

Report on an unannounced inspection of

HMP Bure

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

27 March–7 April 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 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

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

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: 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	47
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	55
Section 6. Appendices	59
Appendix I: Inspection team	59
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	61
Appendix III: Prison population profile	67
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	71

Glossary of terms

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

Introduction

Situated on the former RAF Coltishall base in Norfolk and opened in 2009, HMP Bure is a category C training prison and a national resource for convicted sex offenders. Following the addition of some new accommodation in 2013, the prison now holds just under 650 prisoners.

This is our third report on Bure. At previous inspections we have always reported positive findings and this visit was no exception. Overall, the prison continues to ensure some very good outcomes, although we did make criticisms regarding the prison's approach to offender risk management and resettlement.

Bure remained an overwhelmingly safe and respectful prison. New arrivals were properly inducted and levels of violence were low. Few prisoners self-harmed but arrangements to support those with complex and ongoing needs were weak. The prison needed to guard against complacency concerning this issue. Work in adult safeguarding similarly required improvement. Security was applied proportionately and segregation and force were used sparingly.

Living conditions were decent and respectful and staff-prisoner relationships were generally good, although they were undermined by some inconsistency in the application of basic rules. The promotion of equality was reasonable and prisoners were positive about their experience of health care.

Virtually all prisoners had good time out of cell and there was sufficient purposeful activity for all. Some work was mundane and vocational training opportunities were limited, but most outcomes in work, learning and skills were positive with most prisoners making progress. Our colleagues in Ofsted assessed the overall effectiveness of provision at Bure to be 'good'.

The prison was weakest in its approaches to resettlement. As a national resource for sex offenders, the prison had no resettlement function and, consequently, very limited resources to support reintegration and resettlement. That said, too few prisoners were being transferred to their home area prior to discharge and about 100 prisoners had, in fact, been released from the prison in the preceding six months. Bure held many high-risk prisoners and yet offender management was not good enough and far too variable. We saw some good work but too few men had an up-to-date offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, and contact with offender supervisors for many was intermittent and reactive. Public protection arrangements were generally sound but more attention needed to be paid to comprehensive risk management planning prior to release.

Bure was a safe and decent prison, but weaknesses in offender management and resettlement – requirements which should be at the very heart of the prison's purpose – undermined its success and overall effectiveness. We have made a number of recommendations which we believe will assist further improvement.

Peter Clarke CVO OBE QPM
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

May 2017

Fact page

Task of the establishment

HMP Bure is a category C prison. It is a national resource for the treatment of sex offenders.

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

Public

Region/Department

East of England

Number held

643

Certified normal accommodation

604

Operational capacity

643

Date of last full inspection

29th April – 10th May 2013

Brief history

HMP Bure is built on part of the former RAF Coltishall site, seven miles north of Norwich. Constructed in 2009, the prison is a mix of new buildings and converted RAF accommodation and Service buildings. A new unit, housing 120 prisoners, was constructed in September 2013.

Short description of residential units

There are seven residential units, comprising mostly single cells. Residential units 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 each have four double cells, and residential unit 7 has 19 double cells. Residential units 1–6 have communal showers, and residential unit 7 has integral showers in every cell. Residential unit 6 has 10 cells assigned for new arrivals during their induction period, and other cells on the ground floor are allocated to prisoners with identified medical needs

Name of governor/director

Sue Doolan

Escort contractor

Serco

Health service provider

Virgin Care Services Limited

Learning and skills providers

People Plus

Independent Monitoring Board chair

Maggie Dixon

About this inspection and report

- A1 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons is an independent, statutory organisation which reports on the treatment and conditions of those detained in prisons, young offender institutions, secure training centres, immigration detention facilities, police and court custody and military detention.
- A2 All inspections carried out by HM Inspectorate of Prisons contribute to the UK's response to its international obligations under the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OPCAT). OPCAT requires that all places of detention are visited regularly by independent bodies – known as the National Preventive Mechanism (NPM) – which monitor the treatment of and conditions for detainees. HM Inspectorate of Prisons is one of several bodies making up the NPM in the UK.
- A3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports carry a summary of the conditions and treatment of prisoners, based on the four tests of a healthy prison that were first introduced in this inspectorate's thematic review *Suicide is everyone's concern*, published in 1999. The tests are:
- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Safety | prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely |
| Respect | prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity |
| Purposeful activity | prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them |
| Resettlement | prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and effectively helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. |
- A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS).
- **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 and examples of good practice arising from the inspection. Appendix II lists the recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved.
- A10 Details of the inspection team and the prison population profile can be found in Appendices I and IV respectively.
- A11 Findings from the survey of prisoners and a detailed description of the survey methodology can be found in Appendix V of this report. Please note that we only refer to comparisons with other comparable establishments or previous inspections when these are statistically significant.¹

¹ The significance level is set at 0.01, which means that there is only a 1% chance that the difference in results is due to chance.

Summary

Safety

S1 *Prisoners experienced very good reception processes, followed by robust first night support and a comprehensive induction. The prison remained a very safe place to live but more attention needed to be given to the low-level bullying and victimisation. Levels of self-harm had reduced and were now lower than in prisons with a similar function but the care provided to a very small number of prisoners needed improvement. Strip-searching of all prisoners in reception was excessive but other elements of security were proportionate. Levels of use of force were low and drug availability was very low. Segregation conditions were very good. Substance misuse treatment was reasonably good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Bure were good against this healthy prison test. We made 13 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved and eight had not been achieved.*

S3 Reception processes were mostly excellent. Interviews were conducted in private, a Listener (a prisoner trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) provided useful advice, and staff were friendly and efficient throughout. A range of useful information booklets had been introduced, to provide practical advice about settling into the establishment.

S4 First night cells were extremely clean and well prepared. Useful information was displayed in each cell, and helpful orderlies were on hand to support new arrivals. Prisoners received a comprehensive induction, starting on the next working day after arrival.

S5 Levels of violence were very low, and similar to those at other prisons with the same function. Violent incidents were not very serious in nature but, in our survey, more prisoners than at other category C prisons said that they had experienced victimisation from other prisoners. The violence reduction strategy was comprehensive but poorly applied, with too little attention given to supporting the small number of victims and challenging the perpetrators.

S6 There had been no self-inflicted deaths at the prison since its opening in 2009. The number of self-harm incidents was low, had decreased since the previous inspection and was much lower than we see at prisons with the same function. However, the management of the small number of prisoners with complex needs who required significant ongoing support was not sufficiently well developed or innovative. Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm was poor for this group. Some risk assessments were flawed; care maps did not identify clear goals to address the issues; and support for some ended too soon.

S7 The only constant supervision cell available was located inappropriately on the segregation unit. There was a large group of enthusiastic and well-supported Listeners. However, the lack of dedicated Listener suites remained a gap.

S8 Adult safeguarding procedures were weak. Links with the local authority adult safeguarding board had developed but there was a lack of a coherent approach, too little staff training, and no formal policy or referral process.

- S9 Physical security arrangements were mostly proportionate but the strip-searching of all prisoners going through reception was excessive. There was an appropriate focus on prisoner associations in relation to their offence-related activity and the risk of staff conditioning.
- S10 All evidence indicated little availability of illegal drugs, and in our survey fewer prisoners than at other category C prisons said that they had developed a problem with drugs or prescribed medications while at the establishment. Mandatory drug testing processes were sound and there were very few positive test results.
- S11 In our survey, less than half of prisoners said that the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme was fair. Too few said that it encouraged them to improve their behaviour, and the range of incentives for enhanced prisoners was fairly limited. Some improvements in processes had been achieved; for example, those on the basic level were promoted at the earliest opportunity and there was good strategic management oversight of the scheme.
- S12 The number of adjudications had doubled since the previous inspection and was high but a small number of prisoners accounted for a large proportion of them. Monitoring and managerial oversight of the adjudications process was good.
- S13 Force was rarely used, and in our survey far fewer prisoners than at similar prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had been physically restrained in the previous six months. Analysis and oversight of the use of force were too limited as individual incidents were not reviewed and the committee met too infrequently to provide adequate oversight. Special accommodation had been used three times in the previous six months, and we were satisfied that these uses had been justifiable. Recording was comprehensive and all prisoners were removed from the special accommodation at the earliest opportunity.
- S14 Levels of segregation were low and the average length of stay was fairly short. The segregation unit was extremely clean and cells were in good working order. Monitoring and managerial oversight of the segregation unit was effective.
- S15 There was a clear drug strategy, and Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) worked well in partnership with other stakeholders to deliver a number of priorities. A wide range of psychosocial interventions was delivered, including individual and group-based sessions. Peer support was utilised effectively in a number of recovery-focused activities. There was little demand for clinical management of substance misuse and the arrangements in place were sound.

Respect

- S16** *The quality of accommodation and the general environment were impressive. Prisoners had good access to most basic items. Staff–prisoner relationships were generally strong and consultation with prisoners was excellent. Equality and diversity work was reasonably good and faith provision was sound. Health services provision was very good. The food provided was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***
- S17** *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Bure were good against this healthy prison test. We made 22 recommendations in the area of respect.² At this follow-up inspection we found that 17 of the recommendations had been achieved, and five had not been achieved.*
- S18** Living conditions were decent and respectful. Units were bright, well decorated and clean. The gardens were well maintained and attractive.
- S19** Cells were tidy, furniture was in good repair and toilet areas were screened. The double cells on residential unit 7 were cramped and there were some difficulties across the site with regulating cell temperatures. Prisoners could access essential items easily, including toiletries and cleaning materials, but there were shortages in some prison clothing. Access to showers, telephones and recreational activities was good.
- S20** The applications system was reasonable and in our survey more prisoners than in other category C prisons said that applications were dealt with fairly and quickly. The system for accessing stored property was too slow.
- S21** Staff–prisoner relationships were generally good. In our survey, just over three-quarters said that most staff treated them respectfully. We saw some excellent interactions with prisoners but sometimes there was insufficient engagement during association and other periods of unlock. There were some inconsistencies in applying basic rules, which led to frustration for the prisoners. Consultation with prisoners had improved, and was excellent.
- S22** Equality and diversity provision was reasonable. The equalities action team meeting was well attended and provided adequate oversight and regular monitoring of progress. Encouragingly, there were two equality officers in post but cross-deployment reduced the amount of time available for this work. Discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs) were not always freely available on the residential units. Investigations were thorough but timeliness was poor in too many cases.
- S23** In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners' perceptions raised no significant concerns. Black and minority ethnic peer representatives were in post but were not well trained or supported in the role.
- S24** Since the previous inspection, residential unit 7 had been added. This accommodated some prisoners with disabilities or mobility issues, and provided additional support, such as in-cell showers and two adapted cells. Older prisoners and those with disabilities could access a well-developed programme of recreational activities, including a creative range of sessions in the gym. Care and support for transgender prisoners was good.

