

Report on an unannounced inspection of

# **HMP Coldingley**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**20 February–3 March 2017**

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 (excluding logos) 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](http://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](mailto: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: [hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk)

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

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

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	27
Section 3. Purposeful activity	39
Section 4. Resettlement	45
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	53
Section 6. Appendices	57
Appendix I: Inspection team	57
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	59
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/hmiprisons/about-our-inspections/>

# Introduction

Coldingley is a category C training and resettlement prison in Surrey holding just over 500 adult male prisoners. Nearly all the men held were serving long sentences, up to and including life. The prison aimed to provide opportunities for these men to develop their work-based and educational skills, and had a well-founded reputation for delivering a full regime. Most men moved on from Coldingley to other category C prisons or the open prison estate, but a small number were released directly into the community, hence the need for a resettlement function at the prison.

Coldingley is part of the reform prison group, which also includes High Down, Ford and Lewes, although it was too early at this inspection to see much that was tangibly different resulting from these arrangements. At the last inspection in April 2013, we found that the prison was safe and delivering reasonably good outcomes in activities and resettlement. We did, however, have significant worries about aspects of respect.

However, more men than at the last inspection told us they felt unsafe, and although overall the number was similar to comparator prisons, we considered that this reflected an increase in the use of illegal drugs at the prison and associated debt problems. It was surely not coincidental that in our survey over half of men reported that it was easy to get drugs at the prison. The need for a comprehensive drug strategy, addressing both supply and use, should be a priority for Coldingley. A small number of men were self-isolating on the wings because they did not feel safe, and most men in the segregation unit were there for similar reasons. While levels of violence overall were not high, some incidents had been serious, including a homicide, and we were concerned that prison managers had been slow to respond to some of the challenges. It was positive that there had been no self-inflicted deaths at the prison since our last inspection, and that levels of self-harm were low. While some elements of the assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management processes for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm needed attention, care for vulnerable men was generally good.

Respect remained a really mixed picture; prisoners were positive in our survey about a range of issues related to decency, relationships with staff were reasonably strong, and health care provision was good. In contrast, the living environment in the older residential units remained extremely poor. Night sanitation arrangements were fundamentally disrespectful and the fabric of these wings was generally in a decrepit state, partly because of many years of underinvestment by the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) (now HM Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS)). There was a general lack of cleanliness, particularly in recess areas and stairwells. The neglect and levels of cleanliness on A to D wings were simply unacceptable. We indicated to prison leaders our view that these issues demanded immediate attention. The prison had just started a process of decanting prisoners to other establishments to facilitate a limited refurbishment of these wings, but we did not think the plans sufficient to ensure they were substantially improved within reasonable timeframes. Aside from the physical condition of parts of the prison, we found that work around equality and diversity was underdeveloped and in need of close attention from senior management. In particular there was a need to analyse and understand negative perceptions on the part of black, Asian and minority ethnic prisoners.

Time out of cell was better than we usually see, and exceeded our expectations, which in a closed prison is rare. Ofsted rated learning and skills provision as good overall. All men could be purposefully engaged and outcomes were generally good, although there were some issues around attendance, the flow and accreditation of some work and achievements in English and maths. Nevertheless, outcomes were generally strong.

Similarly, in resettlement, the quality of work was generally good – particularly for higher risk men – and through-the-gate resettlement work was generally sound. While some aspects needed attention, and coordination could have been better, it was notable how positive and hopeful many of the men

were about the opportunities at Coldingley for them to progress. There was a good range of offending behaviour courses, as well as generally good contact with offender supervisors, and a high number of men were being moved to open prisons each month.

Overall, Coldingley was performing at its best when providing a progressive, reliable and rehabilitative regime which focused on providing men who had already served many years of long sentences with some excellent opportunities to make progress through the system. While the prison remained generally safe, we considered that its leaders needed to ensure the challenges being faced around illegal drug use and associated debt were better managed. Our biggest criticism of Coldingley related to the environment on the older wings, which remained very poor. It was simply not possible to judge that the conditions on those units were acceptable for a 21st-century prison. Nevertheless, Coldingley was a prison that offered prisoners hope and the reality of progression, which is a significant achievement that we do not underestimate.

**Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

April 2017

# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

A category C training and resettlement prison for adult males, holding mostly long-term, including life sentenced, prisoners. In 2016 Coldingley became an early adopter of prison reform.

**Prison status**

Public

**Department**

Early adopter reform prisons

**Number held**

514

**Certified normal accommodation**

494

**Operational capacity**

521

**Date of last full inspection**

2–12 April 2013

**Brief history**

Coldingley opened in 1969 as a category B industrial training prison. In 1993, it changed role and became a category C prison. A new unit, E wing, was opened in 2009.

**Short description of residential units**

The original four wings (A to D) held 93 prisoners each, mostly in single cells. Except for three double cells on each wing, none of the cells had integral sanitation. E wing had 115 single and eight double cells with integral sanitation, including a shower. The 10 occupants of F wing had 24-hour access to shared bathroom facilities.

**Name of governor/director**

Jo Sims

**Escort contractor**

Serco and GEOAmey

**Health service provider**

Central and North West London NHS Trust  
Virgin Care Services Limited  
Med-Co Secure Healthcare Services Ltd

**Learning and skills providers**

Milton Keynes College

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Michael Sherley

**Community rehabilitation company (CRC)**

Hampshire and Isle of Wight CRC (Purple Futures)





# About this inspection and report

A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.

A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.

A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:

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

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

- **outcomes for prisoners are good.**  
There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.
- **outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good.**  
There is evidence of adverse outcomes for prisoners in only a small number of areas. For the majority, there are no significant concerns. Procedures to safeguard outcomes are in place.
- **outcomes for prisoners are not sufficiently good.**  
There is evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in many areas or particularly in those areas of greatest importance to the well-being of prisoners. Problems/concerns, if left unattended, are likely to become areas of serious concern.
- **outcomes for prisoners are poor.**  
There is evidence that the outcomes for prisoners are seriously affected by current practice. There is a failure to ensure even adequate treatment of and/or conditions for prisoners. Immediate remedial action is required.

- A5 Our assessments might result in one of the following:
- **recommendations:** will require significant change and/or new or redirected resources, so are not immediately achievable, and will be reviewed for implementation at future inspections
  - **examples of good practice:** impressive practice that not only meets or exceeds our expectations, but could be followed by other similar establishments to achieve positive outcomes for prisoners.
- A6 Five key sources of evidence are used by inspectors: observation; prisoner surveys; discussions with prisoners; discussions with staff and relevant third parties; and documentation. During inspections we use a mixed-method approach to data gathering and analysis, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Evidence from different sources is triangulated to strengthen the validity of our assessments.
- A7 Since April 2013, all our inspections have been unannounced, other than in exceptional circumstances. This replaces the previous system of announced and unannounced full main inspections with full or short follow-ups to review progress. All our inspections now follow up recommendations from the last full inspection.
- A8 All inspections of prisons are conducted jointly with Ofsted or Estyn (Wales), the Care Quality Commission, the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) and HM Inspectorate of Probation. This joint work ensures expert knowledge is deployed in inspections and avoids multiple inspection visits.

## This report

- A9 This explanation of our approach is followed by a summary of our inspection findings against the four healthy prison tests. There then follow four sections each containing a detailed account of our findings against our *Expectations. Criteria for assessing the treatment of prisoners and conditions in prisons*. The reference numbers at the end of some recommendations indicate that they are repeated, and provide the paragraph location of the previous recommendation in the last report. Section 5 collates all recommendations, housekeeping points and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A10 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and IV respectively.
- A11 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix V of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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** *Prisoners were generally positive about escorts to the prison. Early days support was good. More prisoners felt unsafe than at our previous inspection. Levels of violence were not comparably high but had increased. Care for those vulnerable to self-harm was generally good. Security arrangements were mainly appropriate. A more strategic approach to drug use and associated debt was required and the drug strategy and testing needed attention. Adjudication processes were fair. Use of force was not high and generally proportionate. Some men were isolating themselves and often ended up in segregation. Substance misuse support was generally good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***
- S2** *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Coldingley were good against this healthy prison test. We made 14 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and four had not been achieved.*
- S3** Prisoners in our survey were generally positive about their escort experience, most journeys to Coldingley were relatively short and late arrivals were rare. Processes in reception were efficient and more prisoners than at comparable prisons told us they spent less than two hours in reception and that they had been treated well. First night assessments and safety interviews on C wing were undertaken appropriately. In our survey, nearly all prisoners said they had been on an induction course and more prisoners than in the comparator said they got all the information they needed from it.
- S4** In our survey, more prisoners than at our last inspection said they felt unsafe. However, levels of violence were relatively low, although some incidents were very serious, including a homicide in April 2016. Drug use and subsequent debt and bullying were the main causes of violence. A small number of prisoners isolated themselves on wings or sought protection in the segregation unit and a more strategic response was required. Some victim support plans lacked detail and no meaningful action was outlined. Other than disciplinary procedures and the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, few steps were taken to address perpetrators' behaviour.
- S5** The number of incidents of self-harm was relatively low and there had been no self-inflicted deaths since our previous inspection. Procedures to manage those at risk of suicide and self-harm were generally appropriate and most prisoners we spoke to said they felt staff supported them. Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documents and care plans were variable and, in too many cases, not good enough. Management checks focused too much on completing documentation rather than on the effectiveness of interactions. Information and data analysis at the monthly safer custody meeting required greater attention to ensure trends were identified and interrogated. Some use of strip-clothing needed more oversight. The Listener scheme (in which prisoners trained by the Samaritans provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) was generally well supported and access was good. The prison had an adult safeguarding policy but few staff understood it or knew what their responsibilities were and the prison had not yet been involved in local safeguarding structures.
- S6** Procedural security arrangements were proportionate. Good quality intelligence reports were promptly analysed and the security team implemented any required action. The

mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate of 9% was high, and drug testing arrangements were deficient. In our survey, over 50% of men said it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison. The introduction of additional perimeter netting was welcome but the strategic management of supply reduction had been slow to develop and was only just being re-launched.

- S7 In our survey, more prisoners than in the comparator said they had been treated fairly under the IEP scheme. Reviews we looked at demonstrated that both positive and negative behaviour was taken into account. In many cases, officers recorded positive behaviour on the Prison Service IT system, but prisoners were not always aware of this.
- S8 The number of adjudications was lower than at our last inspection. Paperwork and our observations showed adjudication processes were conducted fairly. Use of force was relatively low. Most paperwork we reviewed justifying the use of force was completed to a reasonably good standard. Video footage we reviewed of planned interventions showed thorough briefings and good use of control and restraint techniques. Special accommodation was not used at all.
- S9 The segregation unit remained largely unchanged from our previous inspection: some cells had graffiti and were too hot; communal areas were clean, but the exercise yards were cage-like. Many prisoners continued to use the unit as a way of being transferred out of the prison. Prisoners we spoke to said staff in the unit were respectful.
- S10 The prison had appointed a designated drug strategy manager who was working in partnership with the Rehabilitation for Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) and drug agency Addaction to re-launch, promote and develop the drug and alcohol strategy. RAPt provided a good range of psychosocial interventions, including a four-week programme and active peer support. Service users were involved in expanding the range of recovery-focused activities. Clinical management of substance misuse problems was good and prescribing flexible. Care was well coordinated with other areas of health care.

## Respect

**S11** *The night sanitation system remained degrading and the older units were poor. Staff-prisoner relationships were reasonable. Some aspects of equality and diversity work were underdeveloped and needed to be re-launched. Faith provision was good and complaints were well managed. Prisoners felt their legal rights were respected. Health care was good and many prisoners valued it. Food was relatively good, but the kitchen was in poor condition. Canteen arrangements were reasonable.*  
**Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.**

**S12** *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Coldingley were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved, 16 had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

**S13** In the older units, communal areas and recesses were poorly maintained and most were unacceptably dirty. Many of the cells were too warm and had broken windowpanes with filthy window cages. The night sanitation system remained fundamentally degrading. There were major problems with toilets blocking. A refurbishment programme was just starting,

<sup>2</sup> 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.

but it was too limited. In contrast, conditions on the newer E wing were much better. However, some cells in the unit that were designed for two men were being used to hold three. Despite this, in our survey prisoners were positive about their access to most amenities, particularly on E wing. The applications system generally ran smoothly.

- S14 In our survey, around three quarters of prisoners said staff treated them with respect and just over 80% said they had a personal officer. Staff interactions we observed with prisoners were generally reasonable, but wing-based staff did not always speak to men during association. Consultation with prisoners was reasonably good.
- S15 The strategic management of equality was insufficiently robust; action points at meetings were not always followed up, the action plan was out of date and monitoring was inconsistent. Consultation and support forums were run for some, but not all, groups with protected characteristics. The equalities orderlies were knowledgeable and readily accessible and prisoners valued them. A very good range of equality events were held. The number of discrimination incident reporting forms was low but investigations and responses were inadequate. The prison did not focus sufficiently on the negative perceptions of some groups. Despite this, we found some reasonable support for individual men.
- S16 In our survey, prisoners were reasonably positive about access to religious services and chaplains. Faith provision was good; a wide range of religious and pastoral services were delivered and facilities were sufficient to meet prisoners' needs. The chaplaincy was reasonably well integrated into the prison.
- S17 Responses to complaints were reasonable and improving following the introduction of new quality assurance arrangements. Legal visits were not sufficiently private, but in our survey, prisoners generally felt their legal rights were respected.
- S18 Health care governance arrangements were effective and prisoners had good access to an appropriate range of clinics. We observed skilled practitioners interacting positively with prisoners, delivering clinically effective care. Most prisoners said they were satisfied with the care they received. Pharmacy and medicine management services were good. Dentistry was good and there was an appropriate range of treatments, but waiting times were excessive. Mental health services were delivering timely and clinically appropriate interventions that had a strong emphasis on psychological support. Social care arrangements were still developing, but they responded to prisoners' needs.
- S19 Overall, prisoners were positive about the food, but the separation of halal and non-halal food was not rigorous enough and meals were still served too early. We found the food good. The kitchen was still not sufficiently clean or well maintained. Prisoners' perceptions of the shop were better than at our previous inspection. However, consultation arrangements were not yet sufficiently meaningful. The prison shop operated efficiently.

## Purposeful activity

**S20** *Prisoners' time out of their cells was very good. Leadership of learning, skills and work was effective but management needed to make better use of data to further improve achievements. There were sufficient activity places for the population and most men had purposeful and productive work to do, although more work could have been accredited and offered at higher levels. Attendance required improvement and the induction process needed development. The quality of teaching and learning was good, and achievements were generally good other than in English and maths. Behaviour in activities was generally good and men were encouraged to work well together and develop useful skills. The library had improved considerably and the gym was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

**S21** *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Coldingley were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that 11 of the recommendations had been achieved, one had been partially achieved and five had not been achieved.*

**S22** Men had excellent time out of cell, the regime ran on time, and restrictions were well managed. Most men had around 11 hours on a week day and eight at the weekend. We found around 16% of prisoners locked up during the working day, mostly either unemployed or sick. Association areas and exercise yards were reasonable.

**S23** The quality of education provision had improved since the previous inspection and was now good overall. The prison worked with a good range of commercial partners to provide work for prisoners. In a few cases this led to employment opportunities for prisoners on release. There was now a greater emphasis on the need for prisoners to improve their employment skills, including English and maths. Managers had introduced a Coldingley Industries certificate to recognise work-related skills development and a growing number of prisoners were using it to record their progress. More needed to be done to improve attendance at education and activities. The prison did not carry out enough analysis or use data sufficiently to monitor and improve the provision.

**S24** The prison provided sufficient activity places for the population to be occupied full time. The range of education provision had broadened since the previous inspection. However, it still required further development if it was to meet prisoners' resettlement needs. Good progression routes were available in the Prisoners' Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA) workshop. A greater range of work and vocational training activities had also been introduced and more were planned. Several large workshops did not offer accredited training opportunities. There was some very good work in the engineering, print, DHL and sign workshops. Some work was too mundane.

**S25** Teachers challenged and supported prisoners well, which helped them develop their knowledge and skills. Teachers did not make sufficient use of the results of initial prisoner assessments to inform individual learning plans or allocations.

