excellent, but feedback mechanisms were not robust enough to ensure that information peer workers received was always used properly.
- I.19** The monthly safer custody meeting was well attended, including by prisoners, and the agenda was appropriate. Large amounts of data were presented, but not in a way that relative rates of incidents could be compared. A weekly meeting ensured good information-sharing and coordination between various teams.
- I.20** The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was generally used fairly and promoted safe and supportive relationships. Only 3% were on the basic regime, most because of a single serious incident. The basic regime was not overly punitive and we saw staff relaxing the regime in individual circumstances to promote well-being. However, some women with particularly acute complex needs were on the basic regime, which we were not confident was always appropriate. (See main recommendation S46.)

Recommendations

- I.21** **The prison should keep records of information that safer custody peer workers pass on and ensure all information is processed appropriately.**
- I.22** **Women with complex needs should only be subject to the IEP scheme if it forms part of an individual care plan designed to improve behaviour.**

Self-harm and suicide prevention

Expected outcomes:

The prison provides a safe and secure environment which reduces the risk of self-harm and suicide. Vulnerable women 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 three self-inflicted deaths since our previous inspection, all in the previous six months and all on the second floor of unit 8. The prison had tried to identify the reasons for these deaths using a consultative approach and had made some swift changes. The governor had also commissioned an external investigation, which was due to report in December 2016. Reports and recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) investigations related to these deaths were still awaited. Prior to 2016 the last self-inflicted death at the prison had been in 2007.
- I.24** The number of self-harm incidents was high, but some women harmed themselves prolifically: around 50% of incidents involved less than 1% of the population in any given month. In the previous six months, three women had harmed themselves so seriously that they had required urgent admission to hospital. Investigations into these incidents looked mostly at reporting and did not consider sufficiently how the incident might have been avoided. One incident appeared not to have been investigated at all. Three women had been placed under constant supervision (two for around three weeks) and had required anti-rip clothing.
- I.25** The number of women cared for using assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management processes for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm was similar to our previous inspection and was relatively high. Initial assessments were thorough and usually prompt. Few ACCT reviews were carried out by a multidisciplinary team and care maps were not used well enough. However, most staff knew individual women very well and records showed that women received frequent good support, which assured us that their needs would be identified and met.
- I.26** The Listener scheme was now effective, but had been suspended for three months from 6 April 2016 because of insufficient trained volunteers. Because there was no Listener suite, high risk women could only speak to Listeners through a locked cell door, which was not private.

Recommendations

- I.27** Initial ACCT reviews should be carried out by a multidisciplinary team.
- I.28** There should be a Listener suite.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk) and women with complex needs

Expected outcomes:

The prison promotes the welfare of all prisoners, particularly adults at risk, and protects them from all kinds of harm and neglect.⁴

- I.29** The prison now had a good safeguarding policy, and a regional representative attended local safeguarding adults board meetings. There had not been any specific training, and most staff were not aware of the policy. However, three women with very complex needs had been referred in the previous six months and the prison had successfully negotiated appropriate support.
- I.30** Many of the women held were at risk. Staff identified those who presented concerns and referred them for further assessment or support. There appeared to have been appropriate interventions for all the women who caused us concern and some had individual care plans, that multidisciplinary teams managed. Women with the most complex needs were held in unit 4, where they received care delivered jointly by prison and health staff (see paragraph 2.74).

Security

Expected outcomes:

Physical and procedural security measures are specific to the risks in a women's prison. Security and good order are underpinned by effective security intelligence and positive staff-prisoner relationships. Women are safe from exposure to substance misuse while in prison.

- I.31** Procedural security was proportionate and physical security good. Women on reception were only strip-searched if justified by supporting intelligence. Free flow (allowing prisoners to move about the prison unescorted) was managed effectively and access to activities was not restricted by security concerns. Women who were orderlies living in unit 7, the low security unit, could move between units and provide other more vulnerable women with good support.
- I.32** Dynamic security (active monitoring, supervision and reporting by staff) was effective. There were 1986 incident reports (IRs), which was nearly twice as high as at our last inspection. Staff were aware of the process for dealing with IRs and reports were well managed and analysed. Most IRs related to drugs or threats of violence. They were acted on promptly.
- I.33** Searching of cells and other prison areas was intelligence-led and regularly resulted in finds. Security objectives reflected current concerns around the use and trading of prescription drugs such as buscopan (an antispasmodic that reduces muscle movement). Very few visitors were banned or put on closed visits; when they were, it was because of a significant amount of intelligence about their activities. Banned visitors and closed visits were reviewed every month.
- I.34** The well-attended monthly security meeting focused on and analysed a wide range of data and tasks, and actions were followed up. The security team worked well with other

⁴ We define an adult at risk as a 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)

departments and shared information appropriately. Security staff attended weekly meetings that looked at women who posed a risk or were at risk and focused on keeping prisoners safe.

- I.35** A full-time police liaison officer, based on the site, coordinated the information flow from local police forces. She also helped women take forward concerns about historic abuse and rape and liaised with social services on child welfare matters.
- I.36** In our survey, 36% of women said it was easy to get illegal drugs, which was higher than at the last inspection. In the Kinnon Unit (unit 8), the substance misuse treatment wing, 24% of women reported developing a problem with diverted medication, compared to 8% in other units. The survey findings were not reflected in the random mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate, which averaged 4.3% against a target of 7.5% in the previous six months, although the most recent figures showed an upward trend. Women mainly tested positive for buprenorphine (subutex) (used to treat those with opiate addictions but which can be abused). Use of psychoactive substances such as Spice (a man-made drug that mimics the effects of cannabis but is much stronger with no discernible odour) was infrequent, but some women had disclosed crushing and smoking medication such as buscopan, which could not be tested for. The prison now also tested for psychoactive substances (new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects). However, it was too early to judge how effective this was.
- I.37** MDT facilities and procedures were satisfactory. Problems with timely suspicion testing had been addressed and the prison also carried out risk and voluntary drug tests (see paragraph I.53).
- I.38** Supply reduction had a high priority, and communication and joint working between prison departments and health and substance misuse services demonstrated that security and drug strategy initiatives were integrated well. The substance misuse team shared anonymous information from self-disclosed illicit use at both drug strategy and security meetings, which assisted in trend analysis and informed responses. Joint initiatives had included a drug amnesty and awareness events for staff and prisoners.

Disciplinary procedures

Expected outcomes:

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

Disciplinary procedures

- I.39** There had been 493 adjudications in the six months prior to our inspection, which was relatively high. This was a consequence of the zero-tolerance approach to violence. Many adjudications related to threats, assaults and fights, but very few were for serious violence. Eighteen incidents had been reported to the police in the previous six months.
- I.40** Disciplinary hearings were fair and proportionate, and it was good that some adjudications took place on the wings, but the adjudications room was shabby. Adjudicating governors carefully checked women understood the process and asked if they wanted support, which could be provided.

- I.41** Adjudication paperwork was up to date but did not always detail the circumstances leading up to the incidents or sufficiently record the conversations that had taken place during the adjudication hearing.
- I.42** Punishments were in line with the published tariffs. In the paperwork we sampled, suspended punishments or cautions were seldom used and punishments could have been tailored to the individual. Hearings before the independent adjudicator could take place via the video link, which was good.
- I.43** Adjudications were monitored in detail and comparative data (including on protected characteristics) were considered at regular meetings.

The use of force

- I.44** Force was used more frequently than at our last inspection – on 131 occasions compared with 85 over a six-month period – which was relatively high. Few of these incidents involved the full use of control and restraint and most were spontaneous incidents, rather than ones that were planned and recorded. Most incidents occurred to prevent harm to someone else or because of non-compliance, for example, where women in unit 4 had refused to transfer to a psychiatric unit following sectioning. Some were carried out to prevent a woman from hurting herself.
- I.45** The documentation and CCTV coverage we examined demonstrated that force was generally used appropriately. In one incident, we observed that de-escalation could have been used more effectively.
- I.46** Despite efforts to keep documentation up to date, too many incidents had incomplete paperwork. Reasonably good governance was in place and a wide range of data was monitored at regular meetings.

Segregation

- I.47** There was no segregation unit so women segregated to preserve good order and discipline or subject to cellular confinement for punishment stayed in their rooms on the wing. This reduced the possibility of isolation and disruption and meant that women could retain some of their possessions. They were unlocked for up to an hour for domestic tasks and exercise outside, but had no association and took their meals in their cells. Segregation was used 171 times in the previous six months, which, given the number of incidents, did not appear excessive.
- I.48** Governance of segregation was better than at our last inspection. Women received information about their entitlements. Paperwork was complete, but many entries were still observational and did not detail interactions. The segregated women we spoke to said that staff had regularly checked on them.
- I.49** Health care staff and governors saw segregated women every day. Reviews were timely and although we were confident governors discussed their situation fully with segregated women, there was little documented evidence of behaviour targets.
- I.50** Women who were segregated were monitored well and reports covered a wide range of data, including protected characteristics. The circumstances of women who were segregated more than once in the previous quarter were also reviewed.

Substance misuse

Expected outcomes:

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

- I.51** The substance misuse policy document included both supply and demand reduction strategies, but action plans needed to be updated to reflect the most recent needs analysis. The strategy was well managed and a multi-agency committee met every month to monitor trends and discuss service developments. Good joined-up working between departments and service providers took place.
- I.52** Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust continued to provide psychosocial services as part of a consortium. Severe staff shortages had resulted in lengthy waiting times for full assessments, high caseloads and the suspension of group work. These shortcomings were reflected in our survey: 70% of women said the support they received was helpful compared to 90% last time and 80% at similar prisons. However, more staff were being recruited.
- I.53** The team had appropriately prioritised seeing new arrivals within 24 hours to provide harm reduction advice and contact community services. The caseload stood at 208 and we saw evidence of good quality one-to-one work. The team focused on women with complex needs and those using illicit drugs, and their care was coordinated at weekly meetings with the clinical service. As staffing increased the team was reintroducing group work modules but peer support, service user consultation and family work were still suspended. Women still had access to voluntary drug testing and 83 had signed a compact (an agreement confirming adherence to community rules).
- I.54** The Drug Recovery Community, an eight-week abstinence-based treatment programme, was now located in unit 5. It was no longer self-contained and other women not in treatment were also housed there. This had a detrimental impact on the recovery ethos. Currently six women were undertaking the programme and 20 had successfully completed it in the past 12 months.
- I.55** Bristol Community Health provided clinical substance misuse services. More than 50% of all new arrivals required admission to the Kinnon Unit, the drug and alcohol detoxification unit, where 24-hour monitoring and observation took place.
- I.56** One hundred and fifteen women were prescribed opiate substitution treatment and in the previous six months, 92 had undertaken alcohol detoxification. Access to treatment was prompt, prescribing regimes were flexible and a range of treatment options had been introduced to help women who were using drugs illicitly or who were in danger of relapsing. Specialist substance misuse GPs and nurses provided a high level of care, which was reviewed regularly, but clinical and psychosocial teams were not yet fully integrated. Joint working with the mental health team to coordinate treatment for the large number of women with complex needs was good.

Recommendation

- I.57** **Substance misuse support should be fully integrated and developed in consultation with service users and there should be timely assessments, regular group work and mutual aid.**

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

Women live in a safe, clean and decent environment within which they are encouraged to take personal responsibility for themselves and their possessions. Women are aware of the rules and routines of the prison which encourage responsible behaviour.

- 2.1 Nine residential units were open during the inspection. The outdoor environment around residential units remained clean, pleasant and well maintained. Most internal communal areas were similarly pleasant and clean, particularly those in the low security units, and work to improve the communal areas in units 5 and 6 had been beneficial. The environment and facilities on units 7 and 10, in addition, provided useful opportunities to assist the development of independent living skills.
- 2.2 Residential accommodation remained variable. Units 1 and 3 had been refurbished and were now pleasant. Most of the units were clean, decent and well maintained, except for unit 8, which was now more rundown – cells had extensive graffiti, too much poor quality furniture and few lockable cabinets. Unit 8 was also noisier than other units and in our survey, only 34% of women on that unit compared to 72% on other units said it was quiet enough to relax or sleep at night. Some cells in units 5 and 6 originally designed for one person continued to hold two. Women in some of the units complained about the wide temperature range in their rooms and limited ventilation. They did not have kettles in their rooms but could fill up a flask with boiling water before being locked up.
- 2.3 Communal and in-room toilets had seats and lids. Many rooms had a shower as well as a toilet, which was good but some did not have a curtain, which compromised women's privacy. Communal showers and baths were reasonably private, clean and maintained.
- 2.4 Access to cleaning materials was good but some of the bedding needed replacing. Women wore their own clothes and had adequate access to laundry facilities. They could have property sent in twice a year, which was reasonable, but the prison was considering whether to increase this to three times a year. Women had good access to personal hygiene items and sanitary products.
- 2.5 Application forms were easily available, but the system had deteriorated since our last inspection. Fewer women than in other similar prisons and compared with our last inspection said applications were dealt with promptly and many told us they had not received a reply. Replies were not tracked, so women did not always know if their application had been dealt with. There was a large backlog of applications for access to stored personal property.
- 2.6 Response times to cell call bells were not monitored and fewer women than in other prisons and at our last inspection said it was answered within five minutes, which was a concern. We observed some long delays before officers responded to call bells.