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

- S25 Provision for all faiths was good. The chaplaincy was effectively integrated into the rest of the prison and provided a wide range of support to prisoners.
- S26 Complaint forms were not always freely available on the units. The quality of complaint responses that we sampled was too variable but the monitoring of themes and trends was effective and had led to some positive outcomes.
- S27 Legal services provision had deteriorated but legal visits were held in private and it was relatively easy to get an appointment.
- S28 Competent health care practitioners delivered effective clinical care. Prisoners spoke positively about the support they received, and rated all aspects of health services provision in our survey more positively than those at other category C prisons. Clinical governance arrangements were effective and there were good relationships across the prison. A range of appropriate primary care services were provided and waiting lists for clinics were short. Overall, the management of medicines was adequate and appropriate use was made of in-possession arrangements, but supervision of administration by officers on residential unit 7 was inadequate. Dentistry services were very good, with short waiting times. Mental health services were reasonably good, with an appropriate range of interventions provided. Social care provision was appropriate to meet needs.
- S29 In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection said that the food provided was good, and the food we saw and sampled was healthy and reasonably good. Due to the lack of facilities on most units, most prisoners had to eat in their cell. Consultation about the range of goods available from the prison shop had improved.

Purposeful activity

S30 *Virtually all prisoners had a good amount of time out of their cell each day. The leadership and management of learning and skills had improved in some important areas. There were sufficient activity places but vocational training opportunities were too limited. Some work was mundane and too many of the large number of residential unit workers were not fully occupied in their job. Attendance and punctuality were very good. Retention and achievement rates were high. Both the library and PE provision were well used. **Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.***

S31 *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Bure were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made 10 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and two were no longer relevant.*

S32 Almost all prisoners had a good amount of time out of their cell each day, despite some regime restrictions. Only the very few prisoners who were on the basic level of the IEP scheme and not involved in purposeful activity were locked up during the working day. Prisoners could have association each day but the amount of time allocated to exercise in the open air was too limited.

S33 Effective improvements had been made to teaching, learning and assessment through good professional staff development and robust performance management. Very good learner representation was used effectively to promote and improve the learning and skills activities. There were sufficient purposeful activity places to occupy most prisoners full time and for

the remainder to have regular part-time activities. Some work was mundane and some of the large number of prisoners working on the residential units were not fully occupied. The workshops were mainly purposeful and busy. There was not enough vocational training, and opportunities to progress beyond level 1 qualifications were limited.

- S34 The quality of teaching and learning had improved and was good. Initial assessment results were used well to plan learning in mathematics, English, and information and communications technology. There were high levels of engagement in education, with learners working in a stimulating environment. However, written feedback was not sufficiently detailed to help learners to understand what they needed to do to improve.
- S35 Attendance and punctuality at education, work and vocational training workshops were good, although attendance at other regime appointments disrupted some sessions. Prisoners demonstrated high levels of respect and good behaviour. However, not all work-related skills were sufficiently accredited. Retention rates on courses, and prisoners' achievement of learning and skills qualifications were high. Most prisoners made good progress but a small number of more able learners were not sufficiently challenged in some lessons.
- S36 The library was well used, well managed and had an appropriate range of materials. There was a good focus on developing reading skills through various initiatives.
- S37 PE provision was good and the gym was well used by a large number of prisoners. There was effective partnership working to provide healthy living courses.

Resettlement

S38 *Too many prisoners did not have an assessment of their risk and needs, or a sentence plan to inform their transfer to the establishment. We saw some good work with prisoners at key sentence events. However, the quality of offender management in general was far too variable and usually reactive, with some prisoners receiving little ongoing support or offence-focused work. Basic public protection measures were sound but risk management planning for the release of prisoners was too limited. Too little was done to ensure that all resettlement needs were identified and addressed well enough ahead of release. Categorisation reviews were timely but it was often difficult to move prisoners on. Not enough was done to promote positive family ties and other support networks. Accredited offending behaviour programmes were well managed. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S39 *At the last inspection in 2013 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Bure were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 11 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that seven of the recommendations had been achieved and four had not been achieved.*

- S40 There was an up-to-date reducing reoffending policy, based on a comprehensive needs analysis, but the action plan needed updating to reflect current arrangements.
- S41 Far too many prisoners did not have an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, which meant that they had been transferred to the establishment without a needs assessment or having been engaged in a meaningful sentence plan. There were some examples of high-quality offender management but overall it was far too variable, and in some cases did not manage the risk of harm effectively. Under half of those responding to our survey said that their offender supervisor was helping them to achieve their targets. We found that ongoing contact was not regular or frequent enough, and was often reactive, even

- in some of the higher risk of harm cases. However, some offender supervisors, especially probation officers, had done some good work with prisoners in response to particular events, such as release or parole hearings. Supervision and monitoring of the work of offender supervisors were inadequate, and hampered by inconsistent recording of their work with prisoners.
- S42 Public protection arrangements were generally sound, with a proportionate approach to monitoring mail and telephone calls. Attendance at the monthly interdepartmental risk management meeting was good. Inadequate attention was given to risk management planning for release, including confirmation of the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) level. Contributions to MAPPA level 2 and 3 meetings had improved.
- S43 Categorisation reviews were mostly completed on time. Progressive transfers were arranged where possible but too many were delayed owing to the restrictive criteria for acceptance used by some other prisons.
- S44 Many of the indeterminate-sentenced prisoners were significantly beyond their sentence tariff date. Some felt ignored. However, work had recently started to identify their specific needs and concerns. A national initiative had been introduced to work with some of the more difficult-to-progress prisoners who were serving an indeterminate sentence for public protection.
- S45 There were difficulties in transferring prisoners back to a resettlement prison near to their release area. As a result, more than 100 prisoners had been released from Bure in the previous six months.
- S46 The establishment was not identified as a resettlement prison so did not have on-site community rehabilitation company provision for helping prisoners with education, training and employment; accommodation; and finance, benefit and debt problems. The strategic oversight of resettlement meeting had lapsed and was not involved in developing resettlement plans for prisoners. Neither the community offender managers nor the offender supervisors were sufficiently proactive in ensuring that all resettlement needs were met. Some limited resettlement advice was available for the small number of prisoners who volunteered to work with the Shaw Trust.
- S47 Too many prisoners were released without identified accommodation. Help with financial problems and the opening of bank accounts was very limited.
- S48 Futures Advice, Skills and Employment provided good information, advice and guidance about education, training and employment linked to realistic future opportunities but there was limited use of the virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities).
- S49 Prisoners' health needs were checked before discharge and they were offered appropriate support. For those with complex care needs, there was good joint working between the health care worker and the offender management unit, to ensure appropriate onward care and support. The mental health team linked with local community teams to support discharge planning, including for those prisoners with severe and enduring mental health needs. A 'through-the-gate' support service was available from the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) team and good substance misuse aftercare arrangements were available following release.
- S50 The Ormiston Trust ran a friendly visitors centre but their role was limited, with no involvement in developing work aimed at family engagement. Some provision in the visits hall had improved but some visitors experienced delays in starting their visit. Other than

monthly children's visits, wider provision to help prisoners to build positive family ties and other support networks was underdeveloped.

- S51 The introduction of the new suite of accredited programmes to address sexual offending was being managed well and there were adequate places to meet demand. Some valuable individual work was being done by psychologists with prisoners who were not suitable for accredited programmes. However, the lack of forensic psychology resources delayed the preparation of too many post-programme risk assessments (known as 'structured assessment of risk and need' (SARN) reports), which hindered progression for some prisoners.

Main concerns and recommendations

- S52 Concern: The quality of ACCT case management for the small number of prisoners with complex needs who required significant ongoing support was poor in a number of important aspects. Some risk assessments were flawed; care maps did not identify clear goals to address the issues; and support for some ended too soon.

Recommendation: The quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management should be improved, including better and more accurate risk assessments, comprehensive care maps with clear goals, and support that continues until evidence shows that the prisoner's personal crisis has been fully managed and reduced.

- S53 Concern: The quality of offender management was too variable and mainly reactive, despite the population being high risk. Prisoners were often not engaged with their own risk management and were unsure about how to progress.

Recommendation: The quality of offender management should be improved, to ensure a proactive approach to risk management and the delivery of sentence plan targets. Offender supervisor contact, particularly with the higher-risk prisoners, should be regular and meaningful.

- S54 Concern: There was too little focus on addressing resettlement needs well enough ahead of release. As a result, some prisoners were anxious about their imminent release and we were concerned that not all necessary steps had been taken to reduce the risk of harm or reoffending.

Recommendation: All prisoners should have their resettlement needs addressed well in advance of their release. This should include a robust risk management plan which is developed in partnership with the community-based offender manager and, where relevant, multi-agency public protection meetings.

Section 1. Safety

Courts, escorts and transfers

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.1 Owing to its rural location and the fact that it was a national resource, many prisoners had long journeys to the establishment, often stopping overnight on the way. The new arrivals we observed had spent three and a half hours in the escort vehicle. Some were older and one had been released from hospital the week before, and this was their second day of travelling. Although escort staff had recorded that a comfort break had been offered, none of the prisoners recalled this and we were not confident that it had happened.
- 1.2 Escort vehicles were clean and prisoners had been given food and drink during the journey but they had been given little notice of their transfer to the prison.