**S26** Behaviour in activities was generally good and there was an atmosphere of mutual respect. In most settings men developed some good skills, including English and maths. They enjoyed their learning and made good progress. Some work was to industry standard, such as in barbering, welding, the PICTA workshop and print. Education was often interrupted by learners leaving to attend appointments elsewhere.

**S27** Success rates on almost all courses were high and Coldingley had the highest PICTA outcomes in the country. Achievement rates on English and maths courses required further

improvement and too many prisoners dropped out of some courses. A significant proportion of learners who started English and maths courses were transferred elsewhere before they could complete their learning.

- S28 The library was much better than at our previous inspection, which was reflected in our survey. The extra-curricular activities on Friday afternoons were particularly good. The range of facilities at the gym was good and prisoners could visit it four times a week. In our survey, more than twice as many prisoners as at our last inspection said they went to the gym at least three times a week.

## Resettlement

**S29** *The prison understood men's resettlement needs. Many long-term prisoners felt they could make progress. A range of appropriate interventions were offered, but some resettlement work required better coordination. Offender management work was appropriately prioritised and was reasonably good overall, and more prisoners than usual felt well supported. Public protection arrangements were generally appropriate. Categorisation work was good overall. Most men progressed to other prisons, but support for those released met most prisoners' needs and more men than usual said they had done something at Coldingley to make it less likely they would offend in the future. Children and families work was reasonable. An appropriate range of offending behaviour courses was offered.*  
**Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.**

S30 *At the last inspection in April 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Coldingley were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 15 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, four had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

- S31 The prison understood what it needed to do to support the rehabilitation of the men held, but strategic coordination of the work needed to be developed. Resettlement orderlies provided men with valuable information and prisoners were involved in the resettlement meeting. The prison used release on temporary licence (ROTL) for a small number of men. The ROTL decisions we saw were mostly timely and based on an appropriate assessment. We welcomed plans to increase the use of ROTL further.
- S32 The offender management team worked well together, but some supervision arrangements needed improvement. In our survey, 91% of men said they had a named offender supervisor, which was higher than the comparator and compared with our last inspection. Overall contact levels were good and most men interacted in a meaningful way with their offender supervisor. We found some lower-risk men who had less frequent contact with their offender supervisors. Most men we spoke to told us they felt they could make progress at Coldingley. The sentence plans we reviewed were variable; targets for some lower risk men were not focused enough, but those for higher risk men were generally appropriate. In our survey, 79% of men told us they could achieve their sentence plan targets at Coldingley, higher than the comparator and compared with our last inspection.
- S33 Public protection work was broadly appropriate. Attendance at the risk management meeting needed to be better. Multi-agency public protection arrangement procedures for prisoners nearing release had been strengthened. Categorisation reviews were up to date and decisions were justified, but some cases would have benefited from more personal officer input. Around 15 men were transferred to the open estate every month. Almost 40% of the population was serving an indeterminate sentence. The useful lifer forum and

information day was organised by the men, and lifer family days were valued. However, these initiatives needed to be held more regularly.

- S34 Few men were released directly from Coldingley. There was some bespoke resettlement support, but resettlement planning required greater integration to ensure appropriate action was taken. Most men were released to their family home, own accommodation or an approved premise. The figures we saw suggested two men had been released to no fixed address in the previous six months, but outcomes required better monitoring. A small number of prisoners made good use of the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities). Catch 22, the organisation contracted by the community rehabilitation company to deliver services, had good working links with the National Careers Service.
- S35 The health care primary care team appropriately supported men prior to discharge, providing them with information about registering with a GP and a supply of medication if required. The mental health team had links with local community teams to support discharge planning for men. The RAPt team had developed a good 'meet and greet' and aftercare service for prisoners with drug and alcohol problems on release.
- S36 Finance, benefit and debt support was well developed; men could open bank accounts, get help with debts and access the Jobcentre Plus service.
- S37 The visits provision was reasonable overall, but the visitors' centre was inadequate. However, it was good that an evening session was available. The visits hall was reasonably bright and spacious but not all visits started on time. Prisoners and families valued family days, but the £15 attendance charge was excessive and meant some men did not apply. The Prison Advice and Care Trust now offered some useful family support, but there were no parenting or relationship courses, although plans were in place to address this gap.
- S38 The accredited offending behaviour programmes largely met men's needs and in our survey, 79% of men told us they had been involved in programmes while at the prison. Waiting lists were reasonable.



## Main concerns and recommendations

S39 Concern: Men in our survey said drugs were easy to get hold of at the prison, and most safety issues related to debt associated with the use of illegal drugs. Some of the prison's responses had been slow, and drug testing and aspects of searching were inadequate. The prison lacked an effective multidisciplinary strategy to reduce the supply of drugs in the prison and manage associated problems.

**Recommendation: The prison should introduce a more strategic response to the problems of illegal drug supply and use and associated debt, bullying and violence.**

S40 Concern: The standard of accommodation on wings A to D and F was inadequate and in many respects, disrespectful. The lack of in-cell plumbing and the night sanitation system were unacceptable. Many of the recess areas and much of the fabric of the wings were also poor and had suffered from years of underinvestment. The kitchen was poor and in need of major refurbishment.

**Recommendation: The refurbishment of wings A to D and F should be comprehensive and include recess areas, windows and the kitchen. The night time sanitation should work properly and, long term, it should be replaced as a matter of priority.**

S41 Concern: The management of equality and diversity did not ensure the needs or concerns of all prisoners with protected characteristics were understood or addressed. Diversity monitoring, the management of diversity complaints and consultation with some groups of prisoners needed improvement.

**Recommendation: The prison should ensure the needs of men with protected characteristics are understood and identify any concerns they have about fair and equitable treatment; where possible these needs should be met and concerns addressed.**



# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1** The prison was beginning to reduce the number of prisoners it held so a partial refurbishment of the older wings could take place. This meant only one prisoner was received during our inspection. He was transferred by taxi accompanied by staff from the sending establishment, rather than in a prison van. Nevertheless, prisoners who had recently arrived at HMP Coldingley spoke reasonably positively about their experiences.
- I.2** Most journeys were relatively short and prisoners said that staff were courteous. In our survey 86% of respondents said they had been offered something to eat or drink during the journey, more than at the last inspection or comparable prisons. Reception staff said communication with escort staff was good, which meant they could usually ensure they were available when prisoners arrived.

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.3** The reception area and holding rooms were clean, bright and reasonably welcoming. There were normally around 12 new arrivals each week, most arriving in the afternoon and late arrivals were rare (although see paragraph I.1). Because the reception was closed at lunchtime, some escort vans had to wait outside the prison before they could be admitted. We were told such delays were relatively rare and in our survey prisoners were generally positive about their experience: 72%, more than the 52% at other category C prisons, said they spent less than two hours in reception and 85%, also more than at similar prisons, said staff there treated them well or very well. In both cases responses were also better than at our last inspection.
- I.4** Staff in reception were friendly and efficient and prisoners transferring from other prisons were not routinely strip-searched. Initial screenings appeared thorough and an effective system was in place to ensure all property was logged. Two orderlies worked in reception and, although not specifically trained as Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners), they knew the prison system and could answer any questions.
- I.5** Most first night processes were carried out on C wing, where all new receptions were located unless a prisoner who posed a safety risk to others had been identified. First night arrangements were appropriate, as were safety interviews and meetings with induction peer orderlies. Although shower facilities were available in reception, virtually all prisoners waited to have access on C wing. Staff also facilitated phone calls. Cells identified for new arrivals were reasonably clean and free of graffiti.

- 1.6** Induction was delivered each week between Monday and Wednesday, which meant that some prisoners were locked up for up to six days before they started the course. When they were on induction they were also locked up during the day when no specific session was planned. The programme was run by two peer orderlies and staff from other departments, including the National Careers Service and safer custody team, provided input. However, there was no formal input from resettlement or offender management staff. In our survey, 94% of prisoners said they had been on an induction course, more than at similar prisons and compared with our last inspection and, 74% of prisoners, compared with only 59% at the comparator, said the course covered everything they needed to know. It was also encouraging that 51% of prisoners said they had received help with problems they experienced when they first arrived, compared with only 35% at similar prisons. The prison planned to revamp the induction programme and move it from the cold and unwelcoming room currently used on C wing, to a more appropriate venue in the education department.

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.7** For the majority of prisoners Coldingley was generally a safe prison. During the previous six months, there had been five fights, six assaults on staff, and 29 assaults on prisoners, which was relatively low. However, in our survey, a similar number to the comparator (19%) said they felt unsafe, although this was more than at our last inspection (9%).
- 1.8** Prisoners misusing drugs or getting into debt were more likely to be a victim of violence (see main recommendation S39). Some violent incidents were serious: six men had been hospitalised in the previous six months and a prisoner was fatally stabbed in April 2016. In 2016, there had been 51 unexplained injuries, almost four times as many as before our last inspection. The prison's procedures for investigating explained and unexplained injuries were robust and staff understood the safety issues facing the prison well, although some strategic responses to these challenges were weak.
- 1.9** Staff were aware of 10 men who were too afraid to leave their cells but support for them was variable. Other prisoners sought refuge in the segregation unit while waiting for a transfer to other prisons (see paragraph 1.35). Other than moving prisoners to the slightly separated E wing, the prison lacked a strategic response to this problem.
- 1.10** The prison had updated its violence reduction policy in December 2016 but had yet to implement it. Other than using adjudications and the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme, little was done to challenge or monitor perpetrators. Support plans were established for victims of violence, but while some showed good support, others lacked detail or evidence that meaningful action had been taken. For example, the action plan for one prisoner who had got into debt merely said he should pay off his existing debt.
- 1.11** Monthly violence reduction meetings were well attended and some attempts were made to analyse incidents and trends. The first weekly population management meeting had been held in February 2017. The meetings were promising and a number of disruptive and vulnerable prisoners were discussed. A violence reduction survey had been conducted since our last inspection but it needed to be undertaken again. About 28 prisoners acted as violence reduction representatives but their job description and role were vague and they did not meet as a group regularly.

- I.12** The prison had recently purchased 70 body worn video cameras and was rolling out training for officers on how to use them. It was too early to measure the impact the cameras had on managing violence.

## Recommendations

- I.13** The prison should implement an effective strategy to reduce violence.
- I.14** A range of interventions should be used to challenge and manage perpetrators of violence and to support victims of violence.

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.15** There had been no self-inflicted deaths at the prison since our previous inspection. In the six months prior to the inspection there had been 35 incidents of self-harm involving 20 different prisoners. Although this was slightly higher than at the last inspection (24 incidents involving 12 prisoners) it was still relatively low.
- I.16** A similar number of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management documents for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm had been opened in the six months prior to our inspection compared with our previous inspection (81). Five men had ACCT documents during our inspection. All received appropriate care and all said they felt well supported. ACCT documentation varied considerably. Triggers that led to self-harming behaviour were usually identified, but in many cases targets were poorly considered. In one case where 'poor decision-making' was identified as a trigger, the target was 'to make better decisions'; there was no explanation of how this would be achieved or what support might be necessary. Quality assurance procedures were in place but they centred on whether documents had been completed rather than on the effectiveness or focus of interactions.
- I.17** The prison had also introduced support plans, which were an extension of ACCT procedures. Many, but not all, prisoners were monitored through these plans once they were no longer subject to an ACCT.
- I.18** There were no gated cells; if one was required for a prisoner requiring a constant watch, they were transferred to Bullingdon or High Down prisons. This had happened only twice in the previous year and on both occasions involved the same man. A cell next to the staff office on E wing was used when there were heightened concerns about a prisoner.
- I.19** A safer custody policy was now in place and multidisciplinary meetings took place every month. Attendance from across the establishment was reasonable and discussions were appropriate. However, the meeting failed adequately to analyse self-harm issues or look at how prisoners should be managed. It looked at patterns relating to the location, time and frequency of incidents, but there was little focus on the reasons for self-harming or the need for an ACCT document to be opened. Strip-clothing was used occasionally for prisoners at risk of self-harm, but it was not monitored to assure managers that it was used appropriately and as a last resort.

- I.20** Prisoners had good access to Listeners and more respondents in our survey than at the last inspection said they could see them at any time. All wings had at least one Listener and there was a rota system in place. Listeners we spoke to said they received good training and support. The Listener suite was appropriate. Listeners provided a one-hour drop-in session every day at 5.30pm.

## Recommendation

- I.21** **Quality assurance for ACCT documents should ensure plans are effective and interactions appropriate.**

## Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.22** The prison had introduced its safeguarding adults policy in July 2016. It was reasonably comprehensive and covered the key principles. Health care staff screened all new arrivals and appropriate procedures were outlined in the prison's safer custody policy. Staff across the prison understood the processes reasonably well. Wider safeguarding issues were not well understood, however, and few staff we spoke to knew or understood the principle in practice. Although a manager in the offender management unit had been identified to act as the prison's representative at the Surrey adult safeguarding board, they had yet to attend and knew little about how it worked.

## Recommendation

- I.23** **The prison should ensure that effective links are established with the Surrey adult safeguarding board and that staff are aware of their adult safeguarding responsibilities.**

## Security

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.24** Procedural security arrangements were generally proportionate. Prisoners had good access to free flow (which allows prisoners to move about the prison unescorted) and nobody was subject to closed visits during our inspection. The searching policy had been re-launched in December 2016 but 10% of prisoners were still strip-searched following a visit, which was unnecessary. In the six months before our inspection searches throughout the prison had

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

recovered 349 banned or suspicious items, including weapons, mobile phones, drugs and shop-bought alcohol. Eleven visitors were banned, which appeared justified.

- I.25** During the previous six months, a significant number of intelligence reports were received. Many of them were well written and provided good information. The security team analysed the reports promptly and formulated action in response.
- I.26** The prison had good relations with the police. A police intelligence officer worked with the security team from Monday to Friday. Measures to manage members of organised criminal gangs and extremists were sound. Attendance at the monthly security and operational committee meetings was good and a wide range of information was shared.
- I.27** The biggest threats to the prison's security were mobile phones and drugs. In the previous six months, 9% of prisoners had tested positive for drugs, which was high. These figures did not include those using new psychoactive substances, such as Spice (a man-made drug that mimics the effects of cannabis but is much stronger with no discernible odour and cannot be detected by drug tests). Drug testing arrangements were poor. In two of the previous three months, the prison had failed to conduct the required 26 mandatory drug tests (MDT). Suspicion testing had all but ceased. The MDT suite had been refurbished and was now suitable.
- I.28** In our survey, more than 50% of men said that it was easy to get illegal drugs in the prison. The security team had responded by introducing more perimeter netting to prevent drugs being thrown into the prison. While this was welcome, the overall strategic response to the drug problem had been too reactive. During our inspection, there was no drug strategy meeting, although there were plans to start one in April 2017. Restricting the supply was one of three key elements of the drug strategy, published in October 2016. The prison had commissioned the third sector organisation User Voice to assess the level of drug use in the prison. Once the assessment was completed the prison planned to re-launch its drugs strategy (see paragraph I.40).

## Incentives and earned privileges

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.29** Three percent of the population were on the basic level, 33% on the standard level and 64% on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme. In our survey, 58% of prisoners said they had been treated fairly under the scheme, more than the comparator. There were some distinctions between the levels to encourage positive behaviour. We found many positive case note entries on prisoners' electronic case file records, but prisoners were not always aware of them. Records showed that officers took account of both positive and negative behaviour when reviewing IEP levels.

## Discipline

### Expected outcomes:

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

### Disciplinary procedures

- I.30** There had been 260 adjudications in the previous six months, fewer than at our last inspection. Paperwork and our observations showed that adjudication hearings were conducted fairly: charges were explained clearly and prisoners had time to prepare and the opportunity to present their side of events. Punishments were largely appropriate. Good discussions were held at the quarterly adjudication standards group meetings. Prison managers urged adjudicating governors to look beyond the immediate charge and focus on the underlying cause of prisoners' poor behaviour.

### The use of force

- I.31** During the previous six months, force was used on 48 occasions, which was relatively low. Most paperwork was complete and justified the use of force reasonably well, but in a small number of cases paperwork was incomplete. Filmed footage of incidents we reviewed demonstrated that good briefings and post-incident debriefings took place, and that control and restraint techniques were used appropriately and safely. Officers remained calm in the face of extreme provocation. However, in one incident a prisoner had his clothing forcibly removed and was placed in anti-ligature clothing. The paperwork did not justify such an extreme course of action.
- I.32** Data (for example on ethnicity, location, reasons for force and the staff involved) were not used well to identify emerging patterns or trends and there was no dedicated use of force committee to review incidents. There had been no use of special accommodation.