Recommendations

- 2.7** Conditions in unit 8 should be improved and should include removing graffiti and providing good quality furniture and lockable safes in working order.
- 2.8** A tracking system should be introduced to help ensure all applications receive a timely reply.
- 2.9** Responses to call bells should be monitored to ensure they are answered within a reasonable time.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

Women 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** Staff-prisoner relationships were good. Wing staff and management were focused on providing a safe and decent environment. In our survey, 83% said most staff treated them with respect. We saw some excellent interactions between staff and prisoners.
- 2.11** In our survey, fewer women than at the last inspection and the comparator said staff had checked on them in the previous week. However, many staff were aware of the needs and circumstances of women in their care. Women we spoke to during the inspection and 80% of our survey respondents said there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem.
- 2.12** There was no personal officer scheme (although units 4 and 10 had key workers) but the prison was hoping to introduce one. Wing staff's entries on P-NOMIS (the Prison Service IT system) were brief and too infrequent. The requirement for staff to submit entries every month was not sufficient. We were not confident that staff were recording all meaningful interactions in full. Consultation arrangements were in place, but women who were living in unit 7 represented those in all the other units, which was inappropriate.
- 2.13** Fifty percent of staff in prisoner contact roles were women, and the prison was working to increase the number of female staff in operational roles. In the previous year, 25 staff had been trained in trauma-informed practices, which focuses on the impact of past trauma on behaviour and how women experience custody.
- 2.14** Staff were not formally trained in mediation.

Recommendation

- 2.15** Consultation arrangements should include women from all residential units.

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), transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

Strategic management

- 2.16** Equality and diversity processes had deteriorated somewhat since the previous inspection. However, except for some women with disabilities, we found outcomes continued to be generally positive. Positive staff-prisoner relationships went some way to ensuring the needs of individual women were met appropriately.
- 2.17** Two equalities officers had been appointed. The role was designated 34 hours per week, but over the previous three months their hours had been significantly reduced because of frequent redeployment. Neither the prisoner equalities orderly nor the equalities officers had received formal training for the role. The equalities orderly did not have a job description and her work lacked oversight.
- 2.18** A bi-monthly diversity and equalities action team (DEAT) meeting took place and was chaired by the governor. It had a clear written purpose and objectives; protected characteristics were a standing agenda item. Representation from across the prison was good and included the prison's equalities orderly, the Independent Monitoring Board and external voluntary and statutory organisations. The equalities officers produced a report for the DEAT meeting. It provided useful headline population information, including detailed information of those with disabilities. However, the national equalities monitoring tool was not being used to identify areas where discrepancies in outcomes for those with protected characteristics occurred. This was a concern as it was evident that several areas required further investigation and action. A strategic equality action plan had been introduced, but it was too early to assess its impact.
- 2.19** Discrimination incident reporting forms were not freely available in residential units and management and oversight of investigations was weak. We reviewed 32 forms, which had been submitted over the previous six months. We found most investigations were not sufficient, which meant conclusions were not robust and quality assurance was inadequate.

Protected characteristics

- 2.20** In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners were more negative about some aspects of prison life and many more (72%) said they were victimised by other prisoners compared with their white counterparts (45%); 17% said this was due to their nationality compared with 1% of white prisoners. Some women said when they first arrived they felt isolated, but were more comfortable as they formed relationships. Many of the black and minority ethnic women we spoke to were positive about the care and support they received from individual

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

officers. The prison had held a Gypsy, Romany and Traveller support group in August 2016, so it was too early to assess its effectiveness or impact.

- 2.21** There were 18 (4%) foreign national women in the prison, one of whom was held as a detainee. No independent immigration advice was available. The immigration detainee had been held more than four weeks beyond her sentence, but staff were aware of her situation.
- 2.22** Fifty-nine percent of women in the prison were registered disabled, 75% of whom reported mental health problems. In our survey, disabled women were more negative about several areas, including about being victimised. However, during the inspection we spoke to a number of disabled women who said that support was good and who did not identify with the perceptions in the survey.
- 2.23** There was a fully adapted cell in residential unit I; in other units, individual adaptations were provided including, extra mattresses, wheelchairs and other mobility aids. There was no formal peer support or buddy scheme for disabled women. However, the prison had a care orderly and most women told us they received good support from other women in their unit. Too few women who needed a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP) had one and others were out of date. The prison recorded 15 women as needing assistance in the event of an evacuation, but staff in units did not know all the women who required one.
- 2.24** In our survey, women aged over 50 were more positive about life at the prison than younger women. RECOOP, a charity working for the care and resettlement of offenders, ran a popular group for older women four times a week. Women spoke positively about it. There were 19 young offenders (under 21). Support for them was provided through a helpful young offender focus group held every Friday in the chapel.
- 2.25** Forty-six women (11%) in our survey, disclosed being gay or bisexual. The women from this group we spoke to felt reasonably well supported and did not express any significant concerns related to their sexuality.
- 2.26** Four transgender prisoners were held at the prison during the inspection. They were unhappy with the support available and were keen for better links with community-based transgender groups to be developed. Nevertheless, the prison had invested in supporting this group and provided a range of specific help and information.
- 2.27** The mother and baby unit (MBU) had closed shortly before the inspection due to flooding; it was scheduled to be reopened in December 2016. The MBU would normally have provided facilities for women and their children aged up to 18 months. Alternative placement arrangements were available in other prisons with MBUs. Pregnant women we spoke to were satisfied with their support. A weekly visiting midwife provided care for pregnant women that was equivalent to what would have been expected in the community. Those with more complex needs were appropriately referred to a specialist midwife. Joint working between the health care team, midwife, hospital and the health visitor was good.
- 2.28** MBU staff provided appropriate support and care for women contemplating separation through foster care or adoption. Staff were trained in paediatric first aid and child resuscitation.

Recommendation

- 2.29** **The negative perceptions of women with disabilities should be explored and those requiring a PEEP should have one.**

Faith and religious activity

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.30** Faith provision was appropriate and the chaplaincy was made up of representatives of all major faiths. Community-based organisations provided good input and the chaplaincy was well integrated into prison life. The chapel and multi-faith rooms were peaceful and clean.
- 2.31** Women we spoke to told us they felt the chaplaincy supported them well and there was a trained counsellor for bereaved women. The chaplaincy led the Gypsy, Romany and Traveller group and the weekly young offender support group.
- 2.32** The team had good community links for women being released, which helped facilitate rehabilitation and accommodation provision for Christian women. Provision for other faiths was less developed, but appropriate for the population. The chaplaincy ran an active prison visitors scheme (see also paragraph 4.33).

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

Effective complaints procedures are in place for women, which are easy to access, easy to use and provide timely responses. Women feel safe from repercussions when using these procedures and are aware of an appeal procedure.

- 2.33** Women had easy access to complaint forms and information about the complaints process. In our survey, women's perceptions about complaints were similar to comparator prisons; however, fewer women than at the previous inspection said complaints were answered promptly.
- 2.34** The number of complaints was higher than at our previous inspection but not excessive. Most responses to simple complaints were reasonable. However, many responses to more complex complaints, including complaints against staff (which accounted for 12%), were inadequate. Investigations were often flawed because the investigator only spoke to the staff member and did not interview the complainant or other witnesses. Some replies were disrespectful and others did not deal with all the issues raised. Around 10% of replies did not make clear whether the complaint had been upheld or not.
- 2.35** Managers reviewed trend data every month, but had not completed quality assurance checks consistently during the six months prior to our inspection. The governor took action when women complained repeatedly about particular officers.

Recommendation

- 2.36** **Women should receive respectful and comprehensive responses to all their complaints.**

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.37** In our survey, fewer women than in comparator prisons and compared with our previous inspection were positive about legal rights support. However, legal visits facilities, booking processes and legal mail arrangements were reasonable. We believed that these negative perceptions might have been related to delays activating telephone numbers (see paragraph 4.27). The community rehabilitation company offered women on remand bail advice and had processed 16 bail applications in the six months to the end of September 2016, of which seven had been successful.

Health services

Expected outcomes:

Women 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 women could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.

- 2.38** 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

- 2.39** The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- 2.40** Inspire Better Health, a partnership of eight health providers led by Bristol Community Health had provided all health and substance misuse services since 1 April 2016. Joint working between the prison, health providers and commissioners was effective. More recently, clinical governance and partnership board meetings were well attended and addressed essential areas. A 2015 health needs assessment had informed arrangements. Lessons learned from adverse incidents, audits and complaints was beginning to inform service delivery.
- 2.41** Women could contribute to the improvement of health services through patient questionnaires and comment forms. Health staff attended the monthly prison consultation group.
- 2.42** Separate visits from NHS England representatives and the provider following recent deaths in custody had identified weaknesses in systems, although overall outcomes were appropriate. A senior manager had temporarily moved into the manager role three weeks prior to our inspection to improve governance and address these deficits while a substantive manager was recruited.

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>.

- 2.43** Significant staffing shortages had restricted service delivery, however successful recruitment had improved the situation. Health staff were clearly identifiable and observed interactions were caring and compassionate. Twenty-four-hour nursing care was provided.
- 2.44** In our survey, 42% of prisoners said the overall quality of health services was good, which was similar to comparable prisons, but fewer than last time (63%).
- 2.45** Health staff were up to date with their mandatory training. Some appraisals and clinical supervision had taken place; however more robust systems had been implemented to improve consistency. Training to enable new staff to develop core skills, including lifelong conditions management, had been booked. Health staff had easy access to an appropriate range of health policies including communicable diseases and safeguarding. Communication within the team was good.
- 2.46** The primary care environment was good but a lack of rooms restricted service delivery (see paragraph 2.54) and some of the wing-based medication administration rooms did not meet infection control standards (see paragraph 2.60). However, work was due to start in January 2017 to address both issues. The waiting area replicated a GP practice and a receptionist booked women into their clinics.
- 2.47** Health staff had access to appropriate well-checked emergency equipment across the establishment. Arrangements to ensure there were always sufficient operational staff who were trained in first aid on duty were satisfactory and officers had easy access to defibrillators in the units. Ambulances were called promptly during medical emergencies.
- 2.48** Women could complain, make a suggestion or praise the service through the confidential Listening to You process. Two hundred and forty-four complaints and 40 compliments had been received since April 2016. The responses we sampled were respectful and addressed the issues raised. Women were often seen in person to resolve their issues. However, the tracking system was weak and we found 48 complaints that had not received a prompt response. Managers addressed the concern when we highlighted it during the inspection.
- 2.49** Women did not receive written information about health services on reception. Health promotion information was mainly only available in the main health department. Annual routine breast screening was due to start from January 2017. Health checks for women over 50 were available on request. Delays in secondary screening meant immunisations were not offered promptly (see paragraph 2.52), however, support for blood borne viruses and smoking cessation was good. There was no access to barrier protection.

Recommendation

- 2.50** **Women should have easy access to information about health services and regularly updated health promotion information should be available across the prison.**

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.51** Health care professionals assessed all new arrivals in reception to identify and address women's immediate health needs. Overall women were seen promptly, although some required longer assessments, which caused delays. Appropriate referrals were made and liaison with community services was good.

- 2.52** A secondary health assessment to address women's broader health needs should have occurred within a few days of arrival, but it usually took place four to eight weeks later owing to staffing shortages and some women were released without having had the assessment.
- 2.53** An appropriate range of primary care clinics was provided and waiting times were satisfactory. Women were appropriately prioritised according to clinical need. However, there was no clear confidential application system. Women requested some services through the general application system, which lacked confidentiality. In our survey, only 22% of women, fewer than at the last inspection said it was easy to see the GP, despite there being up to four GP clinics every day Monday to Friday. However, GP appointments were only available following nurse triage and only a few appointments were available for each unit every day on a first-come-first-served basis. Women were generally positive about the care once they were seen.
- 2.54** A dedicated planned care team provided routine primary care services, covering areas such as women's health, immunisation and lifelong conditions management. GPs took the lead on most lifelong conditions management, while the team completed planned training. A separate urgent care team provided unit-based care for those with acute and urgent needs. Consultations were generally private, although insufficient consultation rooms meant some routine appointments were conducted in cells (see paragraph 2.46). Hanham Health provided all GP services, including out-of-hours GPs, which ensured continuity of care.
- 2.55** Most record keeping was very good and demonstrated women were involved in planning their treatment. We were not confident that all women with complex health needs were systematically included in the weekly complex case meeting held by the health care department, and formal care planning was inadequate.
- 2.56** Women were referred promptly for secondary health services. Appointments were rarely cancelled due to insufficient prison staff escorts and women generally had adequate notice of their appointments.

Recommendations

- 2.57** **Women should receive a secondary health screening within their first seven days in the establishment.**
- 2.58** **Patients should have access to health services through a confidential and effective system.**
- 2.59** **Those with complex health needs should have recorded care plans that are reviewed regularly.**

Pharmacy

- 2.60** HMP Bristol supplied medicines promptly six days a week. Some commonly used medicines were still administered from stock, but the proportion of named patient medication was appropriate. A dedicated medicines management team was responsible for medication administration and medicines management, except for unit 4. Staff responded appropriately to drug alerts and medication recalls. Women could access pharmacy-led clinics including medicine use reviews.

- 2.61** Medicines were prescribed and administered on SystmOne (the electronic clinical information system). Dosage times were appropriate, including the in-cell administration of night-time doses. Missed doses were recorded and followed up as necessary. Women being discharged, transferred or attending court received adequate supplies of medication.
- 2.62** During the inspection 85% of women were prescribed medication, 53% of whom had medication in-possession. Initial in-possession risk assessments were completed with written input from the security department and recorded on SystmOne. Random and intelligence-led spot checks occurred. Medication administration took place from rooms in six units and most were satisfactory but the room in unit 4 was not fit for purpose and the one in unit 10 required refurbishment (see paragraph 2.46). Women did not have photographic identification and received medication following verbal checks, which had led to a woman fraudulently obtaining another woman's methadone. Officers ensured effective queue management during medication administration.
- 2.63** Medicines were stored appropriately and date checks carried out regularly. However, the vaccine refrigerator was stored in the kitchen surrounded by cleaning equipment due to insufficient space. Refrigerator temperatures were not recorded every day in all rooms and remedial action was not always recorded when temperatures were outside the required range. Controlled drugs were generally managed well, although not all cupboards complied with current regulations.
- 2.64** Health care professionals could administer an adequate range of medicines without a GP prescription. Clinicians could obtain an appropriate range of medicines out of hours. The audit trail for both was satisfactory.
- 2.65** The well-attended regular medicines and therapeutics committee discussed all relevant issues, including prescribing trends.