Recommendation

- 1.3 **Prisoners on escort vehicles should be offered toilet breaks during long journeys.**

Early days in custody

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.4 On average, the establishment received six or seven prisoners each week, so the reception area was not busy. Reception processes were mostly excellent. Holding rooms were clean.
- 1.5 New arrivals were given a hot drink while a Listener (a prisoner trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners) checked on their welfare and gave useful advice about prison life. In our survey, only half of the new prisoners said that they had been told what would happen to them on arrival but the prison had recently introduced some useful information booklets to address this problem.
- 1.6 All new prisoners underwent a strip-search, which was often unnecessary. Those we saw arriving had already been strip-searched on departure from their sending prison, and then strip-searched twice more when arriving at and leaving a high security prison where they had stopped overnight. There was no intelligence to justify a further strip-search on arrival at the establishment.
- 1.7 Reception staff were friendly and efficient. Prisoners saw a nurse in private and then staff processed their property. An officer interviewed each new arrival privately,

explaining what would happen, checking for thoughts of self-harm, asking about family contact and recording protected characteristics. A new cell sharing risk assessment was completed for every prisoner.

- 1.8 First night cells had been allocated the day before, and were extremely clean and well prepared. Useful early days information was displayed in each cell. The orderlies brought new arrivals a hot meal but, because of the relatively late arrival time on some days, there was not always time for them to shower on the unit before lock-up.
- 1.9 In our survey, prisoners indicated that they had had problems making telephone calls on arrival. Until recently, all pre-existing approved telephone numbers had had to be vetted again by Bure staff, causing long delays. However, this requirement had been removed recently and we saw new arrivals making contact with family members or friends on their first night.
- 1.10 Prisoners received a comprehensive induction, starting on the next working day after arrival. Depending on the number of new arrivals, this took the form of a slide presentation in the induction room or a one-to-one talk in-cell with an orderly. Prisoners then had visits from a variety of prisoner representatives, a Listener and a chaplain. They received most of their information from peer workers, which was helpful but also had the potential for abuse. Induction orderlies received no formal training or regular supervision to prevent this.
- 1.11 Depending on the number of new arrivals placing demand on the 10 first night cells, most prisoners spent a few days on the induction landing before relocating to another unit. Induction was well organised and continued after relocation.
- 1.12 Prisoners with mobility problems or disabilities were identified in reception and immediately located on residential unit 7. Their induction was less formal than on other units, but induction orderlies still visited them to complete paperwork and explain prison life.

Recommendation

- 1.13 **Induction orderlies should receive training and regular supervision.**

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.

- 1.14 Levels of violence were low, and similar to levels at prisons with the same function. All incidents were logged, and records demonstrated that most were very low level, mainly comprising threatening behaviour or the use of insulting comments between prisoners. Records showed that, in the previous six months, there had been, on average, fewer than two assaults or fights each month.
- 1.15 Despite the low levels of violence, our survey showed that far more prisoners than at prisons with a similar function felt unsafe, both at the time of the inspection and also at

any time, and that they had been victimised by other prisoners. There had been no local survey to investigate feelings of safety since 2015.

- 1.16** A well-attended bimonthly violence reduction meeting reviewed a wide range of data to try to identify hotspots or trends, but with so few incidents there was little evidence of adverse patterns of behaviour. The meeting usefully included a large team of violence reduction orderlies. They took part in the induction process and were able to promote the prison's zero-tolerance approach to violence reduction, providing early reassurance to newly arrived prisoners.
- 1.17** There was an excellent and comprehensive violence reduction strategy but procedures to challenge perpetrators of victimisation or bullying were poor, amounting to a single line in electronic case notes indicating that a prisoner was a 'perpetrator' and that an investigation had taken place. In the notes we reviewed, there was no information about what had happened or how prisoners were to be managed. Similarly, victim support amounted to 'victim' being entered into the case notes, and we were unable to find any support plans.

Recommendation

- 1.18** **Outcomes of investigations into incidents of bullying or violence should be clearly recorded and there should be sufficient challenge and management of perpetrators, and support for victims.**

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.

- 1.19** There had been no self-inflicted deaths at the prison since its opening in 2009. There had been 42 self-harm incidents in the previous six months, which was far lower than we see at prisons with the same function and than at the time of the previous inspection.
- 1.20** Assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management was reasonable for most prisoners. However, for a small number of prisoners with complex needs and requiring significant ongoing support, it was poor. These prisoners were subject to repeated periods of ACCT monitoring, and one had made a serious attempt to take his own life two weeks before the inspection. The management of these prisoners was not sufficiently well developed or innovative. Although there was some monthly data analysis, the safer custody team had not identified the particular difficulties faced by the local population and did not have their own action plan to improve outcomes for this small but troubled group of prisoners (see main recommendation S52).
- 1.21** Although ACCT case reviews were usually multidisciplinary and there was good attendance by mental health staff, some risk assessments were flawed, even after prisoners gave clear signs of imminent risk, such as making ligatures. Care maps did not address all of the prisoner's issues, and in some cases were left blank if the prisoner refused to engage. Support for some individuals was ended too soon, only for the ACCT document to be quickly reopened (see main recommendation S52).

- 1.22** The only constant supervision cell available was located on the segregation unit. Although the unit was quiet during the inspection, it was sometimes used to segregate prisoners from nearby HMP Norwich. We were not confident that removing a man from the mainstream residential units and placing him on a segregation unit was the best way of supporting him during periods of personal crisis.
- 1.23** There was a large group of enthusiastic and well-supported Listeners, who provided an impressive service. However, there were no dedicated Listeners suites, so callouts had to take place in cells. The prison had two 'time out' rooms but they were not used for this purpose.

Recommendations

- 1.24** The constant supervision cell should not be located on the segregation unit.
- 1.25** Listeners should have dedicated rooms to accommodate callouts.

Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.26** Adult safeguarding procedures were weak, and inadequate to address the potential risks associated with the prison population.
- 1.27** A local safeguarding policy had been drafted but not yet published to staff. There was no referrals process to enable prisoners or staff to raise concerns, and none of the residential unit officers had received training about identifying and raising concerns.
- 1.28** Although there were no structured or embedded procedures, some good work had been done informally. There was a recent example of a prisoner with vascular dementia being identified and relocated to the older prisoners unit at HMP Norwich for his own safety. Links with the local safeguarding adults board had also started to develop, and the governor had recently begun attending meetings in the community.

Recommendation

- 1.29** Comprehensive adult safeguarding procedures should be introduced and embedded throughout the prison.

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

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.

- 1.30** Physical security arrangements were mostly proportionate. There was an appropriate amount of relatively free movement around the site, and procedures such as volumetric control and cell searching were managed well. However, all prisoners were strip-searched on reception, without a risk assessment (see also paragraph 1.6).
- 1.31** Residential unit staff did not patrol landings regularly enough, and during the inspection we found them in offices, sometimes behind closed doors. Although they seemed to know the prisoners who came to the office, the lack of frequent interactions made it difficult for them to gather evidence of prisoners' attitudes, behaviour or associates (see also paragraph 2.9).
- 1.32** Staff were appropriately sighted on the risks to the prison and were conscious of the need to focus on the activities of prisoners in relation to possible grooming activity and offence-related associations, both within the prison and externally. There was also a good understanding of the risks of staff conditioning, and training was provided regularly to minimise this.
- 1.33** The monthly security meeting was well attended and its membership was appropriate. Objectives agreed at these meetings were ratified at monthly senior management team meetings and disseminated widely. The flow of information into the security department was reasonable, although had reduced since the previous inspection. There was good analysis of intelligence reports (IRs), and there was a drive to encourage departments with few submissions to contribute more. Most IRs related to inappropriate behaviour, self-harm incidents and child protection. The searching of prisoners and their cells was intelligence led and most finds related to smoking requisites, which, following the smoking ban, were now considered to be contraband. There had also been an increase in finds of illegal alcohol.
- 1.34** All evidence, including mandatory drug testing (MDT) results, security intelligence, search finds and liaison with substance misuse services, indicated little availability of illegal drugs. The average random positive MDT rate for the six months to March 2017 was only 1.5%. In our survey, fewer respondents than at other category C prisons said that it was easy to obtain illegal drugs at the prison (15% versus 45%) and that they had developed a problem with drugs or prescribed medications while there (1% versus 11%). The MDT suite was clean, tidy and well equipped. In the previous six months, six suspicion tests had been requested in response to intelligence received; they had all been undertaken, with one positive result and one refusal.

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.

- 1.35** In our survey, only 47% of prisoners said that they had been treated fairly under the IEP scheme, and too few (38%) said that it encouraged them to improve their behaviour. However, decisions were defensible and based on a range of information, although the input from offender supervisors was not sufficiently detailed. Those on the basic level were reviewed weekly and could progress quickly if their behaviour had improved. There were inadequate incentives for enhanced-level prisoners, and pay rates varied between the levels, which was unfair.
- 1.36** Oversight of the scheme had improved, and prisoners who maintained their innocence could now access enhanced status where appropriate. However, many prisoners still believed that this group was automatically excluded from enhanced status, so the new policy needed better promotion.
- 1.37** Consultation was effective, via quarterly meetings with IEP representatives.

Recommendation

- 1.38 Prisoners' pay should not be determined by their incentives and earned privileges (IEP) level.** (Repeated recommendation 1.47)

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

- 1.39** The number of adjudications had doubled and was high. A review of data showed that a small number of very difficult prisoners accounted for a large proportion of adjudications.
- 1.40** Most adjudications were for possession of unauthorised items, disobeying lawful orders and using threatening, abusive or insulting words and behaviour.
- 1.41** Monitoring and oversight of the adjudications process were good. The quarterly adjudication meetings were well attended but there was a lack of monitoring of protected characteristics (see also section on equality and diversity). Tariffs were reviewed and amended appropriately to reflect the seriousness and prevalence of charges.

- 1.42** Records of adjudications demonstrated a good level of questioning and of prisoner involvement in the process. Prisoners had sufficient time to prepare for hearings and were made aware of the appeals process.

The use of force

- 1.43** Use of force was rare. There had been 24 incidents in the previous six months, which was in line with the number at similar establishments. In our survey, far fewer prisoners than elsewhere and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had been restrained in the previous six months. The quality of documentation was generally good and there was clear evidence of a focus on de-escalation. Planned interventions were not filmed routinely, although the recent introduction of body-worn cameras had mitigated this. A use of force committee was in place but it met too infrequently to have an appropriate level of oversight of the use of force and did not review individual incidents.
- 1.44** There had been three uses of the special accommodation in the previous six months. Record keeping was good and we were satisfied that all uses had been justifiable, and that prisoners had been held for very short periods and in all cases removed at the earliest opportunity.