### Recommendation

- I.33 Managers should routinely analyse use of force data and review incidents to monitor trends, identify good practice and learn lessons.**

### Segregation

- I.34** The segregation unit remained largely the same as at our previous inspection. Communal areas were clean but some cells were too hot, poorly ventilated and contained graffiti. Toilets inside cells lacked seats and lids. The two exercise yards were cage-like. Three of the 11 cells were out of use. The unit was full for the duration of our inspection.
- I.35** Six of the eight men were held for their own protection. We were told that the unit was mainly used by men who were too afraid to remain in the main part of the prison, predominantly because of drugs and associated debt. Other than standard segregation paperwork there were no care plans. There was little emphasis on reintegrating these men into the mainstream population and it appeared that many prisoners used the unit as a way of being transferred out of the prison.



- I.36** The longest segregated prisoner had been held for more than eight weeks. A regional manager had reviewed his segregation after six weeks. We observed two segregation reviews, both of which were conducted fairly.
- I.37** Health care and chaplaincy staff attended the unit everyday as did a duty manager. These visits were appropriately recorded. Prisoners could make a phone call and use the shower every day but they still only had half an hour's exercise. Some cells now had electricity points and most men had radios. Prisoners in the unit told us that staff were respectful. Quarterly segregation monitoring and review group meetings were reasonably well attended and constructive.

## Recommendations

- I.38** **Care plans should be raised for all prisoners relocating to the segregation unit for their own protection, with an emphasis on reintegrating them to mainstream location.** (Repeated recommendation I.68)
- I.39** **All prisoners in the segregation unit should receive at least one hour in the open air every day.** (Repeated recommendation I.69)

## Substance misuse

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.40** The prison had recently appointed a designated drug strategy manager who had already created a drugs strategy with drug agency Addaction and the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt). A substance misuse policy had been drawn up, a needs assessment was underway and multi-agency drug strategy committee meetings were due to re-start in April 2017. The new approach looked promising.
- I.41** Substance misuse support was readily available. The RAPt team received an average of 12 new referrals each month and 58 prisoners were involved in structured work. An additional 35 had completed their care plan goals and were still in contact with the service. One-to-one work was supplemented with a range of in-cell packs, and prisoners could also access the four-week Stepping Stones programme, which 51 had completed in the previous six months. Additional activities included mindfulness sessions, a recovery book club and Alcoholics Anonymous meetings.
- I.42** The prison had an active peer support scheme and seven prisoners had been trained to contribute to induction sessions, help with in-cell work and support the Stepping Stones programme. Peer supporters were also involved in developing new initiatives, such as a recovery hub, and service user consultation took place at least quarterly.
- I.43** Clinical management of substance misuse had improved with Addaction clinicians prescribing more flexibly in line with national guidance. On average eight patients per month had received treatment since April 2016 with 75% on reducing regimes, which was appropriate. During the inspection, 100% were on individual reducing regimes, which was excellent. Clinical approaches were supported by compact-based drug testing (in which prisoners sign an agreement) and treatment was well coordinated with other health and prison departments.

- I.44** Integration between the RAPt and clinical substance misuse service was good. Thirteen-week clinical reviews and post-detoxification support were delivered jointly, and care for men with complex needs was planned with the mental health nurse.

## Section 2. Respect

### Residential units

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 Conditions in the older units (wings A to D and F), where 75% of men lived, had further deteriorated since our previous inspection: we found many areas dirty including windows, floors and walls. The cells were small and too warm and many were in poor condition, with shabby furniture. Most cell windows still had filthy, rusting cages, often overflowing with rubbish. Some windowpanes were broken and had been patched with Perspex and others had been painted, obscuring the daylight. There was no in-cell sanitation or drinking water. The toilet areas were badly maintained – we saw missing tiles, damaged ceilings, heavily scaled and stained sanitary ware, leaking pipes, broken glass in windows and cracked mirrors. Showers were dingy and not private.
- 2.2 In these units, prisoners had access to the toilet when they were locked up through an automated unlocking system, which allowed them to leave their cell one by one for eight minutes at a time to visit communal toilets. This system was fundamentally disrespectful: sometimes prisoners had to wait a long time to use the toilet and had to resort instead to using buckets in their cells without being able to wash their hands afterwards. The system had broken down three times in the previous three months. These difficulties were exacerbated by the plumbing being prone to blockages – in the first week of our inspection, 24 blocked toilets were reported.
- 2.3 A limited refurbishment programme was about to begin. The units were to be deep cleaned and painted but none of the windows and only some of the toilet areas were being replaced. The programme would not resolve the degrading sanitation arrangements or the underlying plumbing problems. (See recommendation S40.)
- 2.4 In contrast E wing remained bright and clean. All cells had integral sanitation, including a shower, but it was inappropriate that six cells designed for two men were now being used for three.
- 2.5 However, overall in our survey, prisoners' perceptions about access to amenities were at least as good as in comparator prisons, and better on E wing than elsewhere. In some areas perceptions had improved since our previous inspection. For example, 99% of men now said they could shower every day. Mail and telephone arrangements were satisfactory.
- 2.6 Laundry facilities were adequate, but it took too long for washing machines and tumble dryers to be repaired. Prisoners could wear their own clothes, except to visits. The scheme that allowed men to have replacement clothing handed in periodically had now been limited to underwear and socks.
- 2.7 Staff logged applications and provided prisoners with a copy, but did not track responses. As at our previous inspection, around two thirds of prisoners said applications were dealt with fairly and the process was generally smooth. However, we were not assured that applications to live on E wing were managed carefully enough. Many prisoners complained of unfairness and there was no managerial oversight of the decisions officers took. Similarly, prisoners complained about the condition of their mattresses and we found that new

mattresses were given to prisoners who asked for them, rather than to those whose mattresses were in the worst condition.

## Recommendation

- 2.8** The cleanliness and day-to-day maintenance of wings A to D should be improved to ensure the men live in as decent conditions as possible.

## Staff-prisoner relationships

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.9** In our survey 78% of prisoners said that staff treated them with respect and 68% said there was a member of staff they could turn to for help. Just over 80% said they had a personal officer, and a number of personal officer entries we saw on the Prison Service IT system were detailed and helpful, taking into account resettlement targets.
- 2.10** We observed generally reasonable staff interactions with prisoners, but wing-based staff did not always interact with men during association, which was reflected in our survey. Almost a quarter of officers were reasonably new and inexperienced, which would have affected their confidence in managing the challenging population.
- 2.11** Consultation with prisoners was reasonably good. In 2016, consultation meetings had been convened approximately every six weeks, although attendance by prisoner representatives was low, and it was evident some action had been taken as a result of the meetings. A prisoner representative was in the process of creating a bigger and more structured prisoner council with staff support. In addition, the duty governor attended each wing, on a rota, at a set time each day, during which prisoners could raise issues. Records demonstrated prisoners made the most of these visits.

## Good practice

- 2.12** *The duty governor's regular visit to the wings gave prisoners the opportunity to meet with them directly and raise any concerns.*

## 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 characteristic<sup>4</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.

### Strategic management

- 2.13** The strategic management of equality was insufficiently robust. The strategy document was detailed and outlined the prison's legal responsibilities and local procedures to support diversity. However, the bi-monthly diversity and equalities action team (DEAT) meeting failed to discuss thoroughly all protected characteristics and the associated action plan was significantly out of date. Action points from meetings were not always followed up.
- 2.14** Data were produced every month using the national equalities monitoring tool. The data were presented at the DEAT, but the prison did not consistently monitor areas where protected characteristics were overrepresented, which meant trends over time were not identified or investigated. As a result, prison managers were not sufficiently aware of the negative perceptions some groups held (see paragraph 2.20). This was exacerbated by the fact that consultation groups were run for some but not all those with protected characteristics. (See main recommendation S41.)
- 2.15** A significant number of staff had not participated in any recent equality training. Nevertheless, we found some reasonable support for individual men with protected characteristics. Diversity orderlies were knowledgeable and readily accessible and prisoners valued them. A very good range of equalities events was celebrated.
- 2.16** The number of discrimination incident reporting forms (DIRFs) submitted was low – 10 in the previous six months. Designated boxes on the wings allowed prisoners to submit DIRFs, but not all wings had a supply of forms freely available. Overall investigations and responses to DIRFs were inadequate; senior managers had started to quality assure a dip-sample of responses and provide feedback to relevant staff; however, there was no evidence that this had led to improvements.

### Recommendations

- 2.17** Equalities monitoring should be robust, consistent and used to determine trends over time.
- 2.18** Responses to DIRFs should be timely, detailed and demonstrate that a thorough investigation had taken place.

---

<sup>4</sup> The grounds upon which discrimination is unlawful (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2010).

## Protected characteristics

- 2.19** Protected characteristics were now identified and recorded as part of the induction process.
- 2.20** Black and minority ethnic prisoners comprised approximately 40% of the population. In some key areas, such as victimisation by staff and other prisoners this group was more negative than their white counterparts. While there had been some consultation with Gypsy, Romany and Traveller prisoners, there had been none with the black and minority ethnic population and as a result staff were not fully aware of their negative perceptions and had not investigated them. For example, some black and minority ethnic prisoners believed that white prisoners had more chance of being granted release on temporary licence or re-categorised to category D. (See main recommendation S41.)
- 2.21** There were 43 foreign national prisoners at the prison; the two largest nationality groups were Irish and Jamaican. No detainees were being held post-sentence under immigration powers. There was very little translated information available and the telephone translation service was rarely used. However, in our survey almost all prisoners said they understood both spoken and written English. In addition, the prison kept a list of multilingual staff and prisoners to help with translation when required. Immigration enforcement staff attended the prison periodically to hold a surgery, which prisoners could apply to attend. Foreign national prisoners could make a free monthly telephone call if they did not receive visits.
- 2.22** In our survey disabled prisoners were more negative in some areas, for example, more said they had problems on arrival and were victimised by other prisoners and staff and fewer felt safe on their first night compared with other prisoners. However, they were more positive about their treatment by reception staff on arrival and interactions with staff during association. Disabled prisoners we spoke to said they felt well cared for. Ten prisoners had a personal emergency evacuation plan (PEEP) but not all staff we spoke to were aware of prisoners' needs. There were two adapted cells on E wing, which incorporated a large wet room area. An older prisoner and disabled focus group had met three times in the previous six months, although it had not been consistently well attended.
- 2.23** Eighty-one prisoners were over the age of 50, including two who were over 70 years old. There was little dedicated provision for this group beyond designated gym sessions. F wing was an older prisoner unit housing only those over the age of 50, but it was very small so only a few prisoners benefited. There were no prisoners under the age of 21.
- 2.24** There was no specific consultation with or support for gay or bisexual prisoners. A new policy on the care and management of transgender offenders had been developed following a new Prison Service instruction (PSI). However, staff had not received training on the implications of the PSI nor on what was required to implement it.

## Recommendation

- 2.25** **Wing staff should be familiar with the needs of prisoners who have a PEEP.**

## Faith and religious activity

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.26** In our survey, just over half of prisoners said they felt their religious beliefs were respected. Sixty percent said they could speak to a religious leader of their faith in private; for Muslim prisoners the figure was 80%.
- 2.27** Faith provision was good. The chaplaincy consisted of two full-time chaplains – one representing the Church of England and the other Muslim – and a part-time Roman Catholic chaplain. The rest of the population's needs were met through sessional chaplains.
- 2.28** A wide range of religious and pastoral services were delivered. Facilities were sufficient to meet prisoners' needs. There was a large chapel, a multi-faith room and a mosque with washing facilities. Chaplains were reasonably well integrated into the life of the prison. The chaplaincy ran a bereavement counselling service, which was delivered by a volunteer, and a visitors' scheme involving eight volunteers, which was managed by an external co-ordinator.

## Complaints

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.29** There had been 795 complaints in the six months before our inspection, and in our survey, fewer prisoners than in comparator prisons said they had been prevented from making a complaint.
- 2.30** All complaints received at least an interim reply within five days and were generally answered by an appropriately senior manager. Data analysis was reasonable, but the prison did not sufficiently identify which complaints were upheld so that managers could analyse trends. A few complaints were returned to the prisoner unanswered without good reason.
- 2.31** Most replies were polite and legible and some were good. However, some complaints against staff needed more attention from senior managers to ensure responses were appropriate. In our sample, there was a clear improvement in the standard of replies over the previous year. Every week, managers peer-reviewed a random sample of complaints in small groups. This encouraged better practice, but managers still needed to meet routinely with the complainant and resolve every issue before making a final response.

### Good practice

- 2.32** *Weekly peer review sessions were effective in improving the quality of responses and encouraging better practice.*

## Legal rights

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.33** In our survey, prisoners were generally positive about their legal rights being respected. Legal visits were held in the main visits hall once a week. Too many visits took place at once for privacy to be guaranteed and no refreshments were available. An ongoing technical problem meant that when we tried to book a legal visit, the telephone line was unobtainable. The library stocked key legal textbooks.

### Recommendation

- 2.34** Legal visits should be private.

## Health services

### Expected outcomes:

**Prisoners are cared for by a health service that assesses and meets their health needs while in prison and which promotes continuity of health and social care on release. The standard of health service provided is equivalent to that which prisoners could expect to receive elsewhere in the community.**

- 2.35** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)<sup>5</sup> and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies.

### Governance arrangements

- 2.36** The CQC found there were no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- 2.37** We found effective partnership relationships between all clinicians and other stakeholders. A partnership board was established and health care staff were involved in a number of prison initiatives where their contribution was valued. A health needs assessment informed service delivery.
- 2.38** Arrangements for reporting, investigating and learning from adverse incidents were in place and staff were aware of changes in practice in response to incidents. The prison had established a patient forum and staff responded appropriately to prisoners' concerns. For example, staff had introduced Saturday clinics and provided more health care information during induction.
- 2.39** Clinical governance arrangements were generally appropriate. Services were well led and staffing was sufficient to meet clinical needs – there was an appropriate skills mix, including staff with specialist skills. Mandatory training was well monitored and all staff's core skills

---

<sup>5</sup> 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>.



were up to date. Professional development opportunities were provided and many staff commented positively on the support they had received. Staff received regular clinical and managerial supervision and annual appraisals, although some felt the process was formulaic, which reduced its effectiveness.

- 2.40 Policies and systems were in place to prevent and manage communicable diseases and deal with outbreaks. Information-sharing protocols were established, including those related to sharing confidential health information.
- 2.41 The health centre was generally clean and tidy and treatment rooms were suitable. However, cleaning arrangements were inconsistent and action from the last infection prevention audit had not been achieved.
- 2.42 An ambulance was called promptly in an emergency and response times were appropriate. Resuscitation equipment was checked and maintained regularly and clinical staff were appropriately trained. Automated external defibrillators (AEDs) were located on all wings except for D wing. Few custody staff had basic life support skills, which could have left prisoners vulnerable.
- 2.43 An older people's lead staff member was in post and an adequate range of age-related clinics and screening arrangements had been established, including bespoke gym sessions. Regular health screening clinics were run and prisoners had good access to vaccination programmes. Prisoners were informed at reception that they could ask for barrier protection.
- 2.44 Arrangements for making complaints about health care were inconsistent. There was a very good prisoner-led patient advice and liaison service as well as clinics where prisoners could talk to a manager face to face to resolve concerns in the prison. The formal Virgin health complaints process was not advertised in the prison and most healthcare complaints went through the prison's system, which lacked confidentiality. Responses were not quality assured and lessons from the issues raised were not highlighted. Some of the responses we sampled did not address in full or adequately resolve the concern raised or inform prisoners how they could escalate their complaint if they remained dissatisfied.
- 2.45 There was a reasonable range of prisoner information, which could be printed in a range of languages and alternative formats. A number of health promotion initiatives had taken place.

## Recommendations

- 2.46 **All custody staff should receive regular basic life support training as part of their mandatory training programme and AEDs should be located on all wings.**
- 2.47 **Prisoners should be able to complain about health services through a well-publicised, confidential system; responses should address the issues raised in full and prisoners should receive information on how to escalate their complaint if they are dissatisfied with the response.**

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.48 More prisoners in our survey than at comparator prisons were satisfied about how easy it was to see the GP (45% against 28%) and nursing staff (64% versus 49%). More prisoners in our survey than the comparator and compared with the previous inspection were satisfied with the overall quality of health services. The prisoners we spoke to were also positive

about the care they had received and we saw skilled practitioners interacting with prisoners positively and delivering clinically effective care.