Recommendations

- 2.66** **Photographs should be introduced and used to confirm a patient's identity before medicines, including methadone, are supplied or administered.**
- 2.67** **Refrigerator temperatures should be recorded daily. Appropriate remedial action should be taken and detailed if they are out of range.**

Dentistry

- 2.68** Two dental sessions a week offered a range of treatment, equivalent to what would be expected in the community. Waiting times for routine appointments had been reduced but remained too long at around nine weeks. However, urgent referrals were seen promptly. Oral health promotion was provided verbally during consultations, but was not adequately recorded. Leaflets were being developed. Governance processes were good and ensured safe dental services were provided. The dental suite met infection control standards and waste material was disposed of appropriately.

Recommendation

- 2.69** **Women should have access to routine dental appointments within six weeks.**

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.70** In our survey 79% of women, more than the comparator (64%) and compared with the previous inspection (58%) said they had current emotional well-being or mental health problems. However, fewer than the comparator and compared with last time reported receiving help (40% against 55% and 59% respectively). Joint working between prison, health and mental health staff was very good. Around one third of operational staff had received some mental health awareness training since our last inspection. The mental health team had recently provided learning disability training and planned to deliver regular mental health awareness training.
- 2.71** Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust provided integrated mental health services, ranging from psycho-educational groups through to intense therapy and management under the care programme approach (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness). The team had a rich and appropriate skills mix that included psychology, occupational therapy and learning disability. A consultant psychiatrist from South Wales provided a monthly clinic for women from Wales, which improved outcomes.
- 2.72** Women referred through the open referral system were seen promptly based on clinical needs seven days a week. A weekly multidisciplinary meeting was attended by a GP and substance misuse and Nexus programme staff (see paragraph 4.50), which supported effective communication. During the inspection, the team was supporting 150 women (37% of the population), of which 25 had severe and enduring mental illnesses.
- 2.73** A reasonable range of groups was provided and more were planned to address identified needs, including trauma. Women could receive individual therapy, and bereavement counselling was available through the chaplaincy. Clinical records demonstrated that women received good levels of support.
- 2.74** Support in unit 4 for up to 10 women with complex mental health needs had been enhanced since our last inspection and was good. However, residents stayed longer and the unit was busier mainly because more women with a combination of severe mental health issues, prolific self-harm and very challenging behaviour were held at the prison. We were not confident that a prison environment was the best place for all of these women to be managed. For example, some of the women were being held at Eastwood Park on unit 4 awaiting transfer to mental health facilities under the Mental health Act⁷ because they could not be diverted directly from court into appropriate mental health facilities. Operational staff were always in the unit, and between two and four mental health practitioners were present between 7.30am and 5.30pm daily. Joint working between operational and clinical staff was effective.
- 2.75** A mental health practitioner from the unit assessed all new referrals and admission was agreed at a well-attended multidisciplinary meeting. Individual management plans for all residents were developed and reviewed at separate weekly multidisciplinary admission meeting. Women remained unlocked for most of the day depending on their individual risk. Low intensity groups ran every day and women in the main units who needed day support services also attended. We observed some good care and the environment was also mainly good and included a relaxation room. Discharge planning, including reintegration to the units, remained tailored to the individual.
- 2.76** Sixteen women had been transferred to mental health facilities under the Mental Health Act in the previous six months, all within four weeks. The team expedited prompt transfers, but external factors, including a lack of appropriate beds, created some delays.

⁷ The Mental Health Act (1983) covers the assessment, treatment and rights of people with mental disorders.

Social care

- 2.77** Arrangements for assessing women with social care needs and providing care were appropriate. Not all discipline staff we spoke to knew how to make social care referrals, however written information had recently been provided for each unit.

Catering

Expected outcomes:

Women 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.

- 2.78** Fewer women in our survey compared with the previous inspection said the food was good or very good, although their views were in line with other similar prisons. Many of the women felt the menus contained too many carbohydrates. The catering manager was aware of the issue and was about to review the provision to see if a more balanced diet could be provided. The food we tasted was reasonably good given the limited daily budget. Provision for those with special dietary requirements was good and pregnant women received additional fruit and milk. Meals were served at acceptable times of the day. Breakfast provision was good; it was served on the morning it was to be eaten and consisted of good size portions.
- 2.79** Serveries were very clean and well supervised during meal times. Many women could eat their meals together in communal areas and those in residential units 1, 2 and 3 ate in a large, bright dining hall. Units 7 and 10 had a good range of self-catering facilities, which women appreciated and there were microwaves and toasters on the other wings.
- 2.80** Long-term shortages of catering staff had led to the deterioration of some aspects. For example, servery workers were not always adequately trained and did not always check the temperature of the food just before serving it.
- 2.81** Consultation arrangements were adequate: a twice-yearly survey took place, catering staff attended the regular consultation committee meeting and comments books were available in the units. There was evidence that feedback led to action being taken.

Recommendation

- 2.82** **Servery workers should be adequately trained.**

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.83** New arrivals could wait up to nine days for their first canteen order, which was too long but similar to the last time we inspected. Women could buy emergency canteen packs if they had enough money. Ordering and delivery arrangements for canteen items were adequate. Consultation was undertaken by survey and via the consultation committee. Some changes had been made as a result. It was good that there was a list of items specifically for black and minority ethnic women. The only available catalogue was Avon and only enhanced prisoners could order from it, which was not acceptable.

Recommendation

- 2.84 All women should be able to order personal items from a good range of catalogues.**

Section 3. Purposeful activity

Time out of cell

Expected outcomes:

All women are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.⁸

- 3.1 Time unlocked remained good for women in the open units (accommodating approximately half of the population) who were out of their rooms during the day and up to about 10pm at night. In the remaining closed units, it was also reasonably good at 9.25 hours during the week. Women who could not attend purposeful activity because of their age or disability remained unlocked, while those choosing not to be involved in purposeful activity or on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme were locked up for an additional two hours a day. More women in the first night units were locked up during our checks because they were not involved in activities.
- 3.2 The regime generally ran as scheduled and included periods of association in the early evening and domestic periods every day. These sessions were rarely cancelled unless there were staff shortages and such situations were well managed.
- 3.3 Outside exercise was provided regularly and in some units women could go outside at any point while they were unlocked if they chose to.

⁸ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

All women can engage in activities that are purposeful, benefit them and increase their employability. Women 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.

3.4 Ofsted⁹ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Good

Achievements of women 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

3.5 After a period of slow progress, the prison's new leadership had improved the purposeful activity provision. In the previous year, particularly good progress had been made in introducing creative, industry workshops. Plans were in place to develop the area further by providing work-related qualifications.

3.6 The prison's leaders and managers had further strengthened links with high profile employers and voluntary organisations. As a result, the number of women participating in good, paid employment while on release on temporary licence (ROTL) had increased substantially since the previous inspection and several women had secured full-time employment on release.

3.7 Relationships between the college and the prison's managers were very effective, particularly at operational level. However, the prison's leaders had not done enough to ensure the provision's further development or to challenge learning and skills and work providers to deliver provision of the very highest standards.

3.8 Curriculum planning had been comprehensively informed by labour market data. Overall, the range of activities had improved but not enough work was being done to better meet the needs of the changing population.

3.9 The education and vocational training provision provided by Weston College was good. It led a good team of well-qualified staff that had maintained the high standards of teaching found at the previous inspection.

⁹ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.10** The prison's own evaluation of the provision successfully identified key areas for improvement. However, managers did not fully analyse data to monitor attendance or improve outcomes for learners, particularly in key subjects like English and maths.

Recommendations

- 3.11** Prison leaders should ensure the learning and skills provision fully meets the needs of the changing population.
- 3.12** Managers should improve the use of data to strengthen the scrutiny of women's attainment and improve attainment levels.

Provision of activities

- 3.13** There were sufficient activity spaces for the prison's population. The number of work spaces had increased and the English and maths provision had more than doubled since the previous inspection, but it was still not sufficient to meet women's identified needs.
- 3.14** Weston College offered a suitable range of education and vocational training, which met the needs of most of the women who stayed in the prison for a brief period; for the increasing number of women staying longer, it was limited.
- 3.15** The industrial and work areas offered a broad range of employment activities. However, substantial qualifications were no longer offered in the main kitchen. Women in the detoxification unit (Kinnon Unit) who felt ready to participate in activities could access them.
- 3.16** Despite improvements, many women waited too long to have an induction for activities. The process of allocating them to activities, although better than previously, was not always adhered to. The pay policy was not an incentive to women's participation in education.

Recommendations

- 3.17** The prison should continue to develop the curriculum so it meets the needs of those staying at the prison for longer periods.
- 3.18** Women should be allocated to appropriate activities promptly and pay rates should not discourage women from taking up education courses.

Quality of provision

- 3.19** Teaching, learning and assessment were good. Most learners attending education and vocational training made good progress relative to their starting points. Teachers were well qualified and experienced. They planned activities in lessons that kept learners involved and enthused. In most classes, English and maths was well promoted.
- 3.20** Teachers were aware of individual learners' barriers to learning and used the information effectively to ensure learning assistants and mentors supported women and accelerated their learning. However, a minority of learning assistants and mentors had not completed any training, making their support less effective.

- 3.21** In education and training, learning targets often included the development of personal, behavioural and employment-related skills; progress was clearly recorded. However, newly developed employment skills were insufficiently identified and recorded at work.
- 3.22** The large number of women who had additional learning needs, such as dyslexia, received good levels of support from their tutors. However, tutors could not refer learners for further diagnostic tests and there was no specialist, additional learning support for these women. As a result, a few made slower progress than their peers.
- 3.23** Teachers in vocational areas did not always ensure learners understood how the skills they had acquired applied to the world of employment.

Recommendations

- 3.24** **Managers should ensure that all learners with identified learning needs are offered expert advice and support, including a formal diagnosis of their need.**
- 3.25** **Tutors should identify and record the employment-related skills learners develop and highlight how they could be applied in employment.**

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.26** Learners appreciated the opportunity to get back into education, as many of them had not been involved in education or work for a considerable period. This significantly boosted their confidence and self-esteem. Most of them enjoyed their learning and, despite their many complex needs, became interested in participating in activities and anticipated undertaking further education courses once released. Women behaved particularly well and were respectful towards others.
- 3.27** In education, learners were keen to identify the progress they were making. In vocational training areas, they could confidently explain the work processes they were following. They worked enthusiastically and quickly developed skills such as planning. Most learners improved their English and maths skills through education and vocational training. However, in work and industry areas instructors did not reinforce these essential skills.
- 3.28** Attendance at education and vocational training had not been consistently high in the previous six months. However, during the inspection, attendance was good overall. Managers had only recently begun to monitor attendance at work. Longer-term and planned teaching staff absences were not covered sufficiently and had led to lessons being cancelled. Most learners arrived punctually for the short education day, although a few regularly left training early to attend part-time work.
- 3.29** The implementation of health and safety practices was poor in some work and industry areas. Staff did not emphasise the importance of wearing personal protective equipment.

Recommendations

- 3.30** **Managers should ensure that all women attend planned activities and that the skills they develop in work and industries are recognised and recorded.**
- 3.31** **Senior managers should ensure that safe working practices are implemented throughout work areas.**

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.32** Achievements in most vocational training and education courses were very high. However, more than half of all learners had undertaken very short courses in the previous year. A good proportion of learners achieved English and maths qualifications at lower levels. Learners' work in education and training lessons was good, especially in art where wall displays featured a wide range of impressive line drawings and paintings.
- 3.33** Over the previous two years, achievements in a minority of English and maths courses had been low. Achievements in level 1 maths, which had been an identified area of need, required improvement. Achievement rates in English at level 2 and in English for speakers of other languages were poor in the previous year.
- 3.34** Managers did not analyse sufficiently the performance of different groups of learners to identify and address any differences in their performance over time. Based on the limited data available, only a small minority of learners progressed to a higher level of training. For example, four women progressed from entry level and succeeded at level 1 in English in 2015–2016. A minority of women achieved a considerable number of qualifications at the prison. (See recommendation 3.12.)

Library

- 3.35** South Gloucestershire County Council, provided the prison's library service, which was sufficiently well stocked to meet the needs of the population. Prisoners had adequate access to legal texts and to Prison Service orders and instructions.
- 3.36** Women could borrow talking books and books in easy-read and large print formats. Staff actively promoted literacy through several reading initiatives in the library and the residential units. The rate of book loss was low.
- 3.37** Library staff were responsive to requests from individual teaching staff for resources that supported education and training. However, coordination with education managers to plan purchases for the forthcoming academic year was insufficient.
- 3.38** Access to the library was limited for those in full-time work who were not allocated library sessions. Around 60% of the population were registered with the library, but less than one third of women were regular service users.