Recommendation

- 1.45** **The use of force committee should scrutinise every use of force promptly and robustly.**

Segregation

- 1.46** Use of segregation was low, and in line with that at similar prisons. The average length of stay over the previous six months had been about seven days and most prisoners returned to normal location, with only a few being transferred elsewhere.
- 1.47** The unit was a purpose-built facility. It was clean and maintained to an exceptional standard, and contained some exercise equipment. However, the exercise yards consisted of two cages, which was inappropriate for this type of prison.
- 1.48** All prisoners were strip-searched on location to the unit, regardless of any risk posed. We witnessed some effective and appropriately challenging interactions between staff and prisoners on the unit. Segregated prisoners we spoke to were also very positive about their treatment.
- 1.49** The rules and behavioural expectations of the unit were discussed with all new arrivals and access to some off-unit activities, such as use of the gym and attendance at religious services, was provided, subject to risk assessment.
- 1.50** Monitoring was effective, and quarterly segregation and adjudication meetings were well attended. The meeting had an appropriate focus and reviewed a wide range of data, although did not reflect on equality issues (see also section on equality and diversity). Consideration was given to the selection and training of staff. Electronic case notes provided a good insight into the daily lives of prisoners held on the unit.

Recommendation

- 1.51 The segregation exercise yards should be re-modelled to provide a decent environment.** (Repeated recommendation 1.58)

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.

- 1.52** A clear whole-prison drug strategy had been established which informed practice and facilitated effective partnership working. An action plan to deliver the goals of the strategy was being implemented and was subject to routine monitoring.
- 1.53** The needs of prisoners were assessed on arrival at the establishment, and individuals with substance misuse problems were referred to the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) for a detailed assessment and, where appropriate, ongoing support from a small team of experienced and skilled practitioners.
- 1.54** An appropriate range of psychosocial interventions was provided through individual and group-based sessions. The service was well promoted and information about the available support and harm reduction practices was clear. Prisoners could self-refer or be referred from a range of other areas, including following an adjudication or positive MDT result. They were assessed promptly and could access evidence-based programmes dealing with the misuse of alcohol and other substances. Peer workers were utilised effectively in a number of recovery-focused activities. However, this group was small and they were unable to access all residential areas, although there were plans to increase capacity.
- 1.55** The main focus of the support available was on alcohol use linked to offending behaviour, and there were additional group sessions facilitated by Alcoholics Anonymous. Care plans were of high quality and we found evidence of detailed one-to-one work, voluntary testing compacts, appropriate coordination of care and effective information sharing with other stakeholders.
- 1.56** Clinical substance misuse services were provided by Virgin Care Services Limited ('Virgin Care'), with access to a specialist GP when required. The arrangements in place were sound but demand was extremely low, with only one prisoner requiring opiate substitute treatment during the inspection.
- 1.57** There was good joint working with the 'well-being service' (see paragraph 2.70), but collaboration with Virgin Care for those with more complex mental health needs was underdeveloped.

Section 2. Respect

Residential units

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.1 The establishment provided a safe, decent and respectful environment. Residential units were clean, well decorated and bright, with good natural light and spotlessly clean communal areas. The gardens were attractive and well maintained.
- 2.2 Cells were tidy and furniture was in good repair, although there was little storage space. Cells could be appropriately personalised, and prisoners had privacy keys and lockable medication safes, although we were told that there was a shortage of rechargeable batteries for these. Ventilation and temperature control could be problematic and some cells were too warm or too cold. The double cells on residential unit 7 were cramped and few cells were suitable for prisoners using a wheelchair. All cells contained appropriately screened toilets, and cells on residential unit 7 also contained showers. Cell call bells were usually answered quickly.
- 2.3 There were showers on each landing, and access to them was good. They were very clean but ventilation and drainage were poor and they were beginning to show signs of disrepair. There was good access to toiletries and cleaning materials. Prisoners could order the items they needed, rather than getting a standard weekly issue, and this had reduced the amount distributed. However, there were difficulties in accessing some items of kit. Prisoners complained that the quality of prison clothing returned from the laundry at another prison was poorer than that of the items sent.
- 2.4 Residential unit 7 had areas where prisoners could eat or access recreational activities. The other units had limited association space; although prisoners could access some communal activities there, these spaces were also used for serving meals.
- 2.5 Applications were logged but not tracked. However, in our survey, more prisoners than at other category C prisons said that it was easy to make an application (86% versus 80%), and that were dealt with fairly (70% versus 55%) and quickly (54% versus 38%).
- 2.6 Reception staff processed applications to access stored property but the system for notifying prisoners that their property could be collected was inadequate, which meant that they sometimes waited unnecessarily. Apart from books, prisoners could only receive property from their families in exceptional circumstances.
- 2.7 All telephones were in working order, and access to them was good, but some lacked privacy. Families could send emails to a secure central address. There had been occasional delays with distributing incoming post and emails but the prison was aware of this.

Staff-prisoner relationships

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.8** Staff–prisoner relationships were generally good. In our survey, 77% of respondents said that most staff treated them respectfully, although this was lower for those with a disability. We saw some excellent interactions between prisoners and staff, and men spoke particularly highly about gym staff.
- 2.9** In our survey, fewer respondents than at the time of the previous inspection said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem (72% versus 81%). Only 11% of respondents said that staff usually spoke to them during association, against a comparator of 21% and 22% at the time of the previous inspection. Many residential unit staff spent too much time in offices, and there was insufficient engagement during association and other unlock periods (see also paragraph 1.31).
- 2.10** Although most staff were decent and professional, we heard about, and witnessed, a few conversations among staff that could be seen as unprofessional or inappropriate in front of prisoners. Many staff referred to prisoners by their surnames and there were some inconsistencies in applying basic rules, causing some prisoners frustration and uncertainty.
- 2.11** In our survey, 87% of respondents said that they knew who their personal officer was but only 55% said that they were helpful. There was evidence that personal officers had at least monthly contact with the prisoners in their care. However, we were not confident that this was always meaningful or motivational. The links between offender supervisors and personal officers needed developing, to ensure that personal officers supported offender management work.
- 2.12** Consultation had improved, and was excellent.

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 characteristic⁴ 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** Overall, equality and diversity provision was reasonable. A detailed equality policy had been developed which addressed the specific needs of the prisoner population. The prison had an overarching equality action plan but implementation of recommendations was sometimes weak.

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

- 2.14** Strategic management of the diversity agenda came under the remit of the head of safer prisons and equalities, supported by two equality officers. Frequent cross-deployment of equality officers meant that they were unable to focus sufficiently on this agenda.
- 2.15** There was a quarterly equalities action team (EAT) meeting, which was well attended by staff from all the relevant departments, prisoner equality representatives, the Independent Monitoring Board and the chaplaincy. The meeting addressed all protected characteristics appropriately. Monitoring data, including from the equality monitoring tool and discrimination incident report forms (DIRFs), were analysed at these meetings and subsequent actions were allocated to staff for follow-up.
- 2.16** A total of 53 DIRFs had been submitted in the previous six months. Forms were not always freely available on the residential units. The investigations we reviewed had been thorough but timeliness poor in too many cases. Quality assurance was appropriate and overseen by the head of safer prisons and equalities.
- 2.17** Staff training in equality and diversity was adequate. The prison had developed an in-house staff awareness and training programme which addressed all aspects of the national and local policy.
- 2.18** A wide range of posters was displayed across the prison, promoting equality and diversity across all the protected characteristics. Details and photographs of the various representatives were well placed on all the residential units.

Recommendation

- 2.19** **Discrimination incident report forms should be freely available on all residential units and the timeliness of responses should be improved.**

Protected characteristics

- 2.20** Black and minority ethnic prisoners represented approximately 16% of the prison population. In our survey, the responses of these prisoners were mixed. For example, 47% of these prisoners, compared with 33% of white prisoners, said that they had felt unsafe at the establishment at some time, and 53% compared with 70% said that they were working in the prison. Conversely, 85% compared with 70% said that there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. The prison had nominated black and minority ethnic representatives but they were not always proactively involved by staff or sufficiently informed of their role. Representatives we spoke to said that they had not received training, were not supported and did not know about the existence of DIRFs. In our groups, some black and minority ethnic prisoners complained of differential treatment and a lack of staff awareness, while others said that their experiences were generally positive.
- 2.21** The prison had a detailed foreign national prisoner policy which addressed the specific needs of these prisoners. At the time of the inspection, there were 50 foreign national prisoners, with two detained post-sentence by the Home Office for removal from the UK. There were foreign national prisoner representatives for most residential units, and quarterly meetings were held, addressing all issues pertinent to this group. Home Office staff held a regular surgery at the prison and it was generally easy to get an appointment to see them.

- 2.22** Provision for the large group of older prisoners and those with a disability was reasonable. Since the previous inspection, a new residential unit (residential unit 7) had been added, with in-cell showers and two adapted cells, as well as a lift. However, in our survey, prisoners with a disability reported more negatively than others across a number of important areas. For example, only 68% of these prisoners said that staff treated them respectfully, compared with 80% of prisoners without a disability. More prisoners with a disability than without said that they had felt unsafe at the establishment at some stage (47% versus 31%), and that that they had been victimised by other prisoners (48% versus 29%).
- 2.23** All prisoners with a disability had a personal emergency evacuation plan; the residential staff we spoke to were aware of these, and the plans we reviewed were appropriate. Those who needed wheelchairs or had restricted mobility were located on the ground floor of residential unit 7. Some prisoners had been trained and were paid to push wheelchairs, and this service worked well. There was reasonable provision of social care to address the individual needs of prisoners with a disability, including adapted cell chairs for those assessed as needing them.
- 2.24** A total of 300 prisoners (almost half of the population) were over 50 years of age, of whom 68 were over the age of 70 and one was 88. Retired prisoners were not locked up during the day, and a wide range of recreational activities had been developed for older people. A gym orderly had organised a number of creative gym sessions for older prisoners and those with a disability. The prison organised an annual well-being day for older prisoners, in which various departments participated.
- 2.25** The prison had an LGBT group called Real Voices, which met every month, although the meeting was not minuted and there was no available agenda. Gay and bisexual prisoners we spoke to generally reflected positively about their experiences and treatment.
- 2.26** There was good care and support for the four transgender prisoners currently at the establishment. There were bimonthly meetings to discuss any issues arising but these prisoners felt that this was not sufficiently frequent. However, the prison had engaged proactively with this group, and had provided the full shopping list from women's prisons, with access to female clothes and cosmetics (see also paragraph 2.82).