- 2.49** Prisoners we spoke to and records we reviewed indicated that new arrivals received a comprehensive health screening. Risks were identified and all prisoners were offered a routine follow up with the GP within 72 hours.
- 2.50** The application system was straightforward and prisoners could visit the health centre easily. There were six routine GP sessions per week and an additional pain clinic once a week. Waiting times for most appointments were three to five days, which was good. Specific medical governance involved a regular review of GPs' notes and a peer review of clinical judgements by other GPs at the prison. Out of hours' provision was well organised and there were clear protocols for staff to follow.
- 2.51** Nurses ran a variety of primary care clinics, including a well-man clinic, vaccinations and phlebotomy. Long-term conditions were well managed. There was an appropriate range of primary care services, including access to a podiatrist and optician. Generally waiting times for all these services were good. SystmOne (the electronic clinical information system) was used and entries in patient records were generally of a good standard. Staff used assessment templates that reflected national clinical guidance and care plans were established appropriately.
- 2.52** Hospital referrals were prompt and appropriate. There were two external referral appointments a day. On occasion other demands, such as the emergency transfer of prisoners to hospital, meant that planned referrals did not take place. These situations were managed systematically to ensure prisoners did not miss more than one external appointment. Additionally, all the providers planned to bring external consultants into the prison, either in person or through telemedicine, which would reduce referrals significantly.

## Pharmacy

- 2.53** Individually labelled medicines were dispensed by another prison pharmacy and prescribed in line with the agreed formulary (medications used to inform prescribing). Patients receiving in-possession medication could order repeat medication, which was generally received within 24 hours. Staff had introduced a system for booking in medication, which had detected and prevented a small number of medication errors. A range of stock medications was checked and recorded appropriately. Medicines were stored and issued from the main health care unit and a locked trolley in the segregation unit. The ambient temperature in the pharmacy room was at the upper end of the acceptable range, but it was monitored and a portable air conditioner used if the temperature became excessive.
- 2.54** An up-to-date in-possession policy took account of patient risks and the tradability of medication. Patients had an initial in-possession assessment on reception, which was reviewed annually or if they changed their status. Around 85% of patients had their medication in-possession and most received a monthly supply. Pharmacy staff also ran an asthma clinic and ensured medicines were reconciled with stock records.
- 2.55** The pharmacy worked closely with the prescribers and were involved in medication reviews. A successful analgesics review clinic worked respectfully with patients to reduce the inappropriate prescribing of analgesic medicines. Over an initial six-month period, this saw the number of patients on medication that could be abused fall by around 70% and the time taken to administer supervised medication halved, allowing more people to visit the gym and undertake work opportunities.

- 2.56** Two nurses administered medicines every day at 8.30am, midday and 5.50pm from the main treatment room. At least one officer managed medication queues and each patient's confidentiality was protected at the hatch. While a few patients received sedating medication late in the afternoon (generally in the segregation unit), they did so based on their individual circumstances and an assessment.
- 2.57** Patients could receive ibuprofen along with a number of other simple medicines from health care staff, as outlined in a policy. As well as being available as single doses from the pharmacy, paracetamol was also on the canteen list. Only the hepatitis B vaccination and salbutamol were available through patient group directions (PGDs) (which enable nurses to supply and administer prescription-only medicine), preventing staff from administering more potent pharmacy medications without a prescription.

## Recommendation

- 2.58** **An adequate range of PGDs should be available so minor ailments can be treated without a prescription.**

## Good practice

- 2.59** *The analgesics review clinic helped reduce the inappropriate prescribing of analgesic medicines.*

## Dentistry

- 2.60** There were six dental sessions a week. A full range of treatment was offered and oral education was provided during the treatment session. Appointments were appropriately allocated based on prisoners' needs, and provision for urgent dental care was effective. However, the routine appointment waiting time of 18 weeks was too long.
- 2.61** The dental facility was spacious, well equipped and there was a separate decontamination room, which was compliant with essential requirements. Clinical governance, equipment maintenance and record keeping were appropriate. The damaged plasterwork on a wall in the treatment room was a potential source of bacterial infection and required attention.

## Recommendations

- 2.62** **All prisoners should have timely access to dental services.** (Repeated recommendation 2.81)
- 2.63** **The dental environment should comply with infection prevention standards and the damaged plasterwork in the treatment room should be repaired.**

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.64** Mental health services in the prison consisted of a stepped care model. A five-day service adopted a psychologically-led approach covering mild to moderate problems, which included guided self-help, counselling, group work and a range of psychological therapies. The team had a single nurse manager who undertook initial assessments and led complex care management. Other professional staff delivered sessional input, including a psychiatrist, learning disability nurse, counsellor, psychologists and support staff.

- 2.65** The reception screening identified mental health concerns that triggered a formal mental health assessment if required. There was an open referral system (in which anyone could refer prisoners or men could refer themselves). The team aimed to see referrals within three days and urgent cases within one working day. Fifty-seven men were receiving support and although few prisoners required specialist secondary care, five men with complex or severe and enduring mental health needs were being appropriately supported under the care programme approach (mental health services for individuals diagnosed with a mental illness). The clinical records we examined were good and appropriate professional development and supervision arrangements were in place. Around four referrals were received each week and we judged that the model and staffing profile were appropriate to meet prisoners' needs, although the dependence on a single nurse leader could have resulted in reduced support for men with acute needs should they be absent.
- 2.66** Members of the mental health team liaised and interacted well with prison staff and other health providers, including GPs. Five prisoner champions had been identified to support the prison's mental health promotion initiatives. We observed a number of therapeutic interactions that demonstrated prisoners were involved in framing their own care.
- 2.67** The nurse leader contributed to the work of the segregation unit and the service was involved in all relevant assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case reviews. Few custody staff had received mental health awareness training, although a package had recently been developed specifically for segregation staff.
- 2.68** In the previous 12 months, no-one had required hospital treatment. We were advised that an acutely disturbed prisoner would usually be moved to the inpatient service at HMP High Down if additional support was required.

## Social care

- 2.69** Healthcare staff were aware of their safeguarding responsibilities and knew how to report concerns. Social care arrangements were still developing, but prisoners' needs were being met effectively and access to specialist equipment or adaptations had been appropriately provided. The support needs of men with learning difficulties was also considered as part of these processes.

## Catering

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.70** In our survey, 47% of prisoners said the food was good, more than in comparator prisons and more than at our previous inspection. However, black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners were less positive. Prisoners told us this was because they were not convinced that halal food was appropriately separated during food preparation and serving. We observed that separate utensils were not always used and thought the opaque screens (which prevented prisoners from seeing the food they were being served) also contributed to these perceptions. Consultation arrangements were very informal and not sufficiently effective to identify this issue. (See recommendation 2.77.)
- 2.71** The menu was varied and kitchen staff said that the extra money allocated to prisoners' food had improved its quality. However, meals continued to be served too early, before midday

and 5pm, and breakfast packs were still meagre. Prisoners on E wing had a basic kitchen (although it was temporarily closed for refurbishment) and could now eat together. Prisoners on F wing had full self-catering facilities and some of the older wings and the enhanced landing had a toaster and a fridge. More self-catering opportunities would have been helpful.

- 2.72** The kitchen was still in a poor state. The floor had been repainted since our previous inspection, but was again worn. There were open drains and some tiles were missing. Much of the kitchen and adjacent serving area were dirty, with baked-on food and debris on the floor. The prisoners' toilets were also dirty and there was cigarette ash in the sink (see main recommendation S40).
- 2.73** Prisoners working in the kitchen could not achieve any formal qualifications.

## Recommendations

- 2.74** Prisoners, especially those on longer sentences, should be able to cater for themselves.
- 2.75** The kitchen and surrounding areas should be kept clean.

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.76** In our survey, overall perceptions about the range of goods available in the prison shop were better than at our previous inspection and similar to comparator prisons. Muslim and black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive, even though a catalogue selling religious and cultural items was available. There had been some consultative meetings, but the minutes did not record any meaningful discussion and prisoners did not feel they had been effective. Arrangements for ordering and delivering goods were efficient. Prisoners could buy newspapers and magazines and additional items from a range of catalogues.

## Recommendation

- 2.77** The prison should identify why black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners have poorer perceptions of the food and range of products in the shop and address them.



## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

**All prisoners are actively encouraged to engage in activities available during unlock and the prison offers a timetable of regular and varied activities.<sup>6</sup>**

- 3.1** Most men had excellent time out of their cells. The regime ran on time and restrictions were well managed so that men attending activities had 11 hours out of their cells on a week day, around eight at the weekend and evening association four nights a week. Prisoners on F wing were not locked up at all. During periods of staff shortages, men on E wing were sometimes locked behind the spur gates, but not in their cells.
- 3.2** During our spot checks, we found 16% of prisoners locked up during the working day, most were either unwell or unemployed. This was relatively low, but the lack of integral sanitation in many of the cells made it a concern.
- 3.3** The exercise yards were clean and had exercise equipment. Prisoners could usually use them in the morning and at lunchtime for 30 minutes, but the latter session was sometimes cancelled. Facilities for association were reasonable overall, and good on E wing.

### Learning and skills and work activities

#### Expected outcomes:

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

**3.4** *Ofsted<sup>7</sup> made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:*

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

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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>.

## Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.5** The overall leadership and management of learning and skills and work were good. The management of education and training provided by Milton Keynes College was good. Managers and leaders had improved the quality of teaching and learning as well as qualifications achievements since the previous inspection.
- 3.6** The prison had developed links with commercial partners and won contracts in its own workshops, to provide work for prisoners. In a few cases this led to employment for prisoners on release, but there was no formal progression route to employment.
- 3.7** Senior managers and leaders had recently agreed to emphasise employability and English and maths skills development. As a result, the number of prisoners taking English and maths courses had increased and prisoners' achievements had improved.
- 3.8** The prison had introduced a well-designed in-house accreditation system, the Coldingley Industries certificate (CIC), which recognised and recorded prisoners' developing employability skills. The scheme had enrolled 90 prisoners to date.
- 3.9** While attendance at work, education and training had improved and was generally good, in English and maths lessons it required further improvement. Prisoners' attendance at appointments interrupted work and education sessions.
- 3.10** Managers did not sufficiently analyse or use available data to identify areas for improvement. The most recent self-assessment report was reasonably accurate. However, the quality improvement plan did not contain sufficient measurable outcomes by which to assess progress.

## Recommendations

- 3.11 Senior managers should ensure all prisoners regularly attend planned education activities, particularly English and maths lessons.**
- 3.12 Managers should analyse information in detail and use it to identify examples of best practice and areas for improvement and to agree measurable outcomes for subsequent actions.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.13** The prison provided 456 activity places, sufficient for all prisoners to be involved in full-time purposeful activities. Managers had broadened the range of education provision since the previous inspection. Prisoners could attend courses from entry level up to level 2 in English, maths, information technology (IT), graphic design and art. A range of employability courses and a personal finance course were offered periodically. However, education in the prison at higher levels was otherwise limited.
- 3.14** Good progression routes were available in the Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA) workshop, which enabled prisoners to progress from IT beginner to level 3 network technician. A few prisoners had received assistance finding jobs in the IT industry after release. Thirty-one prisoners were undertaking Open University and other distance learning courses.



- 3.15** Managers had also increased the range of accredited vocational training to include qualifications at level 2 in areas such as performing manufacturing operations, waste management, horticulture and customer services. Vocational courses had been reintroduced in the gym.
- 3.16** Several large workshops did not offer accredited training opportunities. Prison managers had recognised this and planned to introduce new work-based courses, including in catering to better meet prisoners' resettlement needs. Some longer-serving prisoners who had developed more advanced skills, for example in printing, engineering and design, would have benefited from level 3 provision.
- 3.17** Very good, challenging work was available in engineering, print, DHL and sign workshops. However, a minority of jobs involved mundane work, such as folding cards or re-packaging used airline headphones.

## Recommendations

- 3.18** **The education and training provision should be extended to include higher level learning.**
- 3.19** **There should be a greater number and range of work-related and vocational courses.**

## Quality of provision

- 3.20** Teaching, learning and assessment were good. Teachers provided prisoners with very effective support, varied and relevant learning activities and appropriately challenging tasks during lessons. This helped prisoners develop their knowledge and skills and to make good progress. Teachers did not always give classroom assistants enough direction in lessons.
- 3.21** Teachers used a good range of resources that reflected workplace activities well, particularly in barbering, maths, graphic design and web design classes. As a result, prisoners participated well and enjoyed their learning.
- 3.22** The PICTA course was very well managed and prisoners' progress was carefully monitored and recorded. Prisoners produced high standards of work and recognised the value of what they had learned for their career aspirations.
- 3.23** Teachers raised awareness of discrimination and equality and celebrated diversity well in lessons. For example, in a functional skills English lesson, prisoners discussed their understanding of British values and tolerance, and carefully listened to each other's differing views, responding tactfully and without causing offence.
- 3.24** The main prison workshops were large, well equipped and provided very good work experience for many prisoners. The engineering, sign and print workshops produced work to a commercial standard that met the requirements of external customers, as well as the Prison Service. In a minority of workshops instructors used the new CIC well to recognise and record prisoners' developing employability skills.
- 3.25** All prisoners were allocated work in a commercial workshop for the first four weeks of their time at Coldingley. This helped promote and reinforce useful work skills, but there was no formal assessment of prisoners' needs to inform sentence planning or work allocations.

## Recommendation

- 3.26 Teachers and instructors should make better use of the induction period to carry out a detailed initial assessment of prisoners' skills and prior educational attainment to better inform their planning of learning and work activities.**

## Personal development and behaviour

- 3.27** Prisoners in work and vocational training developed useful employment skills. They worked very well in most areas. The behaviour of those in training and education was good throughout. Prisoners were consistently respectful to each other and staff. The minority of prisoners involved in mundane work lacked motivation and their behaviour was poorer.
- 3.28** Prisoners working towards vocational qualifications were keen to learn new skills and took pride in their achievements. For example, men on the barbering course presented their work neatly and understood the importance of creating a good impression with customers.
- 3.29** A minority of prisoners in workshops developed advanced skills and took responsibility for aspects of the production process. For example, in the print workshop prisoners were responsible for the operation of advanced litho print machines and produced work well above the expected level.
- 3.30** Instructors paid good attention to health and safety. As a result, prisoners understood relevant health and safety rules and applied them in their work.
- 3.31** Across a range of subjects, prisoners developed employability skills, such as information and communications technology (ICT). For example, in English lessons, prisoners developed creative ICT skills when preparing presentations. Prisoners enjoyed their learning and made good progress. Some work was to industry standard, such as in barbering, welding, PICTA and print workshop areas.
- 3.32** Prisoners' attendance at their workplace was generally good. However, regular absences in education interrupted prisoners' progress.

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.33** Success rates on almost all education and vocational training courses were very high, although prisoners with learning difficulties or disabilities, were slightly less successful than their peers. Achievement rates on functional skills English and maths courses at entry levels had improved in the year prior to the inspection. However, on English and maths courses at levels 1 and 2 they required further improvement. Around a quarter of prisoners on levels 1 and 2 functional skills courses were transferred before they completed their learning. Coldingley had the highest PICTA outcomes in the country.

## Recommendation

- 3.34 Senior managers should take action to drive up achievement rates on English and maths courses.**

## Library

- 3.35** The library had improved considerably. In our survey, more men than at our previous inspection and compared with similar prisons said they went to the library at least once a week and the stock met their needs. A selection of easy read books and plenty of material on vocational subjects and health promotion were available. The DVD stock had been increased significantly.
- 3.36** The library was open two evenings a week and there was a range of Friday afternoon activities, including a chess club, Spanish course and periodic visits from authors. In 2016, 121 Storybook Dads recordings (in which prisoners record stories for their children) had been made. The librarian had internet access and sent emails on behalf of prisoners.
- 3.37** The second edition of a new library magazine was about to be published. It promoted library services and provided prisoners with the opportunity to have their own writing published.
- 3.38** The librarian had done some consultation, but needed to do more to seek the views of prisoners who did not use the library. The three library orderlies still could not achieve a qualification.