Recommendations

- 3.39** **Staff should ensure that library material purchases are coordinated appropriately so they support the education curriculum.**
- 3.40** **Managers should ensure that all women have access to the library that does not conflict with their attendance at activities.**

Physical education and healthy living

Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.41** The physical education (PE) provision offered a wide range of sport and fitness activities and women had access to a sports hall, cardio-vascular equipment, weights and resistance machinery. The facilities were well maintained and well managed, there were few accidents and the provision was effective at improving and maintaining women's physical fitness. Effective planning ensured all groups of women, including those working outside the prison, could use the gym.
- 3.42** Inductions to the gym were comprehensive and ran every week for all prisoners, including those in the detoxification unit. Women were encouraged to participate in physical education, fitness and associated activities, based on an effective assessment of their individual fitness needs. Good links with the health care department supported referrals to the gym.
- 3.43** Although the PE facilities had no showers, women had access to shower and bath facilities in the residential units and were allowed sufficient time to use them after each session.
- 3.44** Women could not access sport or fitness courses to support the development of their employment skills or enhance their understanding of PE. However, they enjoyed participating in a well-being and self-esteem event and developed an awareness of the importance of having a positive body image. However, due to the prison's transient population, only a few women at a time could benefit from the event.
- 3.45** Instructors promoted healthy living initiatives and gym activities through notice board displays. However, prisoners whose reading skills were poor could not easily access the information.

Recommendations

- 3.46 PE qualifications should be introduced and links made with external sports and fitness organisations to improve prisoners' chances of finding employment and developing their fitness levels.**
- 3.47 Instructors should develop a different approach to promoting PE activities to ensure those with poor reading skills have access to information.**

Section 4. Resettlement

Strategic management of resettlement

Expected outcomes:

Planning for a prisoner's release or transfer starts on her 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 prison's reducing reoffending strategy document was up to date and covered all key aspects of resettlement, including offender management. Development objectives had been clearly identified and quarterly strategic meetings were appropriately constituted. Offender management and resettlement meetings were also held monthly to support the overall development of services.
- 4.2 The Wales community rehabilitation company (CRC) had been in place since May 2015 and was reasonably well established at the prison. Although many of the staff were relatively new, clear development objectives ensured appropriate services were delivered. The geographic region covered by the CRC was large and included three separate contract package areas (CPA), from Gloucestershire to Cornwall and including Wales. Good links had been established with a range of community support services, although it had been more difficult to do so in the rural areas of the southwest. Good links had been made with the Thames Valley and West Mercia CPAs. Approximately 15% of all women released from Eastwood Park returned to areas outside the three main CPAs.
- 4.3 The offender management unit (OMU) was made up of a probation staff, allocated mostly to high and very high risk of harm women, and band 4 prison officer offender supervisors, who worked primarily with low and medium risk women. There had, over the preceding few months, been a considerable reduction in the availability of band 4 staff due to staff shortages and redeployment to other duties of offender management staff. This had a substantial impact on how often they contacted women for whom they were responsible.
- 4.4 Although the work of offender management and CRC staff had a generally appropriate focus, much of it continued to operate in isolation. The two departments were not integrated well enough at an operational level and services did not work together sufficiently to ensure community-based officers and women knew what had been done in custody to address their needs, and what release plans were in place. Therefore, it was not surprising that in our survey, only 14% of women, fewer than in comparable prisons, said someone had helped them prepare for release.
- 4.5 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) had developed well since the previous inspection and in the previous six months 12 women had benefited from it on 413 separate occasions. Risk assessments were robust.

Offender management and planning

Expected outcomes:

All women have a sentence based on an individual assessment of risk and need, which is regularly reviewed and implemented throughout and after their time in custody.

Women, together with all relevant staff, are involved in drawing up and reviewing plans.

- 4.6** All remanded or newly sentenced women were seen within 24 hours of arrival. A basic custody screening (BCS) was completed and a subsequent resettlement plan drawn up by the CRC. All women serving over 12 months also had to have an offender assessment system (OASys) document. During our inspection, there was only a small backlog of six OASys documents and all women had a BCS and a resettlement plan. This meant all women had some form of custody plan, but it was not clear to what extent the women were involved in the process or how much they knew about their plan. Although more women than at the last inspection said they had a named offender supervisor, this remained lower than at comparable establishments; fewer than the comparator also said they had a sentence plan. Women we spoke to during the inspection confirmed these findings.
- 4.7** Despite this, we found resettlement plans and OASys documents to be generally of a good standard. OASys-based sentence plans covered the main issues and appropriately focused on offending. Resettlement plans were comprehensive and covered all key aspects, often going beyond the mandatory fields covered by the CRC.
- 4.8** The real challenge for the CRC and OMU was the large number of women at the prison with complex needs and the high population turnover. Twenty-five percent of the sentenced population were serving less than six months and 41% less than 12 months, which meant they did not need an OASys document. Seventy-two percent of the sentenced population had been at the prison less than 12 months and nearly half of them for less than three months. In our survey, 56% of women said they had problems with drugs when they first arrived at the prison and 37% said they had problems with alcohol, both higher than at similar prisons. In addition, 31% of women said they had housing problems and 48%, more women than at similar prisons, said they had mental health problems. In most of the cases we reviewed we found complex issues that were difficult to resolve while women were at the prison for such a short time. Nevertheless, many of the women we spoke to did not know who their offender supervisor or resettlement worker was and none had copies of their resettlement plans or OASys sentence plans.
- 4.9** Offender supervisors' contact with women was variable. We saw some evidence to demonstrate that offender management and CRC work was supportive and motivational, but too often contact, especially with band 4 offender supervisors was informal and/or infrequent. Offender supervisors told us there were no targets for how often contact should be made and, in most cases, they only had contact if there was a specific need or issue. Women were unclear about the role of CRC staff, who exactly they were and what they could offer.
- 4.10** In the six months up to the inspection, 97 women had been considered by the home detention curfew (HDC) board, 38 of whom were successful. In April 2016, the prison introduced a filter system for women who could be considered for HDC. Only those meeting the criteria went forward to the board. Appropriate checks and balances were in place to ensure the process was fair and women who were excluded could appeal the decision. Since the introduction of the screening, 57% of all cases considered went forward to the board. We reviewed several cases that had been excluded and found the decisions to have been reasonable and fair. The new method meant that 63% of women were considered by the board before their eligibility date.

Recommendation

- 4.11 Offender supervisors should have regular and meaningful contact with those on their caseloads and should involve women in sentence and resettlement planning.**

Public protection

- 4.12** Public protection arrangements were generally sound. During the inspection 33 women were identified as presenting child protection concerns and 48 were subject to restraining orders or harassment charges. Screening procedures were appropriately undertaken when women arrived at the prison and the monthly inter-departmental risk management team (IDRMT) board considered all high-risk cases and those subject to public protection procedures at appropriate intervals.
- 4.13** Arrangements for women subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) were also generally good. Cases were managed through the senior probation officer and MAPPA F reports, information-sharing reports prepared for community MAPPA meetings, were good. However, although the OMU team always asked the community-based responsible officer to confirm what MAPPA level women were subject to on release, the information was not always forthcoming and we were concerned that some women who should have been subject to MAPPA level 2 (where the active involvement of one or more agency is required) could have been overlooked.

Recommendation

- 4.14 The MAPPA level of women due to be released should be clarified at the earliest opportunity.**

Allocation

- 4.15** Categorisation and re-categorisation reviews were generally undertaken on time and there was no backlog during the inspection. Twenty-one women were classified as being eligible for open conditions. Because of the location of the two women's open prisons, women generally preferred to stay at Eastwood Park. The increase in the availability of ROTL meant women were usually not disadvantaged by staying.
- 4.16** The prison was, nevertheless, under pressure to manage its accommodation within the wider estate. At the time of the inspection only eight spaces were available at the prison. Two planned drafts of women to establishments out of the area were planned for the week following the inspection, which meant some women were likely to be moved further away from home. In most cases women who were moved were those serving the longest sentences or were from the actual CPA covered by the receiving prison.
- 4.17** Some women were also moved for specific purposes, such as to attend an offending behaviour programme or complete a course. Two women were due to be moved to HMP Send the following week for this reason.

Recommendation

- 4.18 All sentenced women should be held in the prison closest to their home unless they need to go elsewhere temporarily to complete an intervention.**
(Recommendation repeated 4.24)

Indeterminate sentence women

- 4.19** Since the last inspection there had been a substantial increase in the number of indeterminate sentenced women at Eastwood Park. In 2013 the prison held one prisoner serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection (ISPP) and two serving life sentences. At this inspection, the number had risen to two ISPPs and 11 lifers. The primary reason for this was the introduction of the Nexus programme, in which many long-term prisoners participated. A number were at the prison so they could have accumulated visits.
- 4.20** All indeterminate sentence women were allocated to a probation offender supervisor. They were also monitored via the monthly IDRMT meeting (see paragraph 4.12), which ensured that their needs were met and that their progress was appropriately overseen. The process also monitored women on remand who were likely to receive an indeterminate sentence.

Reintegration planning

Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.21** The prison released around 130 women each month. The Wales CRC saw all women, regardless of which geographical area they were returning to or their risk level. We reviewed the cases of several women who were due to be released within the following fortnight and all had resettlement plans. In our survey, fewer women than at similar prisons and fewer than at the last inspection said they knew whom to speak to about accommodation, benefits, finance and debt, employment and education. Despite this, records indicated women were being seen by the CRC who covered all these areas. The likely explanation for women's perceptions was that they did not have copies of their resettlement plans (see paragraph 4.8), and referrals were made to community-based agencies which, in some cases, would not make contact until after release. Even when staff from agencies came into the prison, information confirming that contact had been made with the woman was not consistently passed on so CRC staff did not always know about it.
- 4.22** The roles and responsibilities of offender supervisors and CRC resettlement staff were not clear. While CRC staff were exclusively responsible for most women sentenced to less than a year, their role in linking with offender supervisors and managers in low and medium risk cases where women were serving over 12 months was confused. In many cases information-sharing with the community was overlooked. High risk cases were better managed – probation staff took responsibility for most issues around resettlement and risk management.
- 4.23** Although it was evident that the mental health team and the drug and alcohol team had developed good contacts in the community and made direct contact with GPs and external agencies to facilitate support on release, details were not consistently sent to the offender supervisor or CRC resettlement worker and was not consistently available to the community offender manager, affecting continuity and the effectiveness of resettlement.

Recommendations

- 4.24** The prison should clarify the responsibilities of CRC staff and offender management staff in managing the resettlement needs of women serving over 12 months, and especially those assessed as posing a low or medium risk of harm.
- 4.25** The prison should ensure that work undertaken in custody with women both internally and externally is shared with CRC and offender management staff to ensure continuity on release and effective resettlement.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.26** There was no overarching family strategy or policy and the work needed further development.
- 4.27** Mail was dealt with appropriately. Email facilities for families were available but Skype was not. Inter-prison visits could take place via the video link. More women than at comparator prisons had difficulties accessing phone numbers on arrival (35% against 26%); it sometimes took four days before some numbers could be authorised and therefore, some women could not contact family or legal representatives promptly.
- 4.28** Visitors and women told us that the booking line was busy and that weekend visits were oversubscribed. Social visits were from 2pm to 3pm and from 3.30pm to 4.30pm. Visitors still had to use two visiting orders if they wanted to stay for both sessions, but they no longer had to leave and come back again for the later session.
- 4.29** Waiting areas for visitors were too small and poorly resourced. Much of the information in the portacabin and waiting room was out of date. Searching was carried out appropriately and visits staff were friendly and approachable. The visits hall was pleasant but cramped and only 15 spaces were available. Refreshments, including cakes made by the women, were available.
- 4.30** Family engagement workers from national charity PACT (Prison Advice and Care Trust), supported by two orderlies who met all women during their induction, spoke to them about the support on offer. The organisation also supplied packs with craft material and stickers so women could make cards for their children, which was extremely popular.
- 4.31** Two PACT workers specifically supported women from South Wales. The excellent Visiting Mum project saw professionals or trained volunteers provide transport to bring families from South Wales to the prison for supervised children's visits. Activities and refreshments were available as part of the quarterly family fun days.
- 4.32** Day-long family visits for enhanced status women had been taking place in the mother and baby unit (MBU), which had been shut during the inspection. The visits hut was being refurbished to provide an additional area for family visits. Women from unit 7 could apply for these visits but enhanced women from other units could not, even though they could previously when they were held in the MBU.
- 4.33** Women receiving visits appreciated them and the different activities on offer. However, during our inspection, over a quarter (116) of women had not received a visit while at the prison; the reasons for this required investigation. The chaplaincy coordinated an active and well-used official prison visits scheme but support for women with families who live far away from the prison, such as all day visits and Skype needed developing (see main recommendation S47 and paragraph 1.3).

Recommendations

- 4.34** The system for checking phone numbers should be streamlined to avoid unnecessary delays for women needing to contact family and lawyers.
- 4.35** The information for visitors available in the portacabin and waiting area should be up to date.
- 4.36** All enhanced women should be allowed access to family visits in the hut.

Good practice

- 4.37** *The Visiting Mum project helped women from South Wales maintain their family links in a supportive and supervised environment.*

Victimisation, abuse and vulnerability

- 4.38** There was no overarching strategy for supporting women who had experienced domestic violence or been involved in sex work. However, two managers took the lead on domestic abuse, sexual violence and trafficking, while CRC staff had received some training in the issues. A CRC prison manager was also very knowledgeable of the area. As a result, issues were approached sensitively during resettlement interviews but the support available was too limited. Some good links had been made with community agencies that could offer individual support. The local Women's Aid group had arranged an initial group session for women who had experienced domestic violence and the CRC had introduced a six-week programme on sexual violence, although the number of women accessing the programme so far was relatively low. Nonetheless the programme appeared appropriate.