Recommendation

- 2.27 Black and minority ethnic prisoner representatives should be trained and understand their role and responsibilities through regular meetings.**

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.

- 2.28** Faith support was good. The managing chaplain was supported by a range of paid and volunteer chaplains, catering for most faiths. In our survey, more prisoners than elsewhere said that their religious beliefs were respected (60% versus 52%). Black and minority ethnic prisoners reported more positively than white prisoners about respect for their religious beliefs and being able to speak to a religious leader of their faith.

- 2.29** The multi-faith room was of a good size and adapted for services for different faiths. The building had a lift for prisoners with a disability. Faith services were well attended. In addition to religious services, the chaplain provided a range of facilities, including meditation. The chaplaincy celebrated festivals from all faiths.
- 2.30** Prisoner faith representatives promoted access to the chaplaincy, which was well integrated into the rest of the prison and provided good support to prisoners. Chaplains visited new arrivals and those in segregation, and were involved in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews where appropriate. They also provided a bereavement counselling service and support for vulnerable prisoners, and made contacts in local communities for prisoners who wished to continue observing their faith after release.

Complaints

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.31** The number of complaints submitted was similar to that at other category C prisons. Most related to residential, property or sentence progression matters.
- 2.32** In our survey, most prisoners said that it was easy to make a complaint. However, complaint forms were not available on all residential units. More respondents than at comparator establishments said that complaints were dealt with fairly (44% versus 33%) and quickly (36% versus 27%). Most of the responses we sampled were timely but their quality varied; while some were good, too many were not thorough enough and did not answer the issue directly. Some staff appeared to lack confidence in dealing with complaints or giving a more nuanced or longer response to a complicated query. Quality assurance was underdeveloped but the prison had recently introduced a new system for this, which they hoped would improve the process.
- 2.33** There was some crossover between the various complaint systems. General complaints raising issues of discrimination were sometimes investigated as DIRFs, which was appropriate. However, some confidential access complaints were treated as ongoing general complaints, which was inappropriate. Few confidential complaints were submitted, and there was not enough consistency in the way they were managed or responded to.
- 2.34** Complaints were discussed quarterly at the senior management team meeting. The monitoring of complaints was effective and had led to changes in practice, particularly regarding residential issues.

Recommendation

- 2.35 Complaint forms should be readily available beside complaints boxes on all residential units.**

Legal rights

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.36** Legal rights services had deteriorated as there was no longer a Citizens Advice representative or a dedicated offender supervisor to provide advice. ‘Access to justice’ laptop computers were available (to allow prisoners to exercise their legal rights and pursue cases), although demand was low.
- 2.37** In our survey, fewer prisoners than at similar establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they could communicate with their solicitor (37% versus 43% and 51%, respectively), and that they could attend legal visits (28% versus 45% and 42%, respectively).
- 2.38** Legal visits were held on one day a week and took place in private, using the contact rooms in the visits hall, and it was relatively easy to get an appointment. The library held a range of legal texts and prisoners reported positively on access to these.

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.

- 2.39** The inspection of health services was jointly undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC)⁵ and HM Inspectorate of Prisons under a memorandum of understanding agreement between the agencies. The Care Quality Commission found no breaches or concerns about regulations during the inspection.

Governance arrangements

- 2.40** Health services were provided by Virgin Care Services Limited (‘Virgin Care’), with some specialist sub-contracted input established for GP, dentistry and mental health well-being support. Governance arrangements were sound and relationships between stakeholders effective. A partnership board had been established and health services staff contributed appropriately to several important prison processes. A health needs assessment had been undertaken and this had helped to shape service delivery.
- 2.41** Clinical governance arrangements were impressive. Quality assurance and audit systems were robust, with thorough reporting systems and effective learning demonstrated from serious untoward incidents. Patient representatives contributed to improving services, with additional feedback received via patient questionnaires.

⁵ CQC is the independent regulator of health and adult social care in England. It monitors, inspects and regulates services to make sure they meet fundamental standards of quality and safety. For information on CQC’s standards of care and the action it takes to improve services, please visit: <http://www.cqc.org.uk>.

- 2.42** A health care manager had only recently taken up post, but continuity and accountability arrangements were well established. At the time of the inspection, there were a few staff vacancies but workforce plans were clear and enabled the appropriate delivery of care. Essential training, supervision and access to service-led professional development ensured a balanced skills mix within the workforce and appropriate access to specialist skills.
- 2.43** There were systems to prevent communicable disease and deal with outbreaks. Information governance arrangements, including training for staff, were appropriate.
- 2.44** The health centre was clean and clinical rooms were fit for purpose and complied with infection prevention standards. Access to the health centre was facilitated by free-flow movements, and a lift enabled ready access to all facilities.
- 2.45** The arrangements to respond to medical crises were good. The emergency services sometimes took a while to arrive on site if called, but this was commensurate with local demographics and no concerns had been reported. Equipment, including resuscitation kits, was checked and maintained regularly, and health services staff received intermediate-level resuscitation training. Automated external defibrillators were in place on all residential units, and rotas were arranged to ensure that first-aid-trained prison staff were consistently on duty.
- 2.46** Information provided for prisoners about health care was adequate but out of date. Complaints about health care were managed well; investigations were thorough, and patients were often seen face to face to discuss the response and ensure that the outcome had been clearly understood and accepted. Responses were timely, dealt directly with the concern and were respectful in tone. Complaints were analysed and trends were identified to improve the service and help to raise standards of care.
- 2.47** There was a systematic approach to disease prevention, with prisoners' needs addressed individually through a number of clinics established to facilitate vaccination programmes and age-appropriate screening. Support for the prison smoke-free initiative had triggered a comprehensive approach to smoking cessation support. Barrier protection was available on request but this was not well advertised. We saw evidence of a developing approach to health promotion, including the use of technology, through a dedicated television channel but the delivery plan was not sufficiently strategic to ensure a more coherent population-based approach.

Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.48** Health screening on reception was well managed, with risk identified early, ensuring prompt access to specialist follow-up if required and appropriate arrangements to access professional telephone interpreting services when needed. Health care practitioners, including the GP, had appropriate contact with all prisoners on the segregation unit.
- 2.49** Prisoners we spoke to were very positive about the quality of the health services provided, and this was reflected in our survey, with 61% of respondents rating the overall quality of services as good or very good, against the 42% comparator.
- 2.50** An appropriate range of primary care services, including physiotherapy, was provided and waiting times were short. Routine GP appointments were available within two days, and 'on the day' urgent appointments were facilitated based on clinical need. Out-of-hours GP cover was provided to the same level as in the community.

- 2.51** The non-attendance rate for most clinics was low, and information on those who did not attend was obtained and analysed, with action taken to decrease this rate even further.
- 2.52** Long-term conditions and complex health needs were overseen by the GP, who liaised with health services staff to ensure a coordinated approach. There were plans for this to be changed to nurse-led long-term condition clinics, to provide a more systematic approach.
- 2.53** Clinical records were held on SystmOne (the electronic clinical record) and those we sampled were good, with appropriate use of care plans and templates based on national clinical guidance.
- 2.54** Patients had good access to secondary care services. External hospital appointments were well managed, with good support from the prison, which ensured that security measures on escorts were proportionate and based on individual risk.

Pharmacy

- 2.55** Individually labelled medicines were dispensed by Virgin Care from HMP Norwich. Deliveries were received every day but we were told that it could take three days to receive routine medicines, and one prisoner we observed waited five days for newly prescribed analgesia, even though there was a system for obtaining urgent medicines from a local pharmacy.
- 2.56** Prisoners could receive treatment for minor ailments through the use of general sale list medicines, when endorsed by nursing staff, although there was no provision for some minor conditions such as coughs or sore throats.
- 2.57** Medicines were stored and administered in two locations, the pharmacy and residential unit 7. We observed medicines, including controlled drugs, being transported during prisoner movement, which was unacceptable, but this was immediately stopped when we brought this to the attention of the new head of health care. The refrigerator in the main pharmacy had often exceeded the maximum recommended temperature, with no evidence of action being taken, although the refrigerator was replaced immediately when we highlighted this issue.
- 2.58** Eighty-seven per cent of medications were supplied as in-possession, and we observed appropriate risk assessments. Medicines were reconciled appropriately, ensuring that these were continued appropriately once prisoners arrived at the establishment.
- 2.59** For most prisoners, medicines were administered three times a day, from the main health centre. The medicine queue was well supervised and patients were provided with privacy and respect. Other time slots were available for collecting in-possession medicines. A few patients received medication from the unit 7 treatment room but the supervision of administration by officers there was inadequate.
- 2.60** All prescriptions, administrations and issuing of in-possession medications were recorded electronically, with robust contingency arrangements established in the event of system failure. Records showed that medicines administered as patches were not used in line with the manufacturer's recommendations. Prisoners could request an appointment with the pharmacy team for medicines advice but patient information leaflets were not provided routinely to prisoners receiving supervised medicines. Prisoners were offered an eight-week programme for smoking cessation on arrival at

the establishment and could access nicotine replacement products from the prison shop after this time if required.

- 2.61** Every prisoner had an annual medicine review and the pharmacy team assisted with the monitoring of high-risk medicines. Emergency medicines were readily available and checked regularly. Drug alerts and recalls were actioned appropriately. Medication errors were reported and reviewed at the medicines management group meeting. The clinical audit programme was supported by pharmacy staff, who also provided medicines management training for all health services staff.

Recommendations

- 2.62** **Newly initiated medicines should be ordered and supplied in a timely manner, to ensure that treatment begins promptly.**
- 2.63** **Medicines requiring cold storage that are found to be kept outside the recommended range should be managed appropriately.**
- 2.64** **The application of transdermal patches should be in line with manufacturer's instructions.**

Dentistry

- 2.65** Dental services were provided by John G Plummer & Associates and were good, offering a range of treatments equivalent to that in the wider community. Dental cover was well organised and responsive to prisoners' needs. The waiting time for routine appointments was appropriate, at four weeks, and emergency provision was effective, with urgent referrals seen promptly. A dental nurse provided comprehensive oral health promotion and advice.
- 2.66** All care and treatment were carried out safely and to the required standards. The dental suite was modern, clean, spacious and properly maintained in accordance with current legislation. There was a separate decontamination room, and current infection control standards were met. There were safe arrangements for disposing of waste materials.

Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.67** Virgin Care delivered mental health services using a stepped-care approach, ranging from facilitating self-help through to supporting prisoners with complex needs. Only the GP received referrals and acted as a gatekeeper to the service.
- 2.68** Referrals were screened at a weekly team meeting and allocated to practitioner caseloads. Routine assessments were undertaken within two days. The core team consisted of a nurse manager, two registered nurses and a health care assistant. They operated five days a week, with input one day each week provided, respectively, by a clinical psychologist and psychiatrist.
- 2.69** The team saw all prisoners placed on an ACCT but, other than that, dealt only with acute concerns presented by prisoners already engaged with the service. At the time of the inspection, the team was supporting 56 prisoners. Of these, 12 had been identified as requiring support under the care programme approach, which was used

appropriately to identify the support required for those with severe and enduring mental health needs.

- 2.70** Complementing provision, Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust delivered individual and group talking therapies through a standalone 'well-being service', which accepted referrals directly from prisoners. This service offered a wide range of time-limited interventions designed to alleviate mild- to moderate-level problems for around 85 prisoners, and there were plans to increase capacity in this area.
- 2.71** The small Virgin Care team undertook reception mental health screening but had limited scope to undertake development work, such as mental health promotion. We judged the care provided as appropriate to the prison population, although there was some overlap between the provision of the well-being service and that of the Virgin Care team. In addition, there was no opportunity to review prisoners jointly when care overlapped or in cases where shared care arrangements (for example, with the GP, the well-being service and the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) team) might have been more appropriate, which could have had a detrimental impact on prisoners' outcomes.
- 2.72** No prisoners had needed assessment for treatment in hospital under the Mental Health Act in the previous 12 months. A programme of mental health awareness training for prison staff was due to restart in May 2017 after a recent hiatus, and a number of staff had already attended previous training.

Recommendations

- 2.73 Referrals from any health professional should be considered and assessed directly by the mental health team.**
- 2.74 All mental health caseloads, particularly those involving overlapping or shared care, should be reviewed regularly in a multidisciplinary and multiagency clinical forum.**

Social care

- 2.75** All health services staff had accessed safeguarding training, and the frontline staff we spoke to knew how to deal with and escalate such concerns. Prisoners with social care needs were identified promptly. The prison had links with Norfolk County Council but there was no contract or memorandum of understanding in place that set out who was responsible for providing this support. Currently, Virgin Care staff delivered support to four prisoners, which could potentially divert resources from mainstream activity, particularly if demand increased. However, we found that agreed care plans were implemented which consistently met individual need, with equipment provided and adaptations made to cells where appropriate.

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.

- 2.76** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection said that the food provided was good, although black and minority ethnic prisoners were less positive than their white counterparts. The kitchen and serveries were very clean and servers were dressed appropriately. The food we saw and sampled was healthy and reasonably good. At least one hot meal a day was provided and additional hot snack choices were usually available at lunchtimes. Much of the food was prepared from scratch on site, and food was pre-portioned in the kitchen, to ensure fairness at the serveries. Fruit was available twice a day. Some prisoners told us that food portions were small but the servings we saw provided plenty of the basic foodstuffs such as bread, rice and potatoes.
- 2.77** Consultation with prisoners about the food provided was good, consisting of bimonthly meetings with food representatives, who canvassed the opinions of others on their units; comments books at the serveries; and an annual survey.
- 2.78** Breakfast packs were issued on the evening before consumption, and were too small. There were no self-catering facilities. Prisoners had kettles and, although they could eat communally on residential unit 7, elsewhere they ate in their cells (see also paragraph 2.4).
- 2.79** Around 50 prisoners worked on rotation in the kitchen but there were no opportunities to gain national vocational qualifications (see also paragraph 3.15).

Purchases

Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.80** In our survey, fewer respondents than at comparator establishments said that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs (42% versus 48%). However, consultation about the range of goods available had improved and was now very good, and DHL was about to expand the shop list considerably. Black and minority ethnic prisoners, who had reported negatively about the shop in our previous survey, now responded similarly to white prisoners, and a black and minority ethnic representative was now invited to consultation meetings.
- 2.81** New arrivals could purchase a reception pack (a grocery pack which usually contains basic food and drink items such as tea, milk, sugar and sweets) and e-cigarettes in reception but still waited up to 12 days to receive their first prison shop order.
- 2.82** A reasonable range of catalogues was available but prisoners still had to pay a 50 pence administration fee.

Recommendations

- 2.83 Prisoners should be able to buy items from the shop within 24 hours of arrival.**
- 2.84 Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee on catalogue orders.**

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.⁶

- 3.1** The amount of time out of cell was reasonably good, with almost all prisoners out of their cells for the activity periods during the core day. This allowed 9.5 hours out of cell from Monday to Friday, and 8.5 hours at weekends. Only the very few prisoners who were on the basic level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme and not involved in purposeful activity were locked up during the working day.
- 3.2** The prison was running a slightly restricted regime, which meant that prisoners were locked up over the lunch period and that the daily association periods were curtailed, with the prison locking up at 6.30pm.
- 3.3** Exercise periods were too short, at a planned 30 minutes. In reality, this was often even shorter, at around 20 minutes.

Recommendation

- 3.4 All prisoners should have the opportunity to spend at least 60 minutes in the open air each day.**

⁶ Time out of cell, in addition to formal 'purposeful activity', includes any time prisoners are out of their cells to associate or use communal facilities to take showers or make telephone calls.

Learning and skills and work activities

Expected outcomes:

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

3.5 Ofsted⁷ made the following assessments about the learning and skills and work provision:

Overall effectiveness of learning and skills and work: Good

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

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

Personal development and behaviour: Good

Leadership and management of learning and skills and work: Good

Management of learning and skills and work

3.6 The operational management and quality of education and vocational training, provided by 'PeoplePlus', were good. Managers had made effective improvements to teaching, learning and assessment since the previous inspection, through good professional staff development and robust performance management. A comprehensive lesson observation process had been implemented across all learning and skills courses, and this had improved the quality of teaching and learning. The identification of required improvements often resulted in pertinent professional staff development taking place, followed by further observations to assess their impact. Annual management appraisals of teaching staff were used well to discuss the quality of teaching and learning observations and to target future development and improvements.

3.7 Prison managers had successfully introduced good opportunities for elected prisoner representatives to attend regular management meetings and contribute to improving the learning, skills and work provision across the prison. Separate prisoner groups met managers to discuss and agree prison issues and potential areas for improvement. One example of an effective improvement had been the introduction of a clearing process for course waiting lists, to reduce the waiting times and provide frequent information updates for those waiting, to reduce the frustrations previously experienced. As a result, learner representatives said that staff–prisoner relationships had improved and that their views were valued highly by managers. A high-quality newsletter, produced by the learner representatives, was distributed to all residential units every two weeks, to inform prisoners of changes and improvements. The newsletter also promoted education courses and learners' successes effectively.

⁷ Ofsted is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills. It reports directly to the UK Parliament and is independent and impartial. It (inter alia) inspects and regulates services that provide education and skills for all ages, including those in custody. For information on Ofsted's inspection framework, please visit: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk>.

- 3.8** Partnership working between prison staff, the education provider and other agencies involved in learning and skills in the prison was effective. All staff worked well together to share information and provide good courses that would benefit learners. For example, there was productive partnership working between PE and education staff to provide healthy living courses. There was also good collaborative working between library staff and outside speakers to promote literacy and improve prisoners' reading, writing and speaking skills.
- 3.9** Prison managers placed a high priority on improving prisoners' English and mathematics skills. Prisoners whose skills were assessed at below level 1 were required to improve these to at least level 1, and in many instances improved their skills even further. Before prisoners with low competencies in English and/or mathematics skills were allowed to work or complete other courses, they had to agree to enrol onto appropriate English and/or mathematics courses and work towards improving their skills. If required, this was made part of prisoners' sentence plans, to ensure that it would be actioned.
- 3.10** The prison self-assessment was accurate and led to appropriate improvement actions being implemented. Effective quality improvement group (QIG) meetings were held regularly to review and update the improvement actions and to share any identified best practice. Learner representatives attended the QIG meetings and made valuable and constructive contributions to them.
- 3.11** Allocation to activities was effective and managed to place most prisoners in activity places within a relatively short period. However, the allocations board did not have immediate access to a current vacancy list at their weekly meetings, to enable them to fill existing spaces accurately.

Recommendation

- 3.12 The prison allocations board should be provided with up-to-date information about the available activity places.**

Provision of activities

- 3.13** There were sufficient activity places for most prisoners to engage in full-time purposeful activities and for the minority to take part in part-time work or education. A narrow range of vocational training courses was offered, including cleaning courses from entry level to level 2; level 1 courses in horticulture and healthy living; engineering at levels 1 and 2 and cycle maintenance at level 2. However, too many vocational courses were at a low level, with few opportunities for progression. Previous courses in painting and decorating, and barbering had been discontinued.
- 3.14** There had been an increase in the number of work opportunities since the previous inspection, through the opening of two additional workshops and a significant enlargement of the gardening department. Work was mainly purposeful, apart from lighting assembly work, which was repetitive and mundane. There were large numbers of residential unit workers and many of these had insufficient work to occupy them fully throughout the working day.
- 3.15** In most work areas, prisoners were developing their skills and knowledge; most basic work skills were accredited well. However, some jobs had no accredited training – for example, prisoners were not able to take up any qualifications in the main kitchen (see also paragraph 2.79).

Recommendation

- 3.16** More vocational training courses should be provided, with higher-level qualifications, and the work available should be purposeful and fully occupy prisoners throughout the day.