## Physical education and healthy living

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.39** All prisoners received an appropriate induction to the gym and once completed they had immediate access. Overall access was good and many prisoners attended four times a week. In our survey 61% of prisoners compared with 33% in other category C prisons said they visited the gym at least three times a week, more than twice the number at the last inspection.
- 3.40** Indoor facilities were good. The hall itself had been refurbished since our last inspection. There was a large cardiovascular area with a range of equipment, including modular weights and a dedicated spinning area. However, there was still no outdoor sports facility.
- 3.41** Sporting activities included football, basketball and badminton. The weekly gym schedule offered prisoners equitable access and included smoking cessation, yoga, and sessions for specific groups, such as segregated prisoners and those with substance misuse or health needs.
- 3.42** Accredited training at levels 1, 2 and 3 in personal fitness were available. Once qualifications had been achieved prisoners were usually employed as gym orderlies to help run classes. The gym area included a classroom where teaching took place and a treatment room was also available.

### Recommendation

- 3.43 Prisoners should be able to use an appropriate outdoor sports field.** (Repeated recommendation 3.46)



## Section 4. Resettlement

### Strategic management of resettlement

#### Expected outcomes:

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

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

**Good planning ensures a seamless transition into the community.**

- 4.1 The resettlement strategy was up to date. Although it had a general analysis of the prison population, it lacked any detail on prisoners' offending-related needs. However, many staff were generally aware of the needs of the long-term population. A well-attended resettlement meeting was used to share information, but more focus was required on ensuring services were well coordinated. However, it was positive that prisoners were involved in the meeting. The activities team managed three resettlement orderlies who were knowledgeable and provided valuable information to their peers.
- 4.2 More needed to be done to achieve a 'whole prison' approach to resettlement, where staff across the prison saw the importance of their role in rehabilitating the men in their care. The unit did not have its own policy or strategy document, which would have helped offender supervisors and staff in other departments understand the work being done in the offender management unit (OMU). The department had also suffered from significant redeployment of its staff, which had negatively affected the frequency of contact with prisoners in some cases.
- 4.3 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) contracted Catch 22 to deliver through-the-gate services. Its staff attended the prison one day a week. The service was not yet fully integrated into the prison.
- 4.4 Overall, the range of provision to help prisoners reduce their risk of reoffending and harm and to reintegrate them back into the community was largely appropriate.
- 4.5 Four category D men could leave the prison regularly on day release. Three were working on refurbishing Café Britannia, outside the prison walls, and one attended college one day a week (see paragraph 4.34). There were plans for more release on temporary licence (ROTL) opportunities once Café Britannia opened. ROTL decisions were mostly timely, but getting information from outside agencies could be difficult. ROTL was granted following an appropriate risk assessment and in line with resettlement plans. When ROTL was refused, men could reapply or participate in alternative activities to support resettlement. In the six months preceding our inspection, nine men had had temporary release for family reasons. Some decisions about temporary release were made too close to the release date for prisoners to make necessary arrangements with families.

## Offender management and planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.6** In our survey, 91% of men said they had a named offender supervisor, which was higher than the comparator and at our last inspection. Significantly more men than the comparator also said they had a sentence plan (76%), that they had been involved in developing the plan (63%) and that their offender supervisor was helping them achieve their sentence planning objectives (51%). Fewer men in our survey than the comparator said nobody was helping them achieve their sentence planning targets.
- 4.7** The prison's target for contact with prisoners was every three months, which took place in cases where probation officers managed prisoners. Levels of contact between offender supervisors and prisoners were generally good for higher risk men and most interactions were meaningful and positive. Contact for medium and lower risk men was more variable. However, the majority of men we spoke to told us they felt they could make progress at Coldingley and there were relatively few complaints about contact with the OMU.
- 4.8** Caseloads were reasonable. Administrative staff were well integrated but hub-working (involving a 'case management' approach) was not yet fully embedded. There was evidence that probation and prison staff shared information well but there were no formal offender management meetings, which could have ensured greater consistency in working practices. Probation staff received regular supervision but prison offender supervisors received no formal casework supervision.
- 4.9** Contact with prisoners was generally well recorded on the profile document. However, the document was not available on the Prison Service IT system, which if it had been would have helped develop a 'whole prison' approach to rehabilitation.
- 4.10** Offender assessment system (OASys) documents were sound. From November 2016 to January 2017, 46 prisoners were transferred to Coldingley without an OASys. The prison had a prioritisation policy for completing OASys documents, relating to key progression dates, and the senior management team received regular feedback on the number of outstanding documents, which totalled around 20 during the inspection. Risk management plans and risk of harm analyses were reasonably good.
- 4.11** Personal officers did not routinely attend sentence planning meetings, although community offender managers often attended via video link. Sentence plans were variable; targets for some lower risk men needed to be more focused; too many were about their general behaviour. Targets for higher risk men were generally appropriate and achievable and interventions available at Coldingley were highlighted. In our survey, 79% of men told us they could achieve their sentence plan targets at Coldingley, more than the comparator and compared with our previous inspection.
- 4.12** Home detention curfew was well managed and requests for information were followed up appropriately. Boards were mostly timely and decisions appropriate. However, some men were not released on their earliest eligibility date.

## Recommendations

- 4.13** Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners on their caseload should be consistent and ensure men are supported in achieving their targets.
- 4.14** All offender supervisors should receive case management supervision.

## Public protection

- 4.15** There was a detailed public protection policy. The OMU hub manager checked the cases of all new receptions on arrival. The senior probation officer also reviewed their case so it could be allocated to staff. However, as at our last inspection arrangements for covering public protection when staff were absent were not in place.
- 4.16** Risk management meetings were held, but they were being reviewed to make them more dynamic. They considered new arrivals, imminent releases, men subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) and those identified as high or very high risk of harm. Wing and security staff did not attend regularly or provide sufficient input and the meetings did not focus enough on managing risks within the prison.
- 4.17** The prison kept a register of people with possible public protection concerns and previous harassment orders, and the violent and sex offender register and MAPPA databases were well managed. The prison had just implemented a system to inform community offender managers when prisoners were being released and needed MAPPA levels setting. It was too early to assess it, but in general contact with community offender managers was managed appropriately and escalated to a senior probation officer where necessary.

## Categorisation

- 4.18** The prison was holding 26 category D prisoners at the time of the inspection. There was no difference in their living conditions or treatment, although they could apply for ROTL. Some category D men wanted to stay at Coldingley for ROTL or family contact reasons.
- 4.19** During our inspection, the population was being slowly reduced to allow a wing to be closed for refurbishment. The aim was to move men for progressive reasons where possible, but many did not want to leave Coldingley. Population management meetings took place every week and considered security, prisoners' behaviour and other transfers.
- 4.20** Re-categorisation decisions, which were up to date, were justified and based on a risk assessment. Men could ask for their re-categorisation to be reviewed less than 12 months since their previous review if they could provide evidence of a change in their risk level. Decisions were based on a fair amount of information but lacked sufficient personal officer input. Around 15 men moved to category D prisons every month. This reflected well on observation, classification and allocation staff and gave other men hope of progressing.

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.21** Nearly 40% of the population were serving an indeterminate sentence and many told us they could make progress at Coldingley. Most indeterminate sentence prisoners were managed by probation staff who met them soon after arrival at the prison and attempted to support progression. The prison focused on prisoners who were over their tariff and tried to assist men with complex cases to make progress.

- 4.22** Paperwork for parole and parole hearings were completed on time but some hearings took place up to six months later than scheduled, which prisoners found frustrating. Men we spoke to did not seem to be aware that legal aid was available in some parole cases.
- 4.23** A useful lifer forum, organised by the men, had met twice but not all allocated wing representatives were able to attend. The forum was also responsible for putting together an annual lifer information day, focusing on important aspects of serving a life sentence and providing a good source of support, information and advice. Men and their families also valued previous lifer family days. However, these positive initiatives were not embedded or resourced adequately, which affected their effectiveness and the lifer family day faced being discontinued.
- 4.24** Lifers had no access to additional property or resources. Not all staff were aware of the specific needs of this group.

## Recommendation

- 4.25 The lifer forum, information day and family visits should be resourced properly and take place regularly.**

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.26** Most progressive moves from Coldingley were to open prisons, and few men were released directly from the prison – about 10 a month. Catch 22 staff tried to meet prisoners approaching release, but were not proactive enough if men did not attend appointments. Release planning was underdeveloped and needed to be better integrated with other departments across the prison, and data on post-release outcomes needed to be collected and analysed. Not all risk factors or areas of need were identified in resettlement plans and there was little evidence that referrals or action were followed up. Despite this, some men had received good individual support and outcomes for those leaving the prison were reasonable. Contact between Catch 22, the OMU and community managers was good.
- 4.27** Pathway work was reasonable, but in our survey, few prisoners knew where to get support on release in some areas. Despite this, the resettlement pathway support provided was generally good, and in our survey, 62% of men said they had done something at Coldingley that would make them less likely to offend in future, significantly more than the comparator and compared to our last inspection.

## Recommendations

- 4.28 Catch 22 and departments within the prison should systematically share and record data about post-release outcomes.**
- 4.29 Services should be promoted more actively and resettlement planning should be improved.**



## Accommodation

- 4.30** Few men needed assistance with accommodation because most of them were released to family homes, their own accommodation or an approved premise. The figures we saw suggested two men had been released without an address in the previous six months, but neither Catch 22 nor the prison held data on outcomes, which required better monitoring. Resettlement orderlies helped men make housing applications and carried out research on housing providers. In the previous six months, one man had been placed in temporary accommodation, while a number of others had been referred to community-based housing providers.

## Education, training and employment

- 4.31** National Careers Service (NCS) and college staff provided new prisoners with appropriate, supportive and helpful inductions to the prison and to education, including careers advice and guidance. The quality of information, advice and guidance delivered on behalf of the NCS, by CfBT was good.
- 4.32** College and NCS staff supported men in using the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) to help them write their CVs, search for jobs on release and take external assessments, but too few were involved. NCS staff interacted well with prisoners to develop useful skills action plans.
- 4.33** Good links between Catch 22 and the NCS team meant all prisoners who required education, training or employment support were referred to the careers service, but only half of prisoners took this up. Three employment fairs had been organised, where prisoners approaching release met with employment and training agencies to discuss opportunities after release. The range of pre-release courses was very limited and there were no data on employment outcomes.
- 4.34** The prison, college, and NCS had provided exceptional support to one learner who attended a higher-level college course outside the prison, backed by charitable trusts and a large employer.

## Health care

- 4.35** Prisoners received appropriate support prior to discharge and all men were seen and reviewed by a member of the primary health care team. Prisoners received information about registering with a GP, and if required provided with a supply of medicines on release. There were effective links with local community mental health teams to support discharge planning for men with ongoing mental health needs.

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.36** The Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners Trust (RAPt) team contributed to sentence planning meetings and provided summaries of completed interventions to offender supervisors. Workers liaised with the substance misuse nurse to ensure treatment continuation on release, and the opiate blocker naltrexone could be prescribed to support abstinence. Release planning started 12 weeks before discharge and RAPt aftercare support included a 'meet and greet' scheme at the gate.

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.37** The finance, benefit and debt pathway was well developed. Ten determinate sentenced men a month could open a bank account through an arrangement with Unlock, a charity for people with convictions. Prisoners on indeterminate sentences could open a credit union account. Resettlement orderlies and Catch 22 staff provided prisoners with debt advice and other support, such as writing letters to creditors and contacting the tax office. The education department ran a money management course and Jobcentre Plus visited every week to support men with benefit queries and applications.

## Good practice

- 4.38** *The credit union facility enabled men on indeterminate sentences to open an account when they otherwise would not have been able to unless they had a definite release date.*

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.39** As at our previous inspection the visitors' centre was essentially a waiting room. Visitors booked in at the gate then waited in the visitors' centre; several told us they had to arrive two hours before the start of visits to be near the front of the queue. Others were concerned about visitors pushing in, which caused tension, and there were no staff to oversee the visitors' centre. No refreshments other than a water cooler were available and only minimal information was provided.
- 4.40** Visits provision was reasonable, and took place every afternoon except Tuesday and Sunday mornings and an evening session had been introduced for an hour on Tuesday. Visits could be booked by phone or email and visitors could now book their next visit while they were at the prison. However, visits staff had not received safeguarding children training.
- 4.41** The visits hall had 32 tables and was reasonably bright and spacious, and there were plans to decorate it with prisoners' artwork. A shop sold hot and cold snacks and there was a vending machine. A newly painted and well-equipped play area, supervised by a Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT) play worker, was available during most sessions since September 2016. There was also now a toilet for men to use during visits. Visitors told us that not all visits started on time, and during the session we observed some visitors were still waiting to go through to the hall 20 minutes after the session had started. Prisoners were not required to wear a distinguishing bib.
- 4.42** Prisoners and families valued family days; 11 had been held during 2016 and eight were planned for 2017, during which a good range of activities and hot food were provided. They were not restricted to enhanced prisoners, but men had to pay £15 to attend, which was excessive given the wages most prisoners received, which meant some men did not apply. PACT now delivered some useful family support case work but there were no parenting or relationship courses, although plans were in place to address this gap. A homework club was beginning at the end of March.

## Recommendations

- 4.43** The visitors' centre should be developed to provide visitors with an appropriate service. (Repeated recommendation 4.46)
- 4.44** Visitors should be admitted to the visits room punctually to allow a full two-hour visit. (Repeated recommendation 4.44)
- 4.45** All relevant prison staff should undertake safeguarding children training.
- 4.46** The £15 charge for family days should be abolished.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.47** The range of offending behaviour programmes was largely appropriate for the population and gaps in the provision were being explored. In our survey, 79% of men said they had been involved in a course. The psychology team offered the Resolve course for violent offenders, the healthy relationships programme and the thinking skills programme (TSP) every year. It was positive that 12% of men completing an offending behaviour course had been able to have a family or friend attend their completion session.
- 4.48** Waiting lists were reasonable, and included men who were eligible for courses, but who were not motivated enough to do one. People who were not involved, or who maintained their innocence met with psychology staff at least once a year to review their situation. Prisoners could get temporary transfers to undertake courses at other prisons.
- 4.49** The chaplaincy ran the Sycamore Tree programme at least three times a year for around 22 men each time. It helped build victim awareness. The excellent crime diversion scheme employed and trained seven men to deliver interventions for young people who were at risk of offending or in contact with the criminal justice system. It used a variety of innovative activities and personal experiences to explore the realities of prison life and committing crime.



# Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

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

## Main recommendations

To the governor

- 5.1 The prison should introduce a more strategic response to the problems of illegal drug supply and use and associated debt, bullying and violence. (S39)
- 5.2 The prison should ensure the needs of men with protected characteristics are understood and identify any concerns they have about fair and equitable treatment; where possible these needs should be met and concerns addressed. (S41)

## Main recommendation

To HM Prison and Probation Service

- 5.3 The refurbishment of wings A to D and F should be comprehensive and include recess areas, windows and the kitchen. The night time sanitation should work properly and, long term, it should be replaced as a matter of priority. (S40)

## Recommendations

### Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.4 The prison should implement an effective strategy to reduce violence. (1.13)
- 5.5 A range of interventions should be used to challenge and manage perpetrators of violence and to support victims of violence. (1.14)

### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.6 Quality assurance for ACCT documents should ensure plans are effective and interactions appropriate. (1.21)

### Safeguarding

- 5.7 The prison should ensure that effective links are established with the Surrey adult safeguarding board and that staff are aware of their adult safeguarding responsibilities. (1.23)

### Discipline

- 5.8 Managers should routinely analyse use of force data and review incidents to monitor trends, identify good practice and learn lessons. (1.33)

**5.9** Care plans should be raised for all prisoners relocating to the segregation unit for their own protection, with an emphasis on reintegrating them to mainstream location. (1.38, repeated recommendation 1.68)

**5.10** All prisoners in the segregation unit should receive at least one hour in the open air every day. (1.39, repeated recommendation 1.69)

### Residential units

**5.11** The cleanliness and day-to-day maintenance of wings A to D should be improved to ensure the men live in as decent conditions as possible. (2.8)

### Equality and diversity

**5.12** Equalities monitoring should be robust, consistent and used to determine trends over time. (2.17)

**5.13** Responses to DIRFs should be timely, detailed and demonstrate that a thorough investigation had taken place. (2.18)

**5.14** Wing staff should be familiar with the needs of prisoners who have a PEEP. (2.25)

### Legal rights

**5.15** Legal visits should be private. (2.34)

### Health services

**5.16** All custody staff should receive regular basic life support training as part of their mandatory training programme and AEDs should be located on all wings. (2.46)

**5.17** Prisoners should be able to complain about health services through a well-publicised, confidential system; responses should address the issues raised in full and prisoners should receive information on how to escalate their complaint if they are dissatisfied with the response. (2.47)

**5.18** An adequate range of PGDs should be available so minor ailments can be treated without a prescription. (2.58)

**5.19** All prisoners should have timely access to dental services. (2.62, repeated recommendation 2.81)

**5.20** The dental environment should comply with infection prevention standards and the damaged plasterwork in the treatment room should be repaired. (2.63)

### Catering

**5.21** Prisoners, especially those on longer sentences, should be able to cater for themselves. (2.74)

**5.22** The kitchen and surrounding areas should be kept clean. (2.75)

## Purchases

- 5.23** The prison should identify why black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners have poorer perceptions of the food and range of products in the shop and address them. (2.77)

## Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.24** Senior managers should ensure all prisoners regularly attend planned education activities, particularly English and maths lessons. (3.11)
- 5.25** Managers should analyse information in detail and use it to identify examples of best practice and areas for improvement and to agree measurable outcomes for subsequent actions. (3.12)
- 5.26** The education and training provision should be extended to include higher level learning. (3.18)
- 5.27** There should be a greater number and range of work-related and vocational courses. (3.19)
- 5.28** Teachers and instructors should make better use of the induction period to carry out a detailed initial assessment of prisoners' skills and prior educational attainment to better inform their planning of learning and work activities. (3.26)
- 5.29** Senior managers should take action to drive up achievement rates on English and maths courses. (3.34)

## Physical education and healthy living

- 5.30** Prisoners should be able to use an appropriate outdoor sports field. (3.43, repeated recommendation 3.46)

## Offender management and planning

- 5.31** Contact between offender supervisors and prisoners on their caseload should be consistent and ensure men are supported in achieving their targets. (4.13)
- 5.32** All offender supervisors should receive case management supervision. (4.14)
- 5.33** The lifer forum, information day and family visits should be resourced properly and take place regularly. (4.25)

## Reintegration planning

- 5.34** Catch 22 and departments within the prison should systematically share and record data about post-release outcomes. (4.28)
- 5.35** Services should be promoted more actively and resettlement planning should be improved. (4.29)
- 5.36** The visitors' centre should be developed to provide visitors with an appropriate service. (4.43, repeated recommendation 4.46)
- 5.37** Visitors should be admitted to the visits room punctually to allow a full two-hour visit. (4.44, repeated recommendation 4.44)

**5.38** All relevant prison staff should undertake safeguarding children training. (4.45)

**5.39** The £15 charge for family days should be abolished. (4.46)

## Examples of good practice

**5.40** The duty governor's regular visit to the wings gave prisoners the opportunity to meet with them directly and raise any concerns. (2.12)

**5.41** Weekly peer review sessions were effective in improving the quality of responses and encouraging better practice. (2.32)

**5.42** The analgesics review clinic helped reduce the inappropriate prescribing of analgesic medicines. (2.59)

**5.43** The credit union facility enabled men on indeterminate sentences to open an account when they otherwise would not have been able to unless they had a definite release date. (4.38)



# Section 6. Appendices

## Appendix I: Inspection team

Peter Clarke	Chief inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Bev Alden	Inspector
Colin Carroll	Inspector
Francesca Cooney	Inspector
Jeanette Hall	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Joe Simmonds	Researcher
Patricia Taflan	Researcher
Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Stephen Eley	Health services inspector
Paul Tarbuck	Health services inspector
Peter Gibbs	Pharmacist
Huw Jenkins	Care Quality Commission inspector
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Denise Olander	Ofsted inspector
Steve Oliver-Watts	Ofsted inspector
Paddy Doyle	Offender management inspector



## Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report

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

### Safety

#### **Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.**

*At the last inspection, in 2013, first days arrangements were reasonably effective. There was little violence and most prisoners reported feeling safe, although a significant number felt victimised by staff. Prisoners at risk of self-harm were generally well cared for. Security was well managed and effective. Fewer prisoners were segregated than at the last inspection, but the regime was limited. Adjudications were conducted fairly. Use of force was low. Substance use services had improved and were good. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

Prisoners should receive a full induction promptly after arrival. (1.12)

**Achieved**

Prisoners' perceptions of victimisation by staff should be investigated and acted on. (1.23)

**Achieved**

There should be a local safer custody policy. (1.24)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners' access to Listeners should be reviewed and any restrictions effectively addressed. At least one Listener should be located on each wing and ways to contact the Samaritans should be prominently advertised. (1.32)

**Partially achieved**

Night staff should receive refresher first aid training, and sufficient first aid trained staff should be on duty at night. (1.33)

**Achieved**

Events that could trigger a crisis should be recorded on ACCT documents, case reviews should be sufficiently multidisciplinary and observation entries should be detailed and meaningful. (1.34)

**Partially achieved**

All prisoners should be given the opportunity to explain fully their version of events relating to the charge, and all charges should be fully investigated. (1.58)

**Achieved**

Data on the use of force, such as ethnicity, location, reasons for use and staff involved, should be monitored for emerging patterns and trends, and appropriate action taken to address identified issues. (I.59)

**Not achieved**

Handcuffs should only be used when escorting prisoners to the segregation unit if an active risk assessment supports their use. (I.60)

**Achieved**

Care plans should be raised for all prisoners relocating to the segregation unit for their own protection, with an emphasis on reintegrating them to mainstream location. (I.68)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.38)

All prisoners in the segregation unit should receive at least one hour in the open air every day. (I.69)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.39)

The regime for longer-stay prisoners should be improved and should include purposeful activity and time out of cell. (I.70)

**Not achieved**

Mandatory drug testing facilities should be relocated and made fit for purpose. (I.79)

**Achieved**

Clinically indicated medications should be available to prisoners in line with national guidance. (I.80)

**Achieved**

## Respect

**Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.**

*At the last inspection, in 2013, the night sanitation system was degrading and most of the residential units were in poor condition. Staff-prisoner relationships were reasonable overall, but black and minority ethnic and disabled prisoners were especially negative about staff. We saw evidence of some good personal officer work. Diversity management was weak and facilities for diverse groups of prisoners were inadequate. Faith provision was good. Many responses to complaints did not deal with underlying issues. Health services were good and had improved since the last inspection. Standards of cleanliness in the kitchen were poor and prisoners were very critical of the food. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

Prisoners should be able to use toilet facilities 24 hours a day, without undue delay. (S43)

**Not achieved**

Diversity provision should be robustly managed in line with a clear strategy. The needs of prisoners with protected characteristics should be identified and met, and the negative perceptions of particular groups should be investigated and acted on. (S44)

**Not achieved**

## Recommendations

The old metal cages outside cell windows on A to D wings should be removed or replaced and kept in a good state of repair. (2.9)

**Not achieved**

The old toilet recesses and showers on A to D wings should be refurbished and well maintained. (2.10)

**Not achieved**

There should be sufficient showers for the population. (2.11)

**No longer relevant**

Residential units should be quiet enough in the evenings and at night to enable relaxation and sleep. Staff should consistently challenge prisoners who play loud music. (2.12)

**Achieved**

Personal officers should speak to prisoners regularly, provide support and help them to achieve their resettlement targets. (2.20)

**Achieved**

The diversity meeting should take place regularly and should consider all elements of diversity. (2.30)

**Not achieved**

All areas of diversity should be monitored and data should be examined by the diversity and race equality action team to identify patterns and trends; action should be taken to address evidence of imbalance. (2.31)

**Not achieved**

Staff should receive training in all aspects of diversity. (2.32)

**Not achieved**

Older prisoners and prisoners with disabilities should be identified on reception and there should be effective liaison between health care and the disability/older prisoners' liaison officer to ensure that appropriate levels of support are provided. (2.39)

**Achieved**

All foreign national prisoners should be offered a free telephone call each month to keep in touch with family abroad. (2.40)

**Not achieved**

Retired prisoners should not be charged for their television. (2.41)

**Not achieved**

Replies to complaints should be thorough and polite and should address the issues raised. (2.52)

**Partially achieved**

The legal services officers should be trained and allocated time to provide an appropriate service to all prisoners. (2.59)

**No longer relevant**

Prisoners should have access to health care and health promotion information in a range of languages. (2.67)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should have timely access to dental services. (2.81)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.62)

Mental health awareness training should be available to all prison staff. (2.84)

**Not achieved**

There should be regular, thorough management oversight of the kitchen to ensure that appropriate levels of cleanliness are maintained. (2.91)

**Not achieved**

The quality of food and balance of meals should be improved. (2.92)

**Achieved**

There should be effective catering and shop consultation arrangements that actively address the negative reports of prisoners. (2.93)

**Partially achieved**

Prisoners should be able to gain accredited qualifications in food preparation. (2.94)

**Not achieved**

The quality and quantity of breakfast items should be improved. (2.95)

**Not achieved**

Lunch should not be served before noon and the evening meal not before 5pm. (2.96)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners on E wing should be allowed to dine in association. (2.97)

**Not achieved**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection, in 2013, time out of cell was reasonable, though association was too often cancelled. Leadership and management of activities lacked focus. Prisoners undertook challenging and fulfilling work in very well equipped workshops. Good work skills were developed, but many prisoners could not obtain qualifications to reflect this. Although it was still limited, vocational training had increased. Education was not used to capacity and the quality of teaching was variable. The library had restricted opening times and limited book stock. PE provision was generally good. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

There should be a range of qualifications that accredit the specific vocational skills obtained by prisoners, including higher level qualifications for specialist work. (S45)

**Partially achieved**

### Recommendations

Prisoners should spend at least 10 hours a day out of their cells. (3.7)

**Achieved**

Association should not be cancelled. (3.8)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should not routinely be locked in their cells if they are not required for work. (3.9)

**Not achieved**

A greater range of commercial partnerships should be established to provide more work opportunities in the prison and employment opportunities on release. (3.15)

**Achieved**

Self-assessment of learning and skills and work should be undertaken across the prison, which evaluates all learning and skills activities and involves staff at all levels in developing actions for improvement. (3.16)

**Achieved**

A comprehensive strategy to improve attendance should be implemented to ensure that all education places are used. (3.17)

**Not achieved**

Challenging targets should be established for the development of essential skills such as English and mathematics, and the needs of those with limited English skills should be met. (3.27)

**Achieved**

The quality of teaching and learning should be improved by ensuring that tutors develop good teaching techniques. Learning should be monitored by the application of challenging criteria to teaching and learning observations. (3.28)

**Achieved**

Individual learning plans should be used effectively to plan, monitor and review the learning and skills developed by each learner as well as the achievement of units or qualifications. (3.29)

**Not achieved**

Greater support and access to resources should be offered to Open University and distance learning learners. (3.30)

**Achieved**

The progress that learners make towards the achievement of their qualifications should be monitored and addressed as necessary. (3.33)

**Achieved**

The difference in achievement by different groups of learners should be analysed and rectified. (3.34)

**Not achieved**

The opening times of the library should be changed to ensure that prisoners can use it more regularly. (3.37)

**Achieved**

The range of material available in the library should be updated to meet the needs and interests of prisoners. (3.38)

**Achieved**

Dangerous protrusions on the sports hall walls should be removed and safety padding put in place. (3.45)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should be able to use an appropriate outdoor sports field. (3.46)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 3.43)

## Resettlement

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

*At the last inspection, in 2013, strategic management of resettlement needed improvement and offending behaviour needs were not well identified. There was reasonable use of release on temporary licence (ROTL), but not for community work placements. The offender management unit was effective. There was not enough provision for lifers. Public protection work was good. The management of Category D prisoners lacked strategic direction. There was some good prisoner-led resettlement pathway support, but a lack of specialist provision or training. Some visitors had to wait for long periods before coming into the visits hall. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

### Recommendations

The resettlement policy should address the needs of all prisoners, including minority groups, and should be based on a needs assessment which uses OASys data to inform pathway provision. (4.6)

**Partially achieved**

Release on temporary licence should be used to facilitate community work placements for appropriate prisoners. (4.7)

**Partially achieved**

Home detention curfew boards should be timely. (4.8)

**Achieved**

Resettlement outcomes for prisoners following release should be monitored and incorporated into the resettlement strategy. (4.9)

**Not achieved**

All offender supervisors should receive case management supervision. (4.16)

**Partially achieved**

There should be clear arrangements to cover the absence of the public protection manager. (4.20)

**Not achieved**

The strategic purpose of F wing should be clarified and should inform the prison resettlement strategy. (4.23)

**No longer relevant**

Indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be able to spend their time in custody purposefully. They should be able to attend regular consultation meetings with a clear purpose and outcomes. (4.25)

**Partially achieved**

Specialist training should be provided for officers and orderlies dealing with resettlement needs. (4.28)

**Achieved**



A pre-release employability course should be introduced. (4.34)

**No longer relevant**

Prisoners should have access to specialist finance, benefit and debt advice and support. (4.39)

**Achieved**

Visitors should be admitted to the visits room punctually to allow a full two-hour visit. (4.44)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.44)

Prisoners should be able to use the toilet without terminating their visits. (4.45)

**Achieved**

The visitors' centre should be developed to provide visitors with an appropriate service. (4.46)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 4.43)

Prisoners should be able to undertake appropriate accredited offending behaviour programmes or they should be expeditiously moved to other establishments for this purpose. (4.54)

**Achieved**



## Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

### Population breakdown by:

Status	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced	0	495	95.9%
Recall	0	21	4.1%
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0
Remand	0	0	0
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

Sentence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	0	0	0
Less than 6 months	0	0	0
6 months to less than 12 months	0	0	0
12 months to less than 2 years	0	3	0.6%
2 years to less than 4 years	0	45	8.7%
4 years to less than 10 years	0	203	39.3%
10 years and over (not life)	0	103	20%
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	42	8.1%
Life	0	120	23.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	21	
Under 21 years	0	0%
21 years to 29 years	146	28.3%
30 years to 39 years	184	35.7%
40 years to 49 years	105	20.3%
50 years to 59 years	64	12.4%
60 years to 69 years	15	2.9%
70 plus years	2	0.4%
Please state maximum age here:	75	
<b>Total</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

Nationality	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
British	0	473	91.7%
Foreign nationals	0	43	8.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Security category</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Uncategorised unsentenced	0	0	0
Uncategorised sentenced	0	0	0
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	0	0
Category C	0	489	94.8%
Category D	0	27	5.2%
Other	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
White	0	304	58.9%
British	0	265	51.4%
Irish	0	7	1.4%
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	0	18	3.5%
Other white	0	14	2.7%
Mixed	0	31	6%
White and black Caribbean	0	16	3.1%
White and black African	0	8	1.6%
White and Asian	0	2	0.4%
Other mixed	0	5	1%
Asian or Asian British	0	42	8.1%
Indian	0	12	2.3%
Pakistani	0	14	2.7%
Bangladeshi	0	5	1%
Chinese	0	0	0%
Other Asian	0	11	2.1%
Black or black British	0	129	25%
Caribbean	0	74	14.3%
African	0	32	6.2%
Other black	0	23	4.5%
Other ethnic group	0	8	1.6%
Arab	0	1	0.2%
Other ethnic group	0	7	1.4%
Not stated	0	2	0.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Religion</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Baptist	0	0	0%
Church of England	0	98	19%
Roman Catholic	0	101	19.6%
Other Christian denominations	0	50	9.7%
Muslim	0	109	21.1%
Sikh	0	9	1.7%
Hindu	0	1	0.2%
Buddhist	0	21	4.1%
Jewish	0	2	0.4%
Other	0	14	2.7%
No religion	0	111	21.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

<b>Length of stay</b>	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>		<b>21 and over</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than 1 month	0	0%	39	7.6%
1 month to 3 months	0	0%	90	17.4%
3 months to 6 months	0	0%	90	17.4%
6 months to 1 year	0	0%	136	26.5%
1 year to 2 years	0	0%	92	17.8%
2 years to 4 years	0	0%	57	11%
4 years or more	0	0%	12	2.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Sentenced prisoners only**

	<b>18–20 yr olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0%
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	0	2	0.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.4%</b>



## 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<sup>8</sup>. 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 20 February 2017 the prisoner population at HMP Coldingley was 515. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 193 prisoners.