Recommendation

- 4.39** The prison should take a whole prison approach to supporting women with experiences of abuse, rape, domestic violence or who had been involved in prostitution or been trafficked. An appropriate and effective range of support services should be developed.

Accommodation

- 4.40** The delivery of accommodation support was a major concern because of a range of factors, including the broad catchment area of the prison, the large number of women serving short sentences and arriving at the prison with housing problems, as well as the national shortage of accommodation. Issues around accommodation were routinely included in custody and resettlement plans and support was provided when needed. However, the prison's own figures suggested around a quarter of all women leaving Eastwood Park did so without suitable identified accommodation. In most cases the women received information about homelessness support in the area to which they were returning, but it was not clear what their outcomes were. (See main recommendation S48.)

Education, training and employment

- 4.41** The ROTL programme was well managed, and women were allocated promptly to a work placement, where they continued developing their skills. The quality of the National Careers Service provided by Prospects was good. Advisers offered prisoners supportive education and employment guidance that led to a comprehensive skills action plan. A pre-release course had been introduced to support prisoners with the practical skills and knowledge they needed for employment or education and training on release; however, it was too early to measure its impact.

Health care

- 4.42** Health staff saw all women a few days before release to ensure continuity of treatment. Mental health staff liaised effectively with community services. We saw evidence of joint working to keep women safe, including prison transport being used to take vulnerable women to appointments on release. The Addiction Recovery Agency, Bristol provided additional throughcare support for women with mental health and substance misuse issues. A dedicated worker provided women from Wales on the offender personality disorder pathway with resettlement support.
- 4.43** There was no palliative care policy or established local links to support women with end-of-life needs, although no woman had required these services since our last inspection.

Recommendation

- 4.44** **Links with local services and a care pathway should be developed to support women with palliative and end-of-life needs.**

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.45** Good joint working between clinical and psychosocial substance misuse services ensured treatment continuation on release. There had been a recent spike in post-release overdose-related deaths. A review of these deaths highlighted issues around joint working between the prison and Welsh drug services, and action had been taken to improve this process. Care for women with complex needs was planned at multidisciplinary meetings, and options for reducing the risk of an overdose now included methadone re-initiation to stabilise women prior to release, the opiate blocker naltrexone to support abstinence, and naloxone training so women could treat an overdose once released.
- 4.46** A designated continuing care nurse communicated with community prescribers to confirm treatment regimes, and substance misuse teams had developed good links with community services across the large catchment area. Prison link workers from surrounding areas visited regularly and a local service picked women up at the gate and offered mentoring.
- 4.47** Release preparation was thorough and included relapse prevention, harm reduction and overdose prevention information.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.48** Support for women with financial and debt problems was appropriate, if somewhat restricted. The CRC provided limited support, focusing primarily on issuing standard letters to relevant agencies and organisations about finance matters for women to complete. It was not clear how helpful women found the service. A finance benefit and debt short group work programme had been agreed and was due to begin shortly. A further financial capability programme was being run.

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.49** No formally accredited programmes were delivered at Eastwood Park. However, the prison did deliver several programmes focusing on victim awareness, including the Sycamore Tree, organised by the chaplaincy, and the Forgiveness Project and I Am programmes (encouraging the taking of personal responsibility as well as active change) run through the activity hub, all of which appeared appropriate for the population.
- 4.50** The Nexus Programme Unit, which had opened in February 2015, provided a residential treatment service for up to 16 women with at least six months to serve who met the criteria for the offender personality disorder pathway. The Nexus programme also offered outreach treatment for up to eight women. Despite delays in opening a residential pre-treatment service, six women were involved with the outreach service during the inspection. Clear, appropriate selection and deselection criteria were in place.
- 4.51** An integrated team of specially trained officers, psychologists and therapists supported women through individual treatment plans. Governance processes, including training and supervision, were appropriate. Joint working with other key departments including mental health services was effective. Women we spoke to were very positive about the support they received. Discharge planning was effective.

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 recommendation

To NOMS

- 5.1** NOMS should ensure accommodation services for women at Eastwood Park are sufficient to support women into stable accommodation on release. (S48)

Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.2** The prison should ensure that women are safe from victimisation, that they feel supported, that antisocial behaviour is consistently challenged and that investigations into serious incidents involving violence or self-harm identify opportunities for improvement. (S46)
- 5.3** The prison should develop a strategic approach to support women to maintain contact with their families, particularly those far from home. Skype and other technology, all-day visits and flexible accumulated visiting orders should be considered to this end. (S47)

Recommendations

To NOMS

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.4** Women should be held in court cells for the minimum possible period and arrive at the prison with enough time left to settle in on the first night wing. (1.4)
- 5.5** Female and male prisoners should be transported separately. (1.5, repeated recommendation 1.6)

Offender management and planning

- 5.6** All sentenced women should be held in the prison closest to their home unless they need to go elsewhere temporarily to complete an intervention. (4.18, repeated recommendation 4.24)

Recommendations

To the governor

Early days in custody

- 5.7** The prison should track who has completed the whole induction programme to ensure all women participate in all relevant elements. (1.13)

Safe and supportive relationships

- 5.8** The prison should keep records of information that safer custody peer workers pass on and ensure all information is processed appropriately. (1.21)
- 5.9** Women with complex needs should only be subject to the IEP scheme if it forms part of an individual care plan designed to improve behaviour. (1.22)

Self-harm and suicide prevention

- 5.10** Initial ACCT reviews should be carried out by a multidisciplinary team. (1.27)
- 5.11** There should be a Listener suite. (1.28)

Substance misuse

- 5.12** Substance misuse support should be fully integrated and developed in consultation with service users and there should be timely assessments, regular group work and mutual aid. (1.57)

Residential units

- 5.13** Conditions in unit 8 should be improved and should include removing graffiti and providing good quality furniture and lockable safes in working order. (2.7)
- 5.14** A tracking system should be introduced to help ensure all applications receive a timely reply. (2.8)
- 5.15** Responses to call bells should be monitored to ensure they are answered within a reasonable time. (2.9)

Staff-prisoner relationships

- 5.16** Consultation arrangements should include women from all residential units. (2.15)

Equality and diversity

- 5.17** The negative perceptions of women with disabilities should be explored and those requiring a PEEP should have one. (2.29)

Complaints

- 5.18** Women should receive respectful and comprehensive responses to all their complaints. (2.36)

Health services

- 5.19** Women should have easy access to information about health services and regularly updated health promotion information should be available across the prison. (2.50)
- 5.20** Women should receive a secondary health screening within their first seven days in the establishment. (2.57)

- 5.21** Patients should have access to health services through a confidential and effective system. (2.58)
- 5.22** Those with complex health needs should have recorded care plans that are reviewed regularly. (2.59)
- 5.23** Photographs should be introduced and used to confirm a patient's identity before medicines, including methadone, are supplied or administered. (2.66)
- 5.24** Refrigerator temperatures should be recorded daily. Appropriate remedial action should be taken and detailed if they are out of range. (2.67)
- 5.25** Women should have access to routine dental appointments within six weeks. (2.69)

Catering

- 5.26** Servery workers should be adequately trained. (2.82)

Purchases

- 5.27** All women should be able to order personal items from a good range of catalogues. (2.84)

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.28** Prison leaders should ensure the learning and skills provision fully meets the needs of the changing population. (3.11)
- 5.29** Managers should improve the use of data to strengthen the scrutiny of women's attainment and improve attainment levels. (3.12)
- 5.30** The prison should continue to develop the curriculum so it meets the needs of those staying at the prison for longer periods. (3.17)
- 5.31** Women should be allocated to appropriate activities promptly and pay rates should not discourage women from taking up education courses. (3.18)
- 5.32** Managers should ensure that all learners with identified learning needs are offered expert advice and support, including a formal diagnosis of their need. (3.24)
- 5.33** Tutors should identify and record the employment-related skills learners develop and highlight how they could be applied in employment. (3.25)
- 5.34** Managers should ensure that all women attend planned activities and that the skills they develop in work and industries are recognised and recorded. (3.30)
- 5.35** Senior managers should ensure that safe working practices are implemented throughout work areas. (3.31)
- 5.36** Staff should ensure that library material purchases are coordinated appropriately so they support the education curriculum. (3.39)
- 5.37** Managers should ensure that all women have access to the library that does not conflict with their attendance at activities. (3.40)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.38** PE qualifications should be introduced and links made with external sports and fitness organisations to improve prisoners' chances of finding employment and developing their fitness levels. (3.46)
- 5.39** Instructors should develop a different approach to promoting PE activities to ensure those with poor reading skills have access to information. (3.47)

Offender management and planning

- 5.40** Offender supervisors should have regular and meaningful contact with those on their caseloads and should involve women in sentence and resettlement planning. (4.11)
- 5.41** The MAPPA level of women due to be released should be clarified at the earliest opportunity. (4.14)

Reintegration planning

- 5.42** The prison should clarify the responsibilities of CRC staff and offender management staff in managing the resettlement needs of women serving over 12 months, and especially those assessed as posing a low or medium risk of harm. (4.24)
- 5.43** The prison should ensure that work undertaken in custody with women both internally and externally is shared with CRC and offender management staff to ensure continuity on release and effective resettlement. (4.25)
- 5.44** The system for checking phone numbers should be streamlined to avoid unnecessary delays for women needing to contact family and lawyers. (4.34)
- 5.45** The information for visitors available in the portacabin and waiting area should be up to date. (4.35)
- 5.46** All enhanced women should be allowed access to family visits in the hut. (4.36)
- 5.47** The prison should take a whole prison approach to supporting women with experiences of abuse, rape, domestic violence or who had been involved in prostitution or been trafficked. An appropriate and effective range of support services should be developed. (4.39)
- 5.48** Links with local services and a care pathway should be developed to support women with palliative and end-of-life needs. (4.44)

Example of good practice

- 5.49** The Visiting Mum project helped women from South Wales maintain their family links in a supportive and supervised environment. (4.37)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Maneer Afsar	Inspector
Francesca Cooney	Inspector
Ian Dickens	Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Nigel Scarff	Inspector
Ellis Cowling	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Emma Seymour	Researcher
Patricia Taflan	Researcher
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Majella Pearce	Health services inspector
Barry Cohen	Pharmacist
Gary Turney	Care Quality Commission inspector
Caroline Williams	Care Quality Commission inspector
Darryl Jones	Ofsted inspector
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Maria Navarro	Ofsted inspector

Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

Safety

Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.

At the last inspection, in 2013, women waited for long periods in court cells before often lengthy journeys to the prison. Reception, first night and induction procedures were good. Most prisoners felt safe and violence reduction arrangements were good. A small number of women accounted for a large proportion of self-harm incidents. Work with women with complex needs was excellent and care for vulnerable women was good. Security arrangements were proportionate and the mandatory drug testing (MDT) rate low. Most use of force incidents involved minimal force, but de-escalation was not always used effectively. Prisoners were segregated in the units and the numbers were low, but governance arrangements needed to improve. Substance misuse support was impressive. Outcomes for women were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Women should be held in court cells for the minimum possible period and arrive at the prison before 7pm (1.5)

Not achieved

Female and male prisoners should be transported separately (1.6)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.5)

Graffiti should be removed from first night cells and damaged furniture should be replaced. (1.17)

Partially achieved

The prison and the local safeguarding adults board should establish effective safeguarding processes and staff training. (1.43)

Partially achieved

Use of force paperwork and videos should be reviewed promptly following incidents. (1.62)

Not achieved

Monitoring of adjudications, use of force, and segregation should include all the protected characteristics, and segregation records should be comprehensive and monitored daily by managers. (1.68)

Achieved

Segregated women should have at least one hour in the open air every day and should get their meals from the server. (1.69)

Not achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2013, living conditions ranged from adequate to very good. Cleanliness was good, but there was some graffiti. The mother and baby unit (MBU) was excellent, if under-occupied. Staff-prisoner relationships were excellent. Equality and diversity support was good and faith provision excellent. Complaints were well managed, but bail and legal services support was inadequate. Health services were good. The demand for mental health services, which were good, was high. Food was good and opportunities to dine in association very good. Canteen arrangements were reasonable. Outcomes for women were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The role and function of the mother and baby unit at Eastwood Park and of similar units in other prisons should be reviewed to better understand why they continue to be under occupied, and policy developed so that these high quality and skilled staff are used most effectively to support more women prisoners with babies and small children. (S39)

No longer relevant

The specific needs of the young adult population should be clearly assessed, and a strategic and coordinated approach taken to meeting them. (S40)

Partially achieved

Recommendations

Graffiti should be removed and a system put in place to record the condition of cells regularly. (2.9)

Partially achieved

Cells designed for one should not be used for two. (2.10)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be able to use all telephones in private. (2.11)

Partially achieved

During the day the MBU should always be staffed by a minimum of two MBU trained officers and single male officers should not staff them at night (2.23).