Quality of provision

- 3.17** The quality of teaching, learning and assessment had improved and was good. The education environment was clean, well maintained and stimulating. Initial assessment results were used well by teachers and training instructors to plan learning in mathematics, English, and information and communications technology (ICT). This allowed learners to make good progress in lessons. Teachers set effective, well-considered individual learning targets, as a result of which most learners were challenged to accelerate their learning and achievement. Learners and teachers recorded progress towards the targets at the end of each lesson, to reinforce learning and monitor accurately learners' overall progression.
- 3.18** Teachers used a broad range of effective learning resources adeptly, to motivate learners and develop their understanding and skills. For example, on ICT courses, well-prepared learning and assessment materials challenged learners at all levels to extend their skills beyond the minimum required for the qualification.
- 3.19** Vocational learning facilities and resources were clean and well maintained. However, there was no access to hot water or toilets in the area shared by waste management and the clothing exchange store. Vocational training instructors promoted the development of practical skills to relevant theory well.
- 3.20** Teachers used questioning techniques effectively to recap, check and extend learning. For example, following teaching on the impact of temperature on food safety, learners were questioned rigorously about their understanding of the consequences of incorrect temperature management on health, to consolidate their learning and prepare them well for external assessment. Trainers in workshops promoted the value of English and mathematics skills within industries appropriately. For example, learners enrolled on cleaning courses were able to dilute chemical solutions to the correct proportions using their improved mathematics skills.
- 3.21** Support for learners undertaking distance learning programmes was particularly strong. In addition to regular support from external tutors, education teachers provided frequent, pertinent tutorial advice and support. Teachers promoted equality and diversity well, including relevant aspects of British values, within the inclusive and respectful culture embedded across education and training.
- 3.22** In too many cases, the assessment of learners' work did not form a sufficient basis to enable them to improve. In vocational training, written feedback was often superficial and lacked detailed guidance to enable learners to produce better work. Individual learning plans were not used sufficiently effectively on vocational courses to record accurately the development of skills. In education classes, too many teachers did not identify and correct learners' spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors.
- 3.23** Learning support for those requiring extra help was underdeveloped. Although a recently appointed learning support assistant had begun to work with a small number of learners in education classes, wider support across most vocational training and work areas was not yet in place.

Recommendations

- 3.24** Areas used for training and work should have suitable facilities to be able to operate safely, hygienically and effectively.
- 3.25** Detailed written feedback should be provided, to inform learners about how to improve.
- 3.26** Individual learning plans should clearly state the prior learning and attainment of each prisoner and accurately record the development of their skills, progress and achievements. (Repeated recommendation 3.21)
- 3.27** The strategies to help prisoners with learning support needs should be agreed, recorded, implemented and regularly reviewed. (Repeated recommendation 3.20)

Personal development and behaviour

- 3.28** Prisoners worked very well in most areas. Across a range of subjects, they developed their work-related skills well, including ICT, team working, and listening and reading skills. However, these new skills were not recognised and recorded sufficiently in most work areas. Prisoners consistently behaved well and were respectful to each other and to staff.
- 3.29** There was an appropriate focus on developing prisoners' employability skills in most workshops and lessons. Most prisoners demonstrated positive team working skills and improved confidence, and developed an appropriate work ethic. Prisoners working towards vocational qualifications were keen to learn new skills and took pride in their achievements; for example, those working in the engineering workshop achieved good standards of skilled work and a few had achieved highly valued welding qualifications.
- 3.30** Trainers and workshop instructors paid good attention to health and safety. As a result, prisoners had a clear working understanding of relevant legislation, regulations and safe working practices, which they applied well in their work.
- 3.31** Attendance and punctuality at workplaces were good. However, absences from education, training and work due to other activities such as health care appointments, access to the library and prisoner forums interrupted learning too often.

Recommendations

- 3.32** The employability skills attained by prisoners in work areas should be assessed, recorded and accredited.
- 3.33** The sequencing of regime appointments should be modified, to minimise interruptions to education, training and work.

Education and vocational achievements

- 3.34** Learners' retention and their achievement of learning and skills qualifications were both high. In 2015/16, learners studying on most courses achieved well, including in ICT, English for speakers of other languages, horticulture and warehousing. In-year data indicated that learners were continuing to make good progress in their studies.
- 3.35** The achievement of English and mathematics qualifications had improved significantly since the previous inspection and was now very high. All learners who studied Open University and other distance learning qualifications achieved well. Some learners had even successfully graduated with a full Master's degree.
- 3.36** Most learners in education classes who completed their courses went on to enrol for higher-level studies. For example, in 2015/16, 167 learners who achieved their functional skills qualifications at one level subsequently progressed to achieve at the next level.
- 3.37** In education and vocational training, the quality of learners' work was consistently high and often exceeded the requirements of the qualifications. For example, in ICT, learners studying on a level 1 course designed and produced presentations which were at a standard required for higher-level courses.
- 3.38** Most learners enjoyed their learning and a few enthusiastically committed themselves to learning outside the taught lessons by taking extra work back to their residential unit to complete, in addition to that set by the teachers. Learners made substantial and sustained progress, although a few more able individuals were not sufficiently stretched and challenged in a minority of lessons.

Recommendation

- 3.39 All learners should be suitably stretched and challenged to achieve to the best of their ability.**

Library

- 3.40** Norfolk County Council provided the prison's well-run and -managed library service. It offered a suitable range of well-displayed fiction and non-fiction books, including easy readers and an adequate selection of resources in foreign languages. Good use was made of an interlibrary loan facility to provide books not stocked by the library. It also contained a wide range of DVDs, CDs and 'talking' books. Legal texts and Prison Service Instructions and Orders were readily available and regularly used by prisoners. Book losses were extremely low.
- 3.41** Timetabled access to the library was adequate. Most prisoners had the opportunity to visit the library at least once a week, and those in full-time work could arrange a library pass to visit when needed. Over three-quarters of the prison population made regular use of the library facilities, which was far higher than we see at similar prisons.
- 3.42** The library promoted literacy through several successful initiatives. For example, a locally devised reading challenge had involved around 200 prisoners. Weekly reading groups enabled prisoners to discuss what they had read and encouraged them to explore new books and themes. Library unit representatives encouraged library use. The well-established use of orderlies as mentors for the 'Turning Pages' reading

programme continued to promote literacy successfully, and around 16 prisoners were participating at the time of the inspection.

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.

- 3.43** The facilities in the main gym were appropriate and there was a wide range of recreational activities. The gym was open seven days a week, including four evening openings. Leaders and managers analysed data appropriately to evaluate gym use by different prisoner groups, to target any under-represented groups. Feedback from the analysis had resulted in the provision of a more diverse range of activities which attracted all groups of prisoners.
- 3.44** The PE facilities included a range of cardiovascular (CV), weights and resistance training equipment, and an outdoor games area, used in the summer months for team sports.
- 3.45** The weekly gym induction was appropriate for preparing newly arrived prisoners to use the service safely. Those with identified health conditions or injuries were referred to health services staff for assessment of their fitness. Effective communication and close working with health services staff ensured swift responses to enquiries, and approval for appropriate exercise regimes.
- 3.46** Recreational PE programmes encouraged all prisoners to participate, and included a range of activities to promote healthy living. These included smoking cessation, weight-loss sessions, remedial training, and sessions for the elderly and frail population.
- 3.47** There were plans to reintroduce relevant vocational courses to supplement the healthy living programme, which was offered through effective partnership delivery arrangements between PE and education staff.
- 3.48** There had been an increase in the number of PE session cancellations due to staff redeployment in recent months. However, most of the population still used the gym regularly.
- 3.49** The outdoor artificial pitch was inappropriate for use in wet or frosty conditions. This severely restricted the range of seasonal team sports, games and activities that could take place.

Recommendation

- 3.50 Prisoners located on the segregation unit should be provided with recreational PE which is supervised by qualified staff, and PE should not be cancelled owing to staff redeployment.**

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 prison was not designated as a resettlement prison. As a result, it did not have community rehabilitation company resettlement provision, even though it released up to 20 prisoners a month into the community.
- 4.2 The reducing reoffending policy was based on a comprehensive needs analysis. There was an action plan but it was mainly concerned with aspects of the regime which prepared prisoners for the future, rather than with services to meet their immediate needs before release. Some aspects of the action plan reflected the situation before the recent changes, and needed updating. Implementation was overseen by the well-attended reducing reoffending committee, which met bimonthly.
- 4.3 The strategic oversight of resettlement process had been established to monitor resettlement outcomes and to influence the provision of services by offender managers for prisoners being released. However, this was not effective. More needed to be done to ensure that full data were provided consistently and that responsible staff met regularly to review the information and take action to ensure that resettlement needs were met well enough ahead of release (see main recommendation S54).

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.

- 4.4 All prisoners were managed by the National Probation Service (NPS) owing to the nature of their offending and risk of harm levels. Offender management and planning was not well enough directed to provide effective progression and risk management of such a high-risk population.
- 4.5 In the previous six months, 61 prisoners had been received without an offender assessment system (OASys) assessment, which meant that they had been transferred to the establishment without a needs assessment or having been engaged in a meaningful sentence plan.
- 4.6 In addition, at the time of the inspection, there were 88 prisoners (13.7% of the population) without a completed OASys assessment and sentence plan. In our survey, only 61% of prisoners said that they knew they had a sentence plan, which was far worse than at the time of the previous inspection.

- 4.7** The offender management unit (OMU) comprised 18 offender supervisors, four of whom were NPS employees, while the other 14 were prison officers. The prison officers had residential duties in addition to their role in the OMU, although they had similar caseloads to probation staff. Some newer members of staff had not been trained in the role and were trying to learn from colleagues while managing a caseload of prisoners, many of whom had been assessed as presenting a high risk of harm.
- 4.8** Oversight of the work of offender supervisors was inadequate and made difficult by the varied, inconsistent and obscure practices for recording contact with prisoners and other professionals. Whereas probation staff had meetings with a manager periodically to discuss their work, there was no corresponding oversight of prison officer offender supervisors. There was a useful daily briefing of OMU staff by managers but regular team meetings had lapsed.
- 4.9** The quality of offender management work with prisoners varied greatly. All prisoners had a community-based offender manager, and the role of offender supervisors in the prison was to progress agreed work with prisoners while keeping offender managers informed of any developments, especially those affecting assessments of risk. In some of the cases we examined, we found that this was working well; offender supervisors had met the prisoners in their care regularly, to motivate and challenge them in achieving meaningful sentence plan targets and to prepare them for release. Some offender supervisors, especially probation officers, had done some good work with prisoners in response to particular events, such as release or parole hearings.
- 4.10** However, too much work, especially of the prison officer offender supervisors, took place in response to specific events, and there was no expectation of consistent and regular contact with prisoners on their caseload. In our survey, 42% of those who knew they had a sentence plan said that no one was working with them to achieve their targets and less than half cited the offender supervisor (see main recommendation S53).
- 4.11** This lack of regular contact was reflected in comments made to us by prisoners. Many told us that they only saw their offender supervisor when they were on the units carrying out residential duties, that they did not receive responses to applications to see them and that communication with them was poor. During weekday exercise periods, prisoners had access to an OMU drop-in session, where they could request contact with their offender supervisor, although prisoners we spoke to were not confident that this was effective. A good initiative to improve communication was the recent appointment and training of OMU prisoner representatives, who could answer basic enquiries about processes and represent the views of prisoners to OMU managers.
- 4.12** We found examples where a lack of offender supervisor contact with prisoners presenting a high risk of harm had resulted in missed opportunities to motivate them to acknowledge their offending, and others where follow-up work from post-programme reviews had not been done. In one case, there had been no contact with a prisoner assessed as high risk who was being released the week after the inspection and expected to be homeless (see main recommendation S53).