We received a total of 141 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 73%. Ten respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 42 questionnaires were not returned.

---

<sup>8</sup> 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
A	21
B	18
C	22
D	25
E	49
F	4
Segregation unit	2

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

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

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 differences<sup>9</sup> are indicated by shading. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading. If the difference is not statistically significant there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a statistically significant difference in prisoners' background details.

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP Coldingley in 2017 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other category C training prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 38 category C training prisons since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMP Coldingley in 2017 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Coldingley in 2013.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of white prisoners and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between those who are British and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners on E wing and those on A, B, C and D wings.

<sup>9</sup> A statistically significant difference between the two samples is one that is unlikely to have arisen by chance alone, and can therefore be assumed to represent a real difference between the two populations. Our significance level is set at 0.01 which means that there is only a 1% likelihood that the difference is due to chance.



## Survey summary

### Section I: About You

<b>Q1.1</b>	<b>What wing or houseblock are you currently living on?</b> See survey methodology.	
<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	Under 21 .....	0 (0%)
	21 - 29.....	37 (26%)
	30 - 39.....	45 (32%)
	40 - 49.....	27 (19%)
	50 - 59.....	25 (18%)
	60 - 69.....	7 (5%)
	70 and over .....	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	134 (95%)
	Yes - on recall.....	7 (5%)
	No - awaiting trial.....	0 (0%)
	No - awaiting sentence .....	0 (0%)
	No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>	
	Not sentenced .....	0 (0%)
	Less than 6 months .....	1 (1%)
	6 months to less than 1 year .....	1 (1%)
	1 year to less than 2 years .....	2 (1%)
	2 years to less than 4 years .....	9 (6%)
	4 years to less than 10 years .....	64 (46%)
	10 years or more.....	29 (21%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection) .....	8 (6%)
	Life.....	26 (19%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?</b>	
	Yes .....	16 (11%)
	No.....	125 (89%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes .....	141 (100%)
	No.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	139 (99%)
	No.....	1 (1%)

<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish) .....	70 (51%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 0 (0%)
	White - Irish.....	6 (4%)	Asian or Asian British - other..... 1 (1%)
	White - other.....	3 (2%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean 6 (4%)
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	19 (14%)	Mixed race - white and black African .. 4 (3%)
	Black or black British - African .....	7 (5%)	Mixed race - white and Asian..... 2 (1%)
	Black or black British - other .....	5 (4%)	Mixed race - other .....
	Asian or Asian British - Indian.....	4 (3%)	Arab..... 1 (1%)
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	2 (1%)	Other ethnic group .....
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	2 (1%)	3 (2%)
<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?</b>		
	Yes .....		7 (5%)
	No.....		131 (95%)
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>		
	None.....	43 (31%)	Hindu .....
	Church of England .....	32 (23%)	Jewish .....
	Catholic .....	21 (15%)	Muslim .....
	Protestant.....	1 (1%)	Sikh .....
	Other Christian denomination .....	5 (4%)	Other.....
	Buddhist .....	6 (4%)	3 (2%)
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>		
	Heterosexual/ Straight .....		139 (99%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		1 (1%)
	Bisexual.....		1 (1%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?</b>		
	Yes .....		22 (16%)
	No.....		118 (84%)
<b>Q1.13</b>	<b>Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?</b>		
	Yes .....		5 (4%)
	No.....		135 (96%)
<b>Q1.14</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>		
	Yes .....		61 (44%)
	No.....		79 (56%)
<b>Q1.15</b>	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>		
	Yes .....		73 (52%)
	No.....		67 (48%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>	
	Less than 2 hours .....	61 (43%)
	2 hours or longer .....	69 (49%)
	Don't remember .....	11 (8%)

<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i> .....	61 (44%)
	Yes .....	66 (48%)
	No.....	7 (5%)
	Don't remember .....	4 (3%)
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i> .....	61 (44%)
	Yes .....	4 (3%)
	No.....	71 (51%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	Yes .....	88 (63%)
	No.....	41 (29%)
	Don't remember .....	10 (7%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	Yes .....	109 (78%)
	No.....	29 (21%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	41 (29%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	65 (46%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	27 (19%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	2 (1%)
	Don't remember .....	2 (1%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i> .....	89 (64%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i> .....	20 (14%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i> .....	29 (21%)
	Don't remember .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	Yes .....	119 (85%)
	No.....	19 (14%)
	Don't remember.....	2 (1%)

### Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	101 (72%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	31 (22%)
	Don't remember .....	8 (6%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	Yes .....	126 (91%)
	No .....	8 (6%)
	Don't remember.....	4 (3%)

<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>	
	Very well.....	39 (28%)
	Well.....	79 (57%)
	Neither.....	18 (13%)
	Badly.....	3 (2%)
	Very badly.....	0 (0%)
	Don't remember.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Loss of property.....	28 (21%)
	Housing problems.....	12 (9%)
	Contacting employers.....	3 (2%)
	Contacting family.....	14 (10%)
	Childcare.....	3 (2%)
	Money worries.....	14 (10%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	12 (9%)
	Physical health.....	24 (18%)
	Mental health.....	24 (18%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners.....	3 (2%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	12 (9%)
	Other.....	6 (4%)
	Did not have any problems.....	54 (40%)
<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>	
	Yes.....	43 (31%)
	No.....	41 (30%)
	Did not have any problems.....	54 (39%)
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Tobacco.....	79 (57%)
	A shower.....	45 (33%)
	A free telephone call.....	52 (38%)
	Something to eat.....	60 (43%)
	PIN phone credit.....	48 (35%)
	Toiletries/ basic items.....	69 (50%)
	Did not receive anything.....	17 (12%)
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	Chaplain.....	65 (47%)
	Someone from health services.....	108 (79%)
	A Listener/Samaritans.....	41 (30%)
	Prison shop/ canteen.....	22 (16%)
	Did not have access to any of these.....	18 (13%)
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	What was going to happen to you.....	71 (52%)
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	43 (32%)
	How to make routine requests (applications).....	58 (43%)
	Your entitlement to visits.....	52 (38%)
	Health services.....	73 (54%)
	Chaplaincy.....	59 (43%)
	Not offered any information.....	35 (26%)
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	Yes.....	111 (80%)
	No.....	21 (15%)
	Don't remember.....	6 (4%)

<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	101 (73%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	29 (21%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	1 (1%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	96 (70%)
	<i>No</i> .....	28 (20%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	6 (4%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i> .....	15 (11%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	62 (45%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	45 (33%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	16 (12%)

#### Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to.....</b>						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	15 (11%)	54 (40%)	18 (13%)	13 (10%)	11 (8%)	24 (18%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	19 (16%)	37 (31%)	13 (11%)	13 (11%)	2 (2%)	35 (29%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	4 (4%)	9 (8%)	15 (14%)	6 (6%)	6 (6%)	69 (63%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters</i> .....					36 (26%)	
	<i>Yes</i> .....					44 (32%)	
	<i>No</i> .....					58 (42%)	
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i> .....					52 (39%)	
	<i>No</i> .....					9 (7%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....					74 (55%)	
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	96 (70%)	36 (26%)	5 (4%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	136 (99%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	99 (72%)	30 (22%)	9 (7%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	103 (76%)	29 (21%)	4 (3%)			
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	48 (36%)	58 (43%)	29 (21%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	96 (71%)	38 (28%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	28 (21%)	73 (54%)	34 (25%)			
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>						
	<i>Very good</i> .....					12 (9%)	
	<i>Good</i> .....					53 (39%)	
	<i>Neither</i> .....					47 (34%)	
	<i>Bad</i> .....					22 (16%)	
	<i>Very bad</i> .....					3 (2%)	

<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i> .....	2 (1%)
	Yes .....	62 (45%)
	No.....	73 (53%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	74 (54%)
	No.....	9 (7%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	54 (39%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	72 (53%)
	No.....	17 (12%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i> .....	48 (35%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	82 (60%)
	No.....	5 (4%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i> .....	49 (36%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i> .....	29 (21%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	41 (30%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	38 (28%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	20 (15%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>			
	Yes .....	121 (88%)		
	No .....	16 (12%)		
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	0 (0%)		
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>			
		Not made one		
		Yes		
		No		
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	2 (2%)	84 (65%)	43 (33%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	2 (2%)	70 (55%)	55 (43%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....	81 (60%)		
	No .....	19 (14%)		
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	35 (26%)		
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints. (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>			
		Not made one		
		Yes		
		No		
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	52 (39%)	27 (20%)	53 (40%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	52 (39%)	20 (15%)	61 (46%)

<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>	
	Yes .....	17 (13%)
	No.....	114 (87%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i> .....	26 (20%)
	Very easy.....	12 (9%)
	Easy .....	27 (21%)
	Neither .....	50 (38%)
	Difficult.....	12 (9%)
	Very difficult.....	3 (2%)

### Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i> .....	5 (4%)
	Yes .....	77 (58%)
	No .....	36 (27%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	15 (11%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i> .....	5 (4%)
	Yes .....	62 (47%)
	No.....	59 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	5 (4%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&amp;R)?</b>	
	Yes .....	6 (4%)
	No.....	131 (96%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i> .....	108 (82%)
	Very well.....	8 (6%)
	Well .....	3 (2%)
	Neither .....	6 (5%)
	Badly.....	4 (3%)
	Very badly .....	2 (2%)

### Section 7: Relationships with staff

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes .....	106 (78%)
	No.....	30 (22%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	Yes .....	91 (68%)
	No.....	43 (32%)
<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes .....	40 (29%)
	No.....	96 (71%)

<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	35 (26%)
	<i>Rarely</i> .....	32 (23%)
	<i>Some of the time</i> .....	45 (33%)
	<i>Most of the time</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>All of the time</i> .....	5 (4%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	26 (19%)
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	33 (25%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	56 (42%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	19 (14%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i> .....	26 (19%)
	<i>Very helpful</i> .....	33 (25%)
	<i>Helpful</i> .....	33 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	16 (12%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i> .....	11 (8%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i> .....	15 (11%)

### Section 8: Safety

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	54 (40%)
	<i>No</i> .....	81 (60%)
<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	26 (19%)
	<i>No</i> .....	108 (81%)
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....	81 (62%)
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	17 (13%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	18 (14%)
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	6 (5%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	17 (13%)
	<i>At work</i> .....	18 (14%)
	<i>During movement</i> .....	27 (21%)
	<i>At education</i> .....	11 (8%)
	<i>At meal times</i> .....	23 (18%)
	<i>At health services</i> .....	11 (8%)
	<i>Visits area</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	19 (15%)
	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	25 (19%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	16 (12%)
	<i>In your cell</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>At religious services</i> .....	4 (3%)
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	36 (27%)
	<i>No</i> .....	99 (73%)



<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> .....	15 (11%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	16 (12%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	29 (21%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	9 (7%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	8 (6%)
	<i>You have a disability</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	6 (4%)
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>	
	Yes .....	31 (23%)
	No .....	105 (77%)
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	15 (11%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	12 (9%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	5 (4%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>You have a disability</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	3 (2%)
<b>Q8.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	Not been victimised .....	83 (65%)
	Yes .....	23 (18%)
	No .....	22 (17%)

### Section 9: Health services

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	7 (5%)	11 (8%)	50 (37%)	16 (12%)	37 (27%)	14 (10%)
	The nurse	9 (7%)	28 (21%)	59 (43%)	12 (9%)	22 (16%)	6 (4%)
	The dentist	18 (13%)	4 (3%)	16 (12%)	13 (10%)	38 (28%)	46 (34%)

<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?</b>						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	15 (11%)	23 (17%)	46 (34%)	24 (18%)	20 (15%)	7 (5%)
	The nurse	11 (8%)	31 (23%)	48 (35%)	22 (16%)	17 (13%)	7 (5%)
	The dentist	37 (28%)	14 (11%)	35 (26%)	20 (15%)	16 (12%)	11 (8%)
<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>						
	<i>Not been</i> .....					8 (6%)	
	<i>Very good</i> .....					21 (16%)	
	<i>Good</i> .....					48 (36%)	
	<i>Neither</i> .....					25 (19%)	
	<i>Bad</i> .....					15 (11%)	
	<i>Very bad</i> .....					16 (12%)	
<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>						
	Yes.....					57 (42%)	
	No.....					79 (58%)	
<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?</b>						
	<i>Not taking medication</i> .....					79 (58%)	
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i> .....					41 (30%)	
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....					10 (7%)	
	<i>No</i> .....					6 (4%)	
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>						
	Yes.....					38 (29%)	
	No.....					95 (71%)	
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>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)?</b>						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....					95 (70%)	
	Yes.....					18 (13%)	
	No.....					22 (16%)	

### Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>		
	Yes.....		18 (13%)
	No.....		118 (87%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>		
	Yes.....		15 (11%)
	No.....		121 (89%)
<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>		
	<i>Very easy</i> .....		57 (42%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....		13 (10%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....		6 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....		3 (2%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....		3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....		53 (39%)

<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy.....	20 (15%)
	Easy.....	14 (10%)
	Neither.....	13 (10%)
	Difficult.....	7 (5%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know.....	74 (55%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes.....	9 (7%)
	No.....	125 (93%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes.....	5 (4%)
	No.....	130 (96%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem.....	110 (84%)
	Yes.....	14 (11%)
	No.....	7 (5%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....	121 (92%)
	Yes.....	8 (6%)
	No.....	3 (2%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help.....	112 (86%)
	Yes.....	16 (12%)
	No.....	2 (2%)

### Section II: Activities

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	4 (3%)	45 (33%)	52(38%)	18 (13%)	12 (9%)	5 (4%)
	Vocational or skills training	12 (9%)	22 (17%)	41 (31%)	21 (16%)	20 (15%)	17 (13%)
	Education (including basic skills)	9 (7%)	30 (23%)	63 (48%)	19 (14%)	6 (5%)	5(4%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	20 (15%)	13 (10%)	33 (25%)	22 (17%)	27 (21%)	16 (12%)
<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>						
	Not involved in any of these.....					17 (13%)	
	Prison job.....					98 (73%)	
	Vocational or skills training.....					28 (21%)	
	Education (including basic skills).....					41 (31%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes.....					24 (18%)	

<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	11 (9%)	38 (31%)	68 (55%)	6 (5%)
	Vocational or skills training	20 (19%)	50 (48%)	26 (25%)	8 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)	13 (12%)	57 (54%)	31 (29%)	5 (5%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	23 (21%)	40 (37%)	36 (33%)	9 (8%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				8 (6%)
	<i>Never</i> .....				13 (10%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....				29 (21%)
	<i>About once a week</i> .....				59 (44%)
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....				26 (19%)
<b>Q11.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>				
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....				18 (14%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....				74 (56%)
	<i>No</i> .....				41 (31%)
<b>Q11.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				11 (8%)
	<i>0</i> .....				29 (22%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....				13 (10%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....				78 (58%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....				3 (2%)
<b>Q11.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				16 (12%)
	<i>0</i> .....				23 (17%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....				36 (27%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....				38 (28%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....				22 (16%)
<b>Q11.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				4 (3%)
	<i>0</i> .....				4 (3%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....				6 (4%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....				29 (22%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....				91 (68%)
<b>Q11.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)</b>				
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....				4 (3%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....				4 (3%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....				18 (13%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....				25 (19%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....				33 (24%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....				46 (34%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....				5 (4%)

### Section 12: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	44 (33%)
	No .....	90 (67%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes .....	52 (39%)
	No .....	82 (61%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes .....	30 (22%)
	No .....	104 (78%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	11 (8%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	15 (11%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	34 (25%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	33 (25%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	21 (16%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	16 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	4 (3%)

### Section 13: Preparation for release

<b>Q13.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	0 (0%)
	Yes .....	113 (85%)
	No .....	20 (15%)
<b>Q13.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i> .....	20 (15%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	39 (29%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	35 (26%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	43 (32%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	34 (26%)
<b>Q13.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	120 (91%)
	No .....	12 (9%)
<b>Q13.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	0 (0%)
	Yes .....	101 (75%)
	No .....	33 (25%)
<b>Q13.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	33 (25%)
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	32 (24%)
	<i>Involved</i> .....	32 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	11 (8%)
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	10 (7%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	16 (12%)