No longer relevant

Staff who have regular contact with prisoners should be required to make meaningful contributions to sentence planning and risk reduction processes. (2.30)

Not achieved

The poorer perceptions of prisoners with a disability highlighted in our survey should be investigated and any issues addressed. (2.51)

Not achieved

The pension for retired prisoners should be increased. (2.52)

Not achieved

An effective bail support service should be established. (2.66)

Partially achieved

An up-to-date health needs assessment should inform health provision and health promotion activity, including smoking cessation, should be regular and timely. (2.79)

Achieved

The complaints process should be confidential. (2.80)

Achieved

External hospital appointments should not be delayed and women should be given sufficient notice of the appointment. (2.91)

Achieved

Women should have access to pharmacist clinics and medicine use reviews should be undertaken. (2.100)

Achieved

The range of PGDs should be expanded to include a wider range of medicines and avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor and delays in reception on arrival. (2.101)

Partially achieved

The pharmacy should be routinely notified where medicine is administered using the special sick policy. (2.102)

Achieved

Named patient medicines should always be used except where there is no alternative but to use stock. (2.103)

Partially achieved

Counselling should be provided to support all women with needs such as bereavement. (2.120)

Partially achieved

Prison staff should all receive mental health awareness training to enable them to identify and support women with mental ill health. (2.121)

Partially achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2013, time out of cell varied from good to very good depending on the unit. Leadership and management of learning and skills were good, but there were some gaps. The number of activity places available was sufficient, but women were negative about the opportunities available and allocation arrangements needed attention. Attendance and punctuality were good and a work ethic was encouraged. The quality of teaching was good and a reasonable range of classes were offered, although shortfalls were evident. Too few work places provided accreditation, and opportunities at higher levels were limited, but achievements in vocational training and education were high. Outcomes for the small number of young adults were less good. The library and gym provided good opportunities. Outcomes for women were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The prison should ensure that the allocation of prisoners to activities is timely, accurate and well coordinated. (S41)

Not achieved

Recommendations

The prison should ensure strategic planning provides clear direction and suitable learning and skills and work priorities, informed by the labour market and other relevant resettlement information. (3.13)

Partially achieved

The prison should offer enough English and mathematics provision to meet prisoners' identified needs. (3.19)

Not achieved

The prison should increase the use, quality and quantity of information and learning technology to support teaching and learning. (3.26.)

No longer relevant

Prisoners' English and mathematics development should be promoted effectively across all subject areas. (3.27)

Achieved

The prison should ensure that prisoners use necessary personal protective equipment. (3.32)

Not achieved

Support for the Toe by Toe scheme on the units should be improved (3.36)

Achieved

All prisoners should have suitable access to the library. (3.37)

Not achieved

Prisoners on the basic regime should have the same access to PE activity as other prisoners. (3.44)

Achieved

The prison should encourage women with disabilities to access PE, and monitor uptake. (3.45)

Partially achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2013, strategic management of resettlement needed to be developed. Prisoners had access to release on temporary licence (ROTL) and opportunities were developing. Arrangements for the small number of women subject to formal offender management were reasonable, but there was a backlog of some assessments. Public protection arrangements were good. Categorisation processes were also good, but too many women were moved further away from home to create spaces at the prison. Prisoners had their resettlement needs assessed on arrival, but pre-release work needed to be better coordinated. Some good support was offered in the resettlement pathways. Support to maintain contact with family and friends was good. Outcomes for women were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

All prisoners should have a custody plan to identify and monitor their resettlement needs and these should be systematically reviewed pre-release. (S42)

Achieved

Recommendations

Regular strategic resettlement meetings should review the effectiveness of resettlement provision in the light of the assessed needs of the population and monitor progress against a strategic plan. (4.5)

Achieved

All sentenced prisoners should be seen by an offender supervisor promptly after sentencing, and receive an OASys document before they are transferred. (4.14)

Achieved

OMU managers should monitor and closely manage the key processes of the department, including OASys documents, HDC and the timeliness of initial interviews. (4.15)

Achieved

Offender supervisor should use P-Nomis to create a comprehensive central case record. (4.16)

Not achieved

All sentenced prisoners should be held in the prison closest to their home unless they need to go elsewhere temporarily to complete an intervention. (4.24)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 4.18)

The work of agencies responsible for meeting the resettlement needs of prisoners should be effectively coordinated and prisoners' additional identified needs should be added to sentence plans. (4.37)

Achieved

Suitable accommodation for NCS interviews should be provided. (4.38)

Achieved

Women should be seen by health care staff before their discharge date to enable effective preparation for transfer or release. (4.40)

Achieved

Women should not have to give up two visiting orders for a two-hour visit, and there should not be a break in the middle of week day two-hour visits. (4.53)

Partially achieved

Arrangements, such as all day visits, should be made for visitors travelling long distances. (4.54)

Not achieved

The visitor centre should remain open at the end of visits to enable visitors to seek advice or support. (4.55)

Partially achieved

Arrangements should be made to enable parents to take pushchairs and car seats into visits. (4.56)

Achieved

Prisoners with experiences of abuse, rape, domestic violence and involvement in prostitution should be supported by an environment that encourages disclosure and provides appropriate counselling and support services. (4.62)

Partially achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	14	274	70.8
Recall		29	7.1
Convicted unsentenced	3	23	6.4
Remand		46	11.3
Civil prisoners		2	0.5
Indeterminate sentence	1	12	3.2
Detainees		1	0.2
Unknown		2	0.5
Total	18	389	100

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	3	81	20.6
Less than 6 months	3	79	20.1
6 months to less than 12 months	4	38	10.3
12 months to less than 2 years	5	34	9.6
2 years to less than 4 years	1	69	17.2
4 years to less than 10 years	1	71	17.7
10 years and over (not life)		4	1.0
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)			
Life	1	11	3.4
Total	18	389	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 18		
Under 21 years	18	4.4
21 years to 29 years	105	25.8
30 years to 39 years	147	36.1
40 years to 49 years	87	21.4
50 years to 59 years	36	8.8
60 years to 69 years	11	2.7
70 plus years	3	0.7
Please state maximum age here: 72		
Total	407	100

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	17	366	94.1
Foreign nationals	1	17	4.4
Not stated		6	1.5
Total	18	389	100

Security category	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised	3	32	8.6
Unsentenced	3	64	16.5
Female closed	12	272	69.8
Female open	0	21	5.2
Total	18	389	100

Ethnicity	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
White	14	344	88.0
British	13	336	85.7
Irish			
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		4	1.0
Other white	1	4	1.2
Mixed	1	5	1.5
White and black Caribbean		2	0.5
White and black African	1		0.2
White and Asian			
Other mixed		3	0.7
Asian or Asian British		11	2.7
Indian		2	0.5
Pakistani		4	1.0
Bangladeshi			
Chinese			
Other Asian		5	1.2
Black or black British		13	3.2
Caribbean		9	2.2
African		3	0.7
Other black		1	0.2
Other ethnic group		1	0.2
Arab		1	0.2
Other ethnic group			
Not stated	3	15	4.4
Total	18	389	100

Religion	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		2	0.5
Church of England		56	13.8
Roman Catholic		50	12.3
Other Christian denominations	4	52	13.8
Muslim		14	3.4
Sikh		2	0.5
Hindu			
Buddhist		2	0.5
Jewish			
Other		8	2.0
No religion	14	194	51.1
Not stated		9	2.2
Total	18	389	100

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	5	1.2	71	17.4
1 month to 3 months	3	0.7	114	28.0
3 months to 6 months	6	1.5	47	11.5
6 months to 1 year			47	11.5
1 year to 2 years	1	0.2	19	4.7
2 years to 4 years			10	2.5
4 years or more				
Total	15	3.7	308	75.7

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry		1	
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).			

Unsented prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	1	0.2	42	10.3
1 month to 3 months			21	5.2
3 months to 6 months	2	0.5	11	2.7
6 months to 1 year			6	1.5
1 year to 2 years			1	0.2
2 years to 4 years				
4 years or more				
Total	3	0.7	81	19.9

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.¹⁰ Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-NOMIS prisoner population printout using a systematic sampling method.

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 7 November 2016 the prisoner population at HMP Eastwood Park was 404. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 173 women.

We received a total of 154 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 89%. This included one questionnaire completed via interview. Five respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 14 questionnaires were not returned.

¹⁰ 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 7%. The formula assumes a 75% response rate (65% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/unit	Number of completed survey returns
1	9
2	14
3	15
4	1
5	21
6	43
7	18
8	29
10	4

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP Eastwood Park.

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

We also present a number of comparative analyses. In all the comparative analyses that follow, statistically significant differences¹¹ are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in women's background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Eastwood Park in 2016 compared with responses from women surveyed in all other women's local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in six local prisons since April 2014.
- The current survey responses from HMP Eastwood Park in 2016 compared with the responses of women surveyed at HMP Eastwood Park in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of white women and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of women 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 women who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.

¹¹ A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. In order to appropriately adjust p-values in light of multiple testing, $p < 0.01$ was considered statistically significant for all comparisons undertaken. This means there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.

- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of women who consider themselves to be homosexual, bisexual or other and those who consider themselves to be heterosexual.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between the responses of prisoners on residential unit 7 and those on residential units 2 and 3.
- A comparison within the 2016 survey between residential unit 8 and those on residential units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10.

Survey summary

Section I: About You

Q1.2	How old are you?	
	<i>Under 21</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>21 - 29</i>	46 (30%)
	<i>30 - 39</i>	57 (37%)
	<i>40 - 49</i>	28 (18%)
	<i>50 - 59</i>	14 (9%)
	<i>60 - 69</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>70 and over</i>	2 (1%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	<i>Yes</i>	119 (79%)
	<i>Yes - on recall</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i>	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Less than 6 months</i>	41 (28%)
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i>	19 (13%)
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i>	15 (10%)
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i>	26 (17%)
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>10 years or more</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Life</i>	2 (1%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	147 (96%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	148 (97%)
	<i>No</i>	4 (3%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	<i>Yes</i>	152 (99%)
	<i>No</i>	2 (1%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	124 (82%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese 0 (0%)
	White - Irish	3 (2%)	Asian or Asian British - other 1 (1%)
	White - other.....	7 (5%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean .. 4 (3%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean	1 (1%)	Mixed race - white and black African..... 1 (1%)
	Black or black British - African.....	1 (1%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 0 (0%)
	Black or black British - other.....	0 (0%)	Mixed race - other 3 (2%)
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	2 (1%)	Arab 1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	3 (2%)	Other ethnic group..... 1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi...	0 (0%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		5 (3%)
	No.....		145 (97%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	71 (47%)	Hindu..... 0 (0%)
	Church of England.....	32 (21%)	Jewish..... 0 (0%)
	Catholic.....	21 (14%)	Muslim..... 5 (3%)
	Protestant.....	2 (1%)	Sikh 1 (1%)
	Other Christian denomination	10 (7%)	Other 6 (4%)
	Buddhist.....	4 (3%)	
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		117 (76%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		10 (6%)
	Bisexual.....		27 (18%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?		
	Yes		68 (45%)
	No.....		84 (55%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes		2 (1%)
	No.....		151 (99%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		70 (46%)
	No.....		83 (54%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		89 (58%)
	No.....		64 (42%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	Less than 2 hours		68 (44%)
	2 hours or longer		75 (49%)
	Don't remember		11 (7%)

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>	68 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i>	50 (33%)
	<i>No.....</i>	29 (19%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (3%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	68 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>No.....</i>	75 (49%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	0 (0%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	<i>Yes</i>	114 (75%)
	<i>No.....</i>	31 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	8 (5%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	<i>Yes</i>	126 (82%)
	<i>No.....</i>	24 (16%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	4 (3%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well.....</i>	64 (42%)
	<i>Well.....</i>	63 (41%)
	<i>Neither</i>	23 (15%)
	<i>Badly.....</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	1 (1%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	122 (79%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information.....</i>	17 (11%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything.....</i>	20 (13%)
	<i>Don't remember.....</i>	3 (2%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	<i>Yes</i>	127 (83%)
	<i>No.....</i>	19 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	7 (5%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours.....</i>	74 (48%)
	<i>2 hours or longer.....</i>	67 (44%)
	<i>Don't remember.....</i>	13 (8%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	<i>Yes</i>	135 (88%)
	<i>No</i>	12 (8%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	6 (4%)

Q3.3 Overall, how were you treated in reception?

Very well.....	60 (39%)
Well.....	62 (41%)
Neither.....	23 (15%)
Badly.....	5 (3%)
Very badly.....	0 (0%)
Don't remember.....	2 (1%)

Q3.4 Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)

Loss of property.....	16 (11%)	Physical health.....	40 (26%)
Housing problems.....	46 (30%)	Mental health.....	72 (48%)
Contacting employers.....	4 (3%)	Needing protection from other prisoners	10 (7%)
Contacting family.....	45 (30%)	Getting phone numbers.....	53 (35%)
Childcare.....	8 (5%)	Other.....	8 (5%)
Money worries.....	47 (31%)	Did not have any problems.....	25 (17%)
Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	64 (42%)		

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

Yes.....	63 (43%)
No.....	58 (40%)
Did not have any problems.....	25 (17%)

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

Tobacco.....	130 (84%)
A shower.....	55 (36%)
A free telephone call.....	128 (83%)
Something to eat.....	130 (84%)
PIN phone credit.....	96 (62%)
Toiletries/ basic items.....	129 (84%)
Did not receive anything.....	0 (0%)

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

Chaplain.....	72 (47%)
Someone from health services.....	95 (63%)
A Listener/Samaritans.....	65 (43%)
Prison shop/ canteen.....	44 (29%)
Did not have access to any of these.....	33 (22%)

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

What was going to happen to you.....	92 (62%)
What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	79 (53%)
How to make routine requests (applications).....	71 (48%)
Your entitlement to visits.....	60 (41%)
Health services.....	79 (53%)
Chaplaincy.....	67 (45%)
Not offered any information.....	33 (22%)

Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	
	Yes	109 (71%)
	No	37 (24%)
	Don't remember	7 (5%)
Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	Have not been on an induction course	27 (18%)
	Within the first week	58 (38%)
	More than a week	55 (36%)
	Don't remember	12 (8%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	Have not been on an induction course	27 (18%)
	Yes	63 (43%)
	No	36 (24%)
	Don't remember	21 (14%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	Did not receive an assessment	31 (21%)
	Within the first week	22 (15%)
	More than a week	82 (55%)
	Don't remember	14 (9%)

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?	11 (7%)	23 (15%)	14 (9%)	39 (26%)	30 (20%)	33 (22%)
	Attend legal visits?	23 (16%)	41 (29%)	17 (12%)	11 (8%)	9 (6%)	40 (28%)
	Get bail information?	6 (4%)	14 (10%)	16 (12%)	20 (15%)	24 (18%)	56 (41%)
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.....						33 (22%)
	Yes						68 (44%)
	No.....						52 (34%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	Yes						50 (33%)
	No.....						10 (7%)
	Don't know						90 (60%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
		Yes	No	Don't know			
	Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	100 (68%)	47 (32%)	1 (1%)			
	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	141 (92%)	12 (8%)	0 (0%)			
	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	125 (83%)	24 (16%)	2 (1%)			
	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	126 (85%)	21 (14%)	2 (1%)			
	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	48 (33%)	74 (51%)	23 (16%)			
	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	96 (65%)	49 (33%)	3 (2%)			
	If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?	33 (23%)	66 (46%)	43 (30%)			

Q4.5	What is the food like here?	
	Very good.....	4 (3%)
	Good.....	35 (24%)
	Neither	29 (20%)
	Bad	34 (23%)
	Very bad.....	46 (31%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	Have not bought anything yet/ don't know.....	9 (6%)
	Yes	79 (53%)
	No.....	61 (41%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes	96 (63%)
	No.....	15 (10%)
	Don't know	42 (27%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes	72 (48%)
	No.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	71 (48%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes	89 (59%)
	No.....	7 (5%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	55 (36%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	I don't want to attend	33 (22%)
	Very easy.....	33 (22%)
	Easy	28 (18%)
	Neither	11 (7%)
	Difficult.....	11 (7%)
	Very difficult.....	5 (3%)
	Don't know	31 (20%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	
	Yes	123 (80%)
	No	26 (17%)
	Don't know	4 (3%)
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)	
		Not made one Yes No
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	12 (9%) 77 (55%) 50 (36%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	12 (9%) 47 (34%) 79 (57%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	
	Yes	86 (57%)
	No	26 (17%)
	Don't know	38 (25%)

Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)	Not made one	Yes	No
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	63 (43%)	38 (26%)	44 (30%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	63 (43%)	28 (19%)	54 (37%)
Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?			
	Yes			29 (20%)
	No			116 (80%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?			
	Don't know who they are.....			56 (38%)
	Very easy.....			16 (11%)
	Easy			26 (18%)
	Neither			24 (16%)
	Difficult.....			22 (15%)
	Very difficult.....			2 (1%)

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	11 (7%)
		Yes	84 (56%)
		No	38 (26%)
		Don't know	16 (11%)
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	11 (8%)
		Yes	75 (52%)
		No.....	42 (29%)
		Don't know	17 (12%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?		
		Yes	8 (5%)
	No.....		141 (95%)
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 have not been to segregation in the last 6 months	128 (90%)
		Very well.....	4 (3%)
		Well.....	4 (3%)
		Neither	4 (3%)
		Badly.....	1 (1%)
	Very badly		2 (1%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?		
		Yes	123 (83%)
	No.....		26 (17%)

Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	117 (80%)
	No	30 (20%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	46 (31%)
	No	104 (69%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	Do not go on association	11 (7%)
	Never	22 (15%)
	Rarely	37 (25%)
	Some of the time	42 (28%)
	Most of the time	23 (16%)
	All of the time	13 (9%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	I have not met him/her	110 (75%)
	In the first week	12 (8%)
	More than a week	12 (8%)
	Don't remember	12 (8%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her	110 (78%)
	Very helpful	7 (5%)
	Helpful	12 (9%)
	Neither	2 (1%)
	Not very helpful	6 (4%)
	Not at all helpful	4 (3%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	Yes	85 (56%)
	No	67 (44%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	Yes	28 (19%)
	No	119 (81%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Never felt unsafe	67 (46%)
	Everywhere	14 (10%)
	Segregation unit	0 (0%)
	Association areas	32 (22%)
	Reception area	3 (2%)
	At the gym	12 (8%)
	In an exercise yard	18 (12%)
	At work	13 (9%)
	During movement	39 (27%)
	At education	18 (12%)
	At meal times	33 (22%)
	At health services	29 (20%)
	Visits area	2 (1%)
	In wing showers	13 (9%)
	In gym showers	1 (1%)
	In corridors/stairwells	22 (15%)
	On your landing/wing	31 (21%)
	In your cell	15 (10%)
	At religious services	6 (4%)

Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	Yes	75 (49%)
	No.....	77 (51%)
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)	43 (28%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	19 (13%)
	Sexual abuse	5 (3%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	55 (36%)
	Having your canteen/property taken.....	18 (12%)
	Medication.....	13 (9%)
	Debt	5 (3%)
	Drugs.....	15 (10%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	6 (4%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	2 (1%)
	Your nationality	6 (4%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	3 (2%)
	You are from a traveller community	2 (1%)
	Your sexual orientation	4 (3%)
	Your age.....	6 (4%)
	You have a disability	8 (5%)
	You were new here.....	18 (12%)
	Your offence/ crime	16 (11%)
	Gang related issues.....	10 (7%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	39 (26%)
	No.....	112 (74%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)	21 (14%)
	Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)	2 (1%)
	Sexual abuse	3 (2%)
	Feeling threatened or intimidated	18 (12%)
	Medication.....	7 (5%)
	Debt	1 (1%)
	Drugs.....	1 (1%)
	Your race or ethnic origin.....	0 (0%)
	Your religion/religious beliefs	1 (1%)
	Your nationality	0 (0%)
	You are from a different part of the country than others.....	1 (1%)
	You are from a traveller community	1 (1%)
	Your sexual orientation	3 (2%)
	Your age.....	2 (1%)
	You have a disability	5 (3%)
	You were new here.....	5 (3%)
	Your offence/ crime	3 (2%)
	Gang related issues.....	1 (1%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised	65 (51%)
	Yes	35 (28%)
	No.....	27 (21%)

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	9 (6%)	5 (3%)	27 (18%)	10 (7%)	61 (41%) 36 (24%)
	The nurse	6 (4%)	18 (13%)	56 (39%)	17 (12%)	31 (22%) 16 (11%)
	The dentist	20 (14%)	4 (3%)	10 (7%)	5 (3%)	39 (27%) 67 (46%)
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	7 (5%)	21 (14%)	49 (34%)	26 (18%)	17 (12%) 26 (18%)
	The nurse	4 (3%)	26 (18%)	60 (41%)	23 (16%)	15 (10%) 17 (12%)
	The dentist	46 (33%)	14 (10%)	26 (19%)	16 (11%)	12 (9%) 26 (19%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?					
	<i>Not been</i>					4 (3%)
	<i>Very good</i>					13 (9%)
	<i>Good</i>					44 (32%)
	<i>Neither</i>					25 (18%)
	<i>Bad</i>					25 (18%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					28 (20%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?					
	Yes					124 (84%)
	No					23 (16%)
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>					23 (16%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>					24 (16%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>					24 (16%)
	<i>No</i>					76 (52%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?					
	Yes					115 (79%)
	No					31 (21%)
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>					31 (22%)
	Yes					44 (31%)
	No					65 (46%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	81 (55%)
	No	65 (45%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	54 (37%)
	No	92 (63%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	22 (15%)
	Easy	31 (21%)
	Neither	13 (9%)
	Difficult.....	9 (6%)
	Very difficult.....	9 (6%)
	Don't know	62 (42%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	2 (1%)
	Easy	3 (2%)
	Neither	8 (5%)
	Difficult.....	16 (11%)
	Very difficult.....	27 (18%)
	Don't know	91 (62%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	9 (6%)
	No.....	138 (94%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes	16 (11%)
	No.....	131 (89%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem	60 (42%)
	Yes	66 (46%)
	No.....	18 (13%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have an alcohol problem	92 (64%)
	Yes	36 (25%)
	No.....	16 (11%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help	66 (47%)
	Yes	52 (37%)
	No.....	22 (16%)

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	11 (7%)	16 (11%)	43 (28%)	16 (11%)	42 (28%)	23 (15%)
	Vocational or skills training	25 (17%)	7 (5%)	43 (30%)	21 (14%)	32 (22%)	17 (12%)
	Education (including basic skills)	12 (9%)	15 (11%)	50 (36%)	19 (14%)	32 (23%)	11 (8%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	38 (27%)	5 (4%)	26 (19%)	19 (14%)	27 (19%)	24 (17%)

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

Not involved in any of these	32 (24%)
Prison job	70 (53%)
Vocational or skills training	8 (6%)
Education (including basic skills)	31 (23%)
Offending behaviour programmes	11 (8%)

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

	Not been involved	Yes	No	Don't know
Prison job	30 (24%)	47 (38%)	30 (24%)	17 (14%)
Vocational or skills training	43 (40%)	28 (26%)	16 (15%)	20 (19%)
Education (including basic skills)	23 (19%)	58 (49%)	16 (13%)	22 (18%)
Offending behaviour programmes	43 (40%)	31 (29%)	14 (13%)	19 (18%)

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

Don't want to go	13 (9%)
Never	34 (24%)
Less than once a week	44 (31%)
About once a week	28 (20%)
More than once a week	23 (16%)

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

Don't use it	32 (23%)
Yes	74 (54%)
No	32 (23%)

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

Don't want to go	34 (24%)
0	40 (28%)
1 to 2	30 (21%)
3 to 5	22 (16%)
More than 5	15 (11%)

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

Don't want to go	20 (14%)
0	15 (10%)
1 to 2	32 (22%)
3 to 5	28 (20%)
More than 5	48 (34%)

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

Don't want to go	12 (9%)
0	13 (9%)
1 to 2	25 (18%)
3 to 5	23 (16%)
More than 5	67 (48%)

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>	7 (5%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	27 (19%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	37 (26%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	18 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	15 (10%)

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>	62 (44%)
	<i>No</i>	79 (56%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	58 (40%)
	<i>No</i>	87 (60%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	39 (27%)
	<i>No</i>	106 (73%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	28 (19%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Easy</i>	22 (15%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	33 (23%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	42 (29%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	6 (4%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	21 (15%)
	<i>Yes</i>	92 (65%)
	<i>No</i>	28 (20%)
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>	49 (36%)
	<i>No contact</i>	37 (27%)
	<i>Letter</i>	23 (17%)
	<i>Phone</i>	5 (4%)
	<i>Visit</i>	30 (22%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	66 (47%)
	<i>No</i>	74 (53%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	21 (14%)
	<i>Yes</i>	44 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	80 (55%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	101 (70%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Involved</i>	11 (8%)
	<i>Neither</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	7 (5%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	8 (6%)
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>	101 (71%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	13 (9%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	20 (14%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	14 (10%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	8 (6%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	101 (71%)
	<i>Yes</i>	28 (20%)
	<i>No</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	9 (6%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	101 (71%)
	<i>Yes</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>No</i>	31 (22%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	4 (3%)
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>	101 (70%)
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (7%)
	<i>No</i>	19 (13%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	14 (10%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	<i>Yes</i>	4 (3%)
	<i>No</i>	56 (40%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	80 (57%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	<i>Yes</i>	19 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	120 (86%)

**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	21 (16%)	43 (33%)	66 (51%)
Accommodation	17 (12%)	48 (35%)	73 (53%)
Benefits	15 (11%)	49 (36%)	73 (53%)
Finances	19 (15%)	29 (22%)	82 (63%)
Education	22 (18%)	35 (28%)	68 (54%)
Drugs and alcohol	30 (23%)	63 (48%)	37 (28%)