<b>Q13.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	33	(25%)	
	<i>Nobody</i> .....	39	(29%)	
	<i>Offender supervisor</i> .....	51	(38%)	
	<i>Offender manager</i> .....	20	(15%)	
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i> .....	10	(8%)	
	<i>Staff from other departments</i> .....	14	(11%)	
<b>Q13.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	33	(25%)	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	77	(59%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	10	(8%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	11	(8%)	
<b>Q13.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	33	(25%)	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	27	(20%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	61	(46%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	11	(8%)	
<b>Q13.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>			
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	33	(25%)	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	27	(21%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	47	(36%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	23	(18%)	
<b>Q13.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs based custody plan?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....	11	(9%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	64	(50%)	
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	54	(42%)	
<b>Q13.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....	24	(18%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	108	(82%)	
<b>Q13.12</b>	<b>Do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you with the following on release? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
		<i>Do not need help</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
	Employment	25 (20%)	33 (26%)	68 (54%)
	Accommodation	27 (21%)	30 (23%)	71 (55%)
	Benefits	32 (25%)	28 (22%)	66 (52%)
	Finances	35 (28%)	21 (17%)	70 (56%)
	Education	31 (24%)	34 (27%)	62 (49%)
	Drugs and alcohol	39 (33%)	22 (18%)	58 (49%)
<b>Q13.13</b>	<b>Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here, that you think will make you less likely to offend in the future?</b>			
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	0	(0%)	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	81	(62%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	50	(38%)	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP Coldingley 2017

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

#### Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 2013
	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				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>141</b>	<b>6,575</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>167</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	99%
1.3	Are you on recall?	5%	9%	5%	7%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	1%	7%	1%	3%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	6%	8%	6%	12%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	11%	11%	11%	10%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	99%	98%	99%	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.)	43%	26%	43%	39%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	5%	5%	5%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	16%	13%	16%	20%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	1%	4%	1%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	16%	22%	16%	18%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	4%	6%	4%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	44%	39%	44%	28%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	52%	51%	52%	58%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	49%	46%	49%	47%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	86%	74%	86%	77%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	5%	8%	5%	8%
2.4	Was the van clean?	63%	60%	63%	68%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	78%	78%	78%	79%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	76%	73%	76%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	64%	60%	64%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	14%	13%	14%	29%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	85%	84%	85%	87%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	72%	52%	72%	63%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	91%	85%	91%	87%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	85%	75%	85%	65%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	60%	61%	60%	63%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	21%	19%	21%	19%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	9%	13%	9%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	2%	2%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	10%	19%	10%	19%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	2%	2%	2%	3%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	10%	13%	10%	12%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	9%	16%	9%	9%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	18%	13%	18%	10%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	18%	19%	18%	9%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	2%	6%	2%	1%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	9%	16%	9%	9%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	51%	35%	51%	38%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	57%	75%	57%	74%
3.6	A shower?	33%	28%	33%	29%
3.6	A free telephone call?	38%	41%	38%	48%
3.6	Something to eat?	44%	57%	44%	46%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	35%	51%	35%	29%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	50%	48%	50%	49%



## Key to tables

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 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				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	47%	53%	47%	48%
3.7	Someone from health services?	79%	69%	79%	74%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	30%	33%	30%	25%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	16%	25%	16%	22%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	52%	50%	52%	46%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	40%	32%	34%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	43%	43%	43%	43%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	38%	39%	38%	40%
3.8	Health services?	54%	52%	54%	49%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	43%	48%	43%	42%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	79%	80%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	90%	94%	88%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	74%	59%	74%	68%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	89%	84%	89%	82%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	51%	43%	51%	51%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	47%	44%	47%	51%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%	14%	12%	12%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	32%	39%	32%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	39%	41%	39%	39%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	70%	66%	70%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	99%	90%	99%	94%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	72%	68%	72%	62%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	76%	63%	76%	69%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	36%	33%	36%	38%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	71%	68%	71%	61%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	21%	23%	21%	15%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	47%	31%	47%	25%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	45%	48%	45%	32%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	54%	55%	54%	41%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	53%	52%	53%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	60%	58%	60%	56%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	58%	49%	58%	57%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 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				
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	88%	80%	88%	88%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	66%	55%	66%	67%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	56%	37%	56%	55%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	58%	60%	57%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	34%	33%	34%	32%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	25%	27%	25%	32%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	13%	20%	13%	16%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	30%	29%	30%	25%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme</b>					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	58%	48%	58%	50%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	47%	45%	47%	43%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	4%	9%	4%	3%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	48%	37%	48%	41%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	79%	78%	71%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	68%	73%	68%	69%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	29%	29%	25%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	12%	21%	12%	11%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	81%	62%	81%	81%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	61%	62%	61%	56%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	40%	39%	40%	28%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	19%	17%	19%	9%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	27%	28%	27%	24%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	12%	11%	9%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	12%	8%	12%	3%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	22%	16%	22%	11%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	6%	8%	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	4%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	5%	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	5%	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	7%	4%	7%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	6%	3%	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%	3%	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?	1%	2%	1%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	6%	3%	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	5%	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	5%	4%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	5%	5%	5%	4%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	23%	28%	23%	31%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	9%	11%	9%	13%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	4%	4%	4%	3%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	11%	12%	11%	11%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	4%	4%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	2%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	9%	4%	9%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	3%	4%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	4%	3%	4%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	1%	2%	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	3%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	2%	4%	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%	4%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%	2%	5%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	51%	40%	51%	26%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 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				
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	45%	28%	45%	34%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	64%	49%	64%	56%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	15%	13%	15%	10%
	For those who have been to the following services, do you think the quality of the health service from the following is good/very good:				
9.2	The doctor?	58%	48%	58%	51%
9.2	The nurse?	63%	56%	63%	60%
9.2	The dentist?	51%	43%	51%	45%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	55%	42%	55%	44%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	42%	50%	42%	39%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	89%	83%	89%	89%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	29%	35%	29%	25%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	45%	50%	45%	57%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	13%	26%	13%	32%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	11%	16%	11%	16%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	52%	44%	52%	39%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	25%	26%	25%	19%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	11%	7%	4%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	8%	4%	3%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	66%	60%	66%	83%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	62%	73%	88%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	89%	75%	89%	86%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Coldingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coldingley 2017	HMP Coldingley 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	71%	48%	71%	47%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	47%	42%	47%	38%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	71%	56%	71%	61%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	35%	23%	35%	26%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	73%	59%	73%	65%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	21%	16%	21%	15%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	31%	22%	31%	21%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	18%	11%	18%	16%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	91%	84%	91%	93%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	34%	43%	34%	47%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	81%	75%	81%	83%
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?	60%	57%	60%	58%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	88%	80%	88%	86%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	61%	57%	61%	60%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	79%	70%	79%	86%
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?	47%	49%	47%	57%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	63%	41%	63%	51%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	56%	46%	56%	34%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	61%	33%	61%	30%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	44%	54%	44%	24%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	68%	62%	68%	73%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	34%	16%	34%	17%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	33%	33%	33%	30%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	39%	43%	39%	41%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	22%	22%	24%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	37%	27%	37%	36%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP Coidingley 2017	Category C Training Prisons Comparator	HMP Coidingley 2017	HMP Coidingley 2013
	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				
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	85%	81%	85%	85%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	35%	36%	35%	34%
13.2	Contact by letter?	31%	33%	31%	42%
13.2	Contact by phone?	38%	26%	38%	27%
13.2	Contact by visit?	30%	31%	30%	30%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	91%	75%	91%	61%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	76%	61%	76%	84%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	63%	53%	63%	55%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	39%	46%	39%	48%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	51%	38%	51%	30%
13.6	Offender manager?	20%	27%	20%	30%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	10%	12%	10%	21%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	14%	15%	14%	15%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	79%	61%	79%	70%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	27%	20%	27%	24%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	28%	28%	28%	40%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	9%	6%	9%	6%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	18%	15%	18%	17%
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?	33%	33%	33%	29%
13.12	Accommodation?	30%	36%	30%	29%
13.12	Benefits?	30%	37%	30%	29%
13.12	Finances?	23%	27%	23%	23%
13.12	Education?	35%	34%	35%	40%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	27%	42%	27%	58%
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?	62%	54%	62%	53%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMP Coldingley 2017

**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	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse							
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details							
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference							
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>59</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>117</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	15%	9%			18%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	93%	100%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)			56%	41%	95%	32%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	2%	8%	7%	5%	0%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	36%	1%	27%	15%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	15%	17%	7%	17%	21%	15%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	2%	5%	0%	4%	0%	4%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	43%	46%	44%	44%	44%	44%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	81%	72%	81%	75%	86%	74%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	66%	81%	61%	46%	67%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	92%	91%	81%	93%	91%	91%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	85%	85%	63%	88%	82%	85%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	62%	59%	69%	59%	66%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	80%	79%	80%	79%	86%	77%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	80%	82%	88%	80%	73%	82%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	92%	96%	100%	94%	82%	97%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	47%	55%	56%	51%	46%	52%



## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	64%	75%	63%	71%	54%	73%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%	100%	98%	100%	98%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	37%	33%	44%	35%	34%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	39%	54%	37%	49%	28%	52%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	51%	37%	46%	24%	49%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	55%	54%	31%	57%	48%	56%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	60%	48%	37%	55%	66%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	68%	53%	56%	61%	80%	56%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	90%	88%	89%	86%	89%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	67%	54%	31%	64%	55%	61%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	54%	63%	37%	61%	45%	60%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	48%	44%	48%	40%	48%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	7%	3%	0%	5%	14%	3%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	79%	78%	56%	81%	76%	78%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	76%	64%	56%	70%	76%	66%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	14%	12%	12%	12%	14%	12%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	88%	76%	69%	82%	82%	80%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	39%	40%	56%	38%	38%	41%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	26%	14%	19%	20%	29%	18%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	30%	24%	31%	26%	29%	27%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	21%	21%	31%	20%	20%	22%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	12%	3%	19%	5%	20%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	9%	3%	12%	5%	14%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	3%	19%	2%	9%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	7%	3%	12%	3%	14%	3%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	29%	16%	25%	23%	34%	21%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	7%	12%	11%	14%	11%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	18%	0%	19%	8%	20%	7%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	10%	0%	12%	3%	20%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	1%	12%	3%	9%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	1%	12%	1%	9%	1%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	31%	56%	25%	48%	29%	49%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	60%	67%	50%	66%	48%	67%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	43%	42%	25%	44%	34%	44%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	27%	29%	25%	29%	29%	29%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	48%	55%	56%	51%	48%	53%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	73%	74%	63%	75%	66%	74%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	25%	17%	12%	22%	9%	23%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	34%	26%	19%	32%	29%	31%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	16%	18%	25%	17%	14%	18%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	62%	63%	56%	64%	71%	62%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	70%	55%	63%	60%	57%	61%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	42%	46%	44%	46%	38%	45%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	66%	70%	37%	72%	62%	69%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	37%	33%	25%	35%	38%	34%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	46%	34%	44%	38%	45%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	24%	31%	21%	21%	23%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Coldingley 2017

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

#### Key to tables

		Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>22</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>109</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	5%	13%	6%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	41%	44%	34%	45%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	0%	6%	4%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	23%	16%	9%	19%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			25%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	5%	4%	6%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	46%	43%	38%	45%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	77%	68%	78%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	68%	62%	50%	68%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	100%	90%	97%	90%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	95%	83%	87%	84%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	91%	55%	62%	60%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	91%	76%	87%	76%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	84%	68%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	95%	94%	97%	93%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	45%	52%	62%	48%

## 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?	86%	67%	85%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%	97%	99%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	48%	34%	39%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	57%	46%	44%	49%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	57%	44%	53%	43%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	66%	51%	68%	50%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	50%	62%	50%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	71%	58%	66%	59%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	91%	88%	94%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	62%	59%	72%	56%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	53%	58%	61%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	75%	42%	51%	46%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	9%	4%	0%	6%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	86%	76%	85%	76%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	76%	66%	70%	67%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	25%	10%	19%	10%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	70%	82%	81%	81%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	50%	38%	44%	39%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	30%	18%	22%	19%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	38%	25%	38%	23%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	20%	22%	22%	21%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	7%	9%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	0%	7%	3%	7%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	5%	4%	3%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	9%	5%	13%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	24%	1%	9%	3%

## 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?	34%	21%	19%	24%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	14%	11%	6%	12%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	5%	10%	6%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	5%	4%	0%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	5%	4%	0%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	5%	1%	3%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	9%	1%	3%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	48%	44%	60%	41%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	66%	63%	72%	62%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	71%	36%	60%	37%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	64%	22%	33%	27%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	57%	51%	56%	51%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	62%	75%	87%	69%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	24%	21%	19%	22%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	24%	32%	25%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	14%	19%	19%	18%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	76%	60%	68%	61%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	48%	63%	44%	66%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	24%	49%	41%	46%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	81%	65%	45%	75%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	38%	34%	32%	35%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	34%	40%	38%	39%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	14%	24%	15%	25%



## Prisoner survey responses HMP Coldingley 2017

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

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>E Wing</b>	<b>A, B, C &amp; D Wings</b>
	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		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>49</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	0%	7%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	0%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	9%	4%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	16%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	100%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	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.)	45%	42%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	17%	16%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	2%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	19%	13%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	0%	6%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	42%	47%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	53%	53%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	51%	48%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	84%	78%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	79%	75%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	74%	59%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	84%	87%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>E Wing</b>	<b>A, B, C &amp; D Wings</b>
	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		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	<b>69%</b>	<b>74%</b>
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>94%</b>	<b>90%</b>
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>90%</b>	<b>82%</b>
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	<b>55%</b>	<b>62%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	<b>18%</b>	<b>21%</b>
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	<b>12%</b>	<b>6%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	<b>6%</b>	<b>10%</b>
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	<b>16%</b>	<b>17%</b>
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	<b>10%</b>	<b>22%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	<b>0%</b>	<b>4%</b>
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	<b>6%</b>	<b>9%</b>
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	<b>47%</b>	<b>64%</b>
3.6	A shower?	<b>22%</b>	<b>40%</b>
3.6	A free telephone call?	<b>29%</b>	<b>43%</b>
3.6	Something to eat?	<b>35%</b>	<b>50%</b>
3.6	PIN phone credit?	<b>33%</b>	<b>35%</b>
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	<b>43%</b>	<b>53%</b>

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	A, B, C & D Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	43%	51%
3.7	Someone from health services?	75%	81%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	35%	28%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	10%	19%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	46%	55%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	27%	34%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	44%	43%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	35%	40%
3.8	Health services?	54%	54%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	38%	48%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	82%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	94%	95%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	88%	89%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	58%	48%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	50%	47%
4.1	Get bail information?	13%	12%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	29%	31%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	43%	38%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	84%	61%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	100%	98%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	78%	69%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	85%	69%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	38%	35%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	87%	61%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	31%	15%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	39%	52%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	49%	44%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	62%	49%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	62%	48%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	69%	57%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	67%	53%



**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>E Wing</b>	<b>A, B, C &amp; D Wings</b>
	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		
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	<b>88%</b>	<b>89%</b>
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	66%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	9%	15%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	33%	28%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	<b>78%</b>	49%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	53%	44%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	5%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	<b>92%</b>	71%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	<b>79%</b>	63%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	29%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	17%	9%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	85%	80%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>E Wing</b>	<b>A, B, C &amp; D Wings</b>
	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		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	31%	42%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	10%	21%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	22%	27%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	10%	10%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	8%	15%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	15%	25%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	2%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	0%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	9%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	4%	5%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	A, B, C & D Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	21%	25%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	15%	6%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	5%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	0%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	6%	14%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	4%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	0%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	2%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	0%	4%
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	48%	43%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	67%	61%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	13%	17%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	49%	37%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	21%	31%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	12%	13%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	15%	9%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	54%	49%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	30%	23%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	6%	8%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	4%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	E Wing	A, B, C & D Wings
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	79%	67%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	51%	46%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	81%	65%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	40%	34%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	84%	70%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	22%	20%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	31%	32%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	21%	18%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	62%	64%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	60%	55%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	74%	55%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	55%	36%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	63%	74%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	33%	35%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	31%	33%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	46%	34%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	22%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	43%	35%
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	91%	92%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	7%	10%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	22%	18%