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>	21 (15%)
Yes	62 (44%)
No	58 (41%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Eastwood Park 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				
	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		154	949		
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	2%	4%	2%	7%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	86%	83%	86%	62%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	8%	7%	3%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	40%	25%	40%	32%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	1%	3%	1%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	9%	4%	8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	98%	98%	98%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	99%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	12%	16%	12%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	7%	3%	5%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	3%	5%	3%	3%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	24%	28%	24%	21%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	45%	34%	45%	39%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	1%	1%	1%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	46%	52%	46%	40%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	58%	55%	58%	62%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	49%	39%	49%	44%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	60%	49%	60%	50%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	11%	11%	11%	23%
2.4	Was the van clean?	75%	59%	75%	67%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	82%	76%	82%	86%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	83%	78%	83%	85%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	79%	75%	79%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	11%	4%	11%	3%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	83%	80%	83%	92%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	48%	57%	48%	50%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	89%	88%	93%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	76%	80%	86%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	83%	81%	83%	78%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	11%	10%	11%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	31%	27%	31%	34%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	3%	3%	3%	2%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	30%	28%	30%	26%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	5%	4%	5%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	31%	23%	31%	32%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	42%	40%	42%	35%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	27%	25%	27%	27%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	48%	40%	48%	38%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	7%	4%	7%	6%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	35%	26%	35%	29%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	52%	48%	52%	61%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	84%	81%	84%	88%
3.6	A shower?	36%	46%	36%	30%
3.6	A free telephone call?	83%	75%	83%	88%
3.6	Something to eat?	84%	79%	84%	86%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	62%	52%	62%	71%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	84%	73%	84%	90%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	47%	53%	47%	59%
3.7	Someone from health services?	63%	71%	63%	78%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	43%	45%	43%	51%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	29%	28%	29%	32%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	62%	52%	62%	68%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	53%	50%	53%	65%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	48%	40%	48%	55%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	41%	38%	41%	48%
3.8	Health services?	53%	49%	53%	62%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	45%	48%	45%	59%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	71%	72%	71%	77%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	82%	88%	82%	85%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	53%	56%	53%	62%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	79%	83%	79%	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?	23%	40%	23%	33%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	45%	55%	45%	60%
4.1	Get bail information?	15%	16%	15%	28%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	44%	41%	44%	39%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	33%	40%	33%	45%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	68%	69%	68%	72%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	92%	91%	92%	93%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	83%	91%	83%	78%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	85%	84%	85%	81%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	33%	43%	33%	46%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	65%	66%	65%	66%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	23%	27%	23%	29%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	26%	27%	26%	37%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	53%	48%	53%	53%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	63%	67%	63%	78%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	48%	62%	48%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59%	68%	59%	69%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	40%	55%	40%	45%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	82%	80%	89%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	61%	63%	61%	73%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	37%	48%	37%	57%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	57%	60%	57%	65%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	47%	41%	47%	58%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	34%	39%	34%	53%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	19%	20%	12%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	29%	35%	29%	44%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	56%	51%	56%	51%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	52%	50%	52%	53%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	7%	5%	5%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	54%	47%	54%	88%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	83%	78%	83%	89%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	80%	80%	80%	81%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	31%	38%	31%	44%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	24%	25%	24%	35%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	25%	63%	25%	21%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	62%	65%	62%	79%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	56%	47%	56%	37%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	16%	19%	11%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	49%	39%	49%	29%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	28%	21%	28%	17%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	10%	13%	4%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	36%	28%	36%	19%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	12%	9%	12%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	9%	8%	9%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	2%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	10%	5%	10%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	3%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	4%	2%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	3%	3%	3%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	4%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	5%	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	12%	10%	12%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	11%	7%	11%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	3%	7%	6%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 8: Safety continued					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	26%	30%	26%	24%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	13%	14%	11%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	13%	12%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	6%	5%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	4%	1%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	3%	0%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	3%	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	4%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	1%	2%	1%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	56%	49%	56%	41%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	26%	22%	39%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	52%	49%	52%	65%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	10%	16%	10%	18%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	50%	41%	50%	69%
9.2	The nurse?	61%	52%	61%	72%
9.2	The dentist?	43%	42%	43%	53%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	42%	36%	42%	63%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	84%	75%	84%	85%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	39%	41%	39%	44%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	79%	64%	79%	58%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	40%	55%	40%	59%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	56%	44%	56%	51%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	37%	30%	37%	37%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	36%	35%	36%	21%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	3%	3%	3%	2%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	7%	6%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	11%	9%	11%	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?	79%	79%	79%	83%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	69%	74%	69%	84%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	70%	80%	70%	90%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 11: Activities					
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:				
11.1	A prison job?	39%	54%	39%	34%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	35%	43%	35%	35%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	47%	57%	47%	49%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	22%	29%	22%	28%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2	A prison job?	53%	64%	53%	42%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	6%	14%	6%	5%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	23%	30%	23%	32%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	8%	15%	8%	4%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	76%	80%	76%	67%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	50%	57%	50%	57%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	60%	65%	60%	60%
	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%	60%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	81%	74%	81%	74%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	60%	65%	60%	66%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	60%	62%	60%	52%
	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?	49%	55%	49%	44%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	36%	43%	36%	48%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	54%	46%	54%	63%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	26%	22%	26%	28%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	53%	35%	53%	50%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	48%	51%	48%	59%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	13%	16%	13%	21%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	44%	48%	44%	56%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	40%	43%	40%	26%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	27%	21%	27%	18%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	19%	32%	19%	26%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	Women's local prisons comparator	HMP Eastwood Park 2016	HMP Eastwood Park 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 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%	71%	77%	58%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:				
13.2	No contact?	42%	44%	42%	47%
13.2	Contact by letter?	26%	30%	26%	16%
13.2	Contact by phone?	6%	12%	6%	6%
13.2	Contact by visit?	34%	34%	34%	43%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	47%	56%	47%	33%
	For those who are sentenced:				
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	35%	54%	35%	37%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	51%	59%	51%	69%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:				
13.6	Nobody?	31%	31%	31%	33%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	47%	38%	47%	30%
13.6	Offender manager?	34%	28%	34%	20%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	12%	22%	12%	0%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	19%	30%	19%	30%
	For those with a sentence plan:				
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	66%	69%	66%	78%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	15%	19%	15%	25%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	23%	30%	23%	54%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	3%	8%	3%	8%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	14%	22%	14%	21%
	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?	40%	49%	40%	53%
13.12	Accommodation?	40%	57%	40%	64%
13.12	Benefits?	40%	58%	40%	65%
13.12	Finances?	26%	40%	26%	47%
13.12	Education?	34%	48%	34%	58%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	63%	68%	63%	74%
	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?	52%	55%	52%	49%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Eastwood Park 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	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		18	134
1.3	Are you sentenced?	79%	88%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	17%	1%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	21%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	49%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	62%	44%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	83%	83%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	66%	81%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	94%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	79%	80%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	82%	83%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	66%	61%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	50%	74%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	82%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	30%	22%

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?	79%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	32%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	25%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	55%	52%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	50%	65%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	45%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	71%	58%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	72%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	36%	61%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	59%	56%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	11%	5%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	83%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	83%	80%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	6%	27%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	28%	25%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	66%	55%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	28%	17%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	72%	45%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	50%	34%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	11%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	17%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	6%	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%	27%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	11%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	11%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	28%	55%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	72%	86%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	50%	82%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	23%	39%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	71%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	11%	5%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	23%	24%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	11%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	38%	35%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	28%	26%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	45%	55%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	66%	46%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	6%	14%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	34%	41%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	28%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Eastwood Park 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

	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					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		68	84		20	134
1.3	Are you sentenced?	86%	87%		84%	86%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	7%		6%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	96%		90%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%		94%	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.)	3%	19%		10%	12%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	2%		0%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	2%	5%		0%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?				42%	45%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	2%		10%	0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	38%	54%		60%	44%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	84%	82%		90%	82%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	78%	80%		65%	81%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	96%		90%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	80%	80%		81%	80%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	93%	76%		55%	87%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	53%	70%		55%	64%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	63%	77%		81%	70%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	84%	81%		90%	81%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	22%	24%		19%	23%

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?	61%	72%	90%	64%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91%	93%	94%	92%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	27%	38%	28%	34%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	30%	23%	45%	24%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	47%	58%	55%	53%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	58%	66%	55%	64%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	44%	52%	55%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	64%	58%	59%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	81%	80%	85%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	63%	53%	52%	58%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	46%	65%	48%	58%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	56%	48%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	5%	6%	0%	6%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	88%	90%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	72%	86%	80%	80%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	20%	27%	28%	24%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	32%	19%	26%	24%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	64%	51%	60%	55%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	21%	18%	25%	18%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	61%	41%	37%	51%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	49%	27%	37%	36%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	0%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	0%	0%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	0%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	10%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	10%	1%	6%	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?	39%	16%	26%	26%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	24%	2%	10%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	0%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	2%	1%	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	8%	0%	10%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	14%	26%	20%	22%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	54%	48%	41%	53%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	94%	76%	89%	84%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	95%	65%	50%	83%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	39%	34%	55%	34%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	51%	55%	50%	53%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	3%	8%	19%	4%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	22%	25%	38%	22%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	9%	12%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	39%	38%	35%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	22%	30%	21%	27%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	40%	64%	55%	53%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	34%	60%	50%	48%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	6%	18%	7%	14%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	40%	41%	28%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	31%	24%	17%	28%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (sexual orientation) HMP Eastwood Park 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

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		37	117
1.3	Are you sentenced?	92%	84%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	0%	5%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	8%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	4%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	57%	41%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	1%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	32%	50%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	72%	86%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	87%	77%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	91%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	85%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	84%	83%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	62%	63%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	70%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	83%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	27%	21%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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?	70%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	90%	93%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	28%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	22%	28%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	46%	55%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	64%	62%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	45%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	61%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	83%	80%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	68%	54%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	45%	60%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	57%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	3%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	85%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	75%	81%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	35%	21%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	35%	21%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	65%	53%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	17%	20%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	70%	43%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	52%	31%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By prisoners)	8%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	8%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	5%	5%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to be homosexual or bisexual	Consider themselves to be heterosexual
	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?	43%	20%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	19%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your sexual orientation? (By staff)	3%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	3%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	53%	51%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	78%	87%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	81%	78%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	40%	35%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	55%	52%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	8%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	26%	23%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	10%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	32%	37%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	28%	26%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	49%	55%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	45%	49%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	11%	13%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	34%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	40%	23%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Eastwood Park 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	Residential Unit 7	Residential Units 2 and 3
	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		18	29
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	4%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	87%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6%	7%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	11%	55%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	0%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	0%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	96%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	100%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	21%	11%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	0%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	11%	0%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	11%	34%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	53%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	0%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	89%	21%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	45%	62%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	50%	55%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	89%	72%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	83%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	89%	87%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	89%	93%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 7	Residential Units 2 and 3
	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?	55%	45%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	89%	72%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	53%	86%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	7%	4%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	36%	39%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	7%	0%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	18%	39%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	18%	0%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	30%	39%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	36%	39%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	11%	36%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	11%	61%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	7%	0%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	18%	53%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	72%	96%
3.6	A shower?	45%	32%
3.6	A free telephone call?	89%	66%
3.6	Something to eat?	89%	76%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	55%	79%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	94%	76%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 7	Residential Units 2 and 3
	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?	55%	25%
3.7	Someone from health services?	79%	58%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	45%	32%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	34%	29%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	72%	58%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	66%	43%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	50%	43%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	50%	43%
3.8	Health services?	72%	47%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	50%	36%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	62%	68%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	75%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	100%	78%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	55%	21%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	71%	44%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	24%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	79%	55%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	47%	28%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	93%	47%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	87%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	71%	83%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	93%	62%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	65%	29%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	94%	55%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	38%	23%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	11%	19%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	41%	59%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	100%	58%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	50%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	55%	68%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	55%	45%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 7	Residential Units 2 and 3
	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?	89%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	72%	47%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	11%	38%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	83%	22%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	89%	36%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	72%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	7%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	94%	76%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	100%	64%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	28%	32%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	34%	18%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	28%	8%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 7	Residential Units 2 and 3
	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?	62%	58%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	6%	22%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	38%	51%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	28%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	24%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	7%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	28%	34%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	0%	13%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	24%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	6%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	6%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	11%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	7%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 7	Residential Units 2 and 3
	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?	11%	32%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	18%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	0%	0%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	0%	18%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	0%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	11%	26%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	47%	69%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	6%	7%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	94%	93%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	50%	81%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	17%	70%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	11%	41%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	50%	35%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	6%	0%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	0%	12%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	14%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 7	Residential Units 2 and 3
	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?	79%	18%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	72%	19%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	89%	36%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	47%	21%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	89%	28%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	6%	5%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	11%	32%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	6%	5%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	45%	48%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	82%	62%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	45%	21%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	71%	44%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	93%	21%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	45%	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?	55%	28%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	36%	48%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	36%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	34%	12%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	93%	20%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	0%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	21%	8%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Eastwood Park 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	Residential Unit 8	Residential Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10
	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		29	125
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	87%	86%
1.3	Are you on recall?	13%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	68%	34%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	0%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	4%	4%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	7%	13%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	11%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	0%	4%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	32%	22%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	71%	39%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	24%	51%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	66%	57%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	34%	52%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	90%	80%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	86%	82%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	90%	77%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	93%	81%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 8	Residential Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10
	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?	45%	49%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	90%	88%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	86%	79%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	93%	81%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	7%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	34%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	38%	28%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	11%	4%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	38%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	55%	39%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	28%	26%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	66%	43%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	11%	6%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	41%	34%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	93%	82%
3.6	A shower?	41%	35%
3.6	A free telephone call?	90%	82%
3.6	Something to eat?	90%	83%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	51%	65%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	87%	83%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 8	Residential Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10
	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?	49%	47%
3.7	Someone from health services?	62%	63%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	49%	42%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	24%	30%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	70%	60%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	66%	51%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	66%	44%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	44%	40%
3.8	Health services?	66%	51%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	52%	44%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	83%	69%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	71%	85%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	49%	87%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	22%	23%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	49%	45%
4.1	Get bail information?	18%	14%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	34%	47%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	24%	36%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	49%	72%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	91%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87%	82%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	96%	82%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	33%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	34%	72%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	19%	24%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	43%	23%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	44%	55%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	59%	64%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	32%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	49%	62%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	25%	44%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 8	Residential Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10
	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?	72%	82%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	56%	58%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	21%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	31%
SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	63%	55%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	60%	50%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	17%	3%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	86%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	89%	78%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	34%	30%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	26%	24%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	23%	25%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 8	Residential Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10
	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?	55%	56%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	20%	19%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	51%	49%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	28%	29%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	13%	12%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	7%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	34%	37%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	17%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	17%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	7%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	17%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	13%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	21%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	12%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	13%	5%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 8	Residential Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10
	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?	41%	22%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	17%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	1%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	7%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	24%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	13%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	4%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	4%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	4%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	7%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	11%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	0%
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	23%	22%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	61%	49%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	4%	11%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	93%	82%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	93%	75%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	78%	50%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	52%	34%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	34%	37%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	4%	3%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	14%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	24%	8%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Residential Unit 8	Residential Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10
	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?	17%	44%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	29%	36%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	27%	51%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	14%	24%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	29%	58%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	0%	7%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	16%	25%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	5%	9%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	8%	41%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	38%	57%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	19%	28%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	61%	51%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	27%	53%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	0%	15%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	38%	45%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	47%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	30%	26%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	14%	20%
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	23%	53%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	3%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	12%	14%