Recommendations

- 4.13 Prisoners should not be sent to the establishment without a full risk assessment and sentence plan to inform the prison of their risk and treatment needs.**
- 4.14 Offender supervisors should be trained and managers should have oversight of all their work, especially in high-risk cases.**

Public protection

- 4.15** Public protection measures were mostly good. Information on new arrivals was assessed to identify risks, and restrictions were proportionate. Once authorisations for child contact had been checked, this was allowed to continue, and telephone monitoring was not automatically imposed if it had been discontinued at a previous establishment.
- 4.16** There was a monthly interdepartmental risk management meeting, which was well attended by representatives from appropriate departments, including security and police liaison. The risks present in the establishment, such as the risks to female staff and unpredictable behaviour towards other prisoners, were considered, as well as applications for child contact, communications with the public and telephone monitoring. A significant omission was consideration of risk management plans for prisoners due for release, including ensuring that offender managers had reviewed their multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) level, having been provided with information about their prison behaviour (see main recommendation S54).
- 4.17** All prisoners were eligible for MAPPA processes but management levels were not recorded for half of the population, even though there was a process for requesting them from offender managers. In our sample of 45 prisoners due for release in the next three months, MAPPA levels were not recorded in 17 cases (see main recommendation S54).
- 4.18** When information had been requested for a MAPPA meeting, to plan the risk management of a prisoner, the quality of the reports we sampled was good.

Categorisation

- 4.19** Categorisation reviews were mostly up to date, with only a small backlog. Processes were thorough and transparent to prisoners, who were able to make written contributions. To improve confidence in the system, it was planned to hold categorisation boards with the prisoners concerned in attendance.
- 4.20** Prisoners recommended for category D by offender supervisors were referred to the OMU manager for approval. Suitable prisoners were quickly moved to open conditions in most cases, with only a few delays, which were for acceptable reasons. During the inspection, several prisoners were moved to open prisons and only two category D prisoners remained.
- 4.21** At the time of the inspection, there were 57 prisoners waiting for a transfer for progressive moves and to be closer to their families. In the previous six months, there had been 72 transfers, of which 28 had been progressive moves, not including for family ties. While this level of onward progression was reasonable, there were difficulties with securing places at some appropriate prisons because of the restrictive criteria for

acceptance, which delayed movement, and 12 prisoners had waited more than 100 days for a move. OMU staff actively negotiated to secure appropriate moves, and protocols had been developed with some receiving prisons.

Recommendation

- 4.22 There should be effective agreements with receiving establishments, to ensure that suitable prisoners are transferred in a timely manner.**

Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.23** At the time of the inspection, the prison held 121 indeterminate-sentenced prisoners (ISPs), of whom 41 were serving life sentences. Most of these were significantly beyond their tariff date, some felt ignored and many complained that progression was too slow.
- 4.24** There were no specific services for ISPs, such as lifer days or forums to identify their concerns. Parole dossiers were provided on time and any delays in hearings had been caused by the late submission of community reports or parole board scheduling.
- 4.25** OMU managers had recognised that the needs of ISPs should be addressed, and had begun consultation work by issuing a questionnaire to them, with the intention of establishing regular consultation groups. A national initiative had been introduced to work with some of the more difficult to progress prisoners serving indeterminate sentences for public protection.
- 4.26** Some of the ISPs who were most difficult to progress had been identified and meetings held with them, the senior probation officer and a psychologist, to draw up plans for their progression.

Recommendation

- 4.27 Specific provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be developed, based on an analysis of their needs.**

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.

- 4.28** The establishment was not identified as a resettlement prison, so did not have on-site community rehabilitation company provision for helping prisoners with education, training and employment; accommodation; and finance, benefit and debt problems.
- 4.29** In the previous six months, 105 prisoners had been released from the establishment because they had not been accepted by their local resettlement prison. There was no established procedure for ensuring that all their resettlement needs had been met, and in too many cases offender supervisors had not worked sufficiently well with offender managers to meet needs.

- 4.30** Prisoners within three years of release or their tariff date could volunteer to work with the Shaw Trust. This provided a reasonable range of support but was voluntary and did not provide help to all those being released. At the time of the inspection, there were 52 prisoners volunteering to access their help.

Recommendation

- 4.31 All prisoners' resettlement needs should be assessed in good time for release and adequate support should be provided to them.**

Accommodation

- 4.32** In our survey, only 25% of prisoners said that they knew where to get help with accommodation problems, which was far worse than the 43% at the time of the previous inspection. In the previous six months, 11.5% of the prisoners released had not had identified accommodation to go to.
- 4.33** In the absence of dedicated accommodation services at the prison, it was the responsibility of community-based offender managers to provide accommodation support, and for offender supervisors to help to manage the process by liaising with the prisoner. Too little was done well enough ahead of release to address housing problems (see main recommendation S54). The link between resettlement and public protection, to manage the risk implications of releasing prisoners without accommodation, was not well developed (see also section on public protection).
- 4.34** Prisoners undertaking the Shaw Trust programme could get help with accommodation, and three had been provided with rent deposits.

Education, training and employment

- 4.35** Futures Advice, Skills and Employment held the contract to provide careers advice. The careers advice provided was effective. Skills action plans provided good information, advice and guidance linked to realistic future opportunities and career options. Regular reviews of the skills action plans were carried out.
- 4.36** Effective help was provided with writing CVs and planning future education, training and employment requirements for prisoners who were to be released directly from the prison.
- 4.37** The virtual campus (internet access for prisoners to community education, training and employment opportunities) was not used sufficiently for job search activities.

Recommendation

- 4.38 Prisoners due to be released should be allowed to access the virtual campus for job search.**

Health care

- 4.39** Patients received good pre-release assessments from a nurse, to support them to register with community health services on release. Patients with a known release date were offered an appointment at the discharge clinic and issued with a supply of take-home medication if required. For those with complex care needs, there was good joint working between the health care worker and the OMU, to ensure appropriate onward care and support.
- 4.40** Links were established with local community mental health teams and other partners, to support discharge planning for prisoners with ongoing mental health needs. However, arranging external input into care programme approach discharge planning, to support prisoners with ongoing severe and enduring difficulties, was often delayed until the final few weeks of their sentence owing to uncertainty about resettlement plans.

Drugs and alcohol

- 4.41** A 'through-the-gate' support service was available from the Rehabilitation of Addicted Prisoners trust (RAPt) team for the very few prisoners who required ongoing support with substance use issues. The team arranged pre-discharge support and linked into community teams, to ensure that good substance misuse aftercare arrangements were available following release.

Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.42** Support was very limited. There was no longer any dedicated financial advice available for all prisoners but those undertaking the Shaw Trust programme could get help with debt problems. They could also open bank accounts with Barclays Bank.
- 4.43** The healthy living programme run by the education department provided modules on budgeting and money management.

Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.44** There were five visits sessions each week, one on Friday afternoons and four on weekend mornings and afternoons. Two visiting orders could be combined, to allow a full day's visit at the weekend, but visitors had to leave the prison in between the morning and afternoon sessions. Prisoners on the enhanced level of the incentives and earned privileges scheme were entitled to an additional visit each month, which unfairly penalised those whose behaviour might have benefited from family contact.
- 4.45** As a result of the location of the prison (see below) or the consequences of their offending behaviour, 95 prisoners (15% of the population) had never had a visit. A good source of support for these men was the official prison visitor scheme, run by the chaplaincy, which was well staffed, with 19 active volunteers.
- 4.46** The prison was located a long way from many prisoners' home areas. A subsidised bus service from Norwich provided some help for visitors travelling by public transport but was provided for only two of the visits sessions.
- 4.47** The Ormiston Trust ran the friendly visitors centre and booked visits. There was a tea bar in the centre, offering refreshments. The Trust's role was limited, with no family

engagement work and no presence inside the prison beyond overseeing the monthly children's visits. There were 13 places available for these special supervised visits each month, which met demand. Applications were appropriately risk assessed. The children's soft play area in the visits hall was only open during these monthly sessions when Trust staff were present to supervise. However, few children attended weekly social visits, so this was not a significant gap.

- 4.48** Some visitors experienced delays in starting visits. Records showed that those last in the queue often arrived in the visits hall almost half an hour late. These delays had a disproportionate impact at Bure because visitors travelled long distances from outside the area and tended to visit infrequently.
- 4.49** Some improvements had been made to the visits hall. The fixed tables had been replaced and prisoners were able to wear prison-issue shirts and jeans during visits, without the need to wear bibs. The refreshments available had improved substantially. Café Britannia, a catering operation at nearby HMP Norwich, now provided food and drink.
- 4.50** There was a manager with responsibility for children and families provision. However, other than Storybook Dads (in which prisoners record stories for their children), run by library staff, and the monthly children's visits, there was little to help prisoners to rebuild or maintain links with their families, or establish wider support networks. There was no parenting course, relationship counselling or family engagement work to help prisoners to re-establish ties safely with their local communities in preparation for release.

Recommendations

- 4.51 Visits procedures should be improved, to ensure that all visits start on time.**
- 4.52 Provision to help prisoners to rebuild and maintain family ties, and wider support networks, should be improved.**

Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.53** There was a well-established programmes team, which provided a range of offending behaviour programmes to meet the assessed need. There was an annual needs assessment of the population, to identify gaps in programme provision and submit proposals to programme commissioners.
- 4.54** One new programme for sex offenders, Horizon, had been started, and the 63 prisoners on the waiting list would be able to complete the programme in time for release or parole hearings. The Kaizen and Healthy Sex programmes for higher-risk prisoners and those with specific needs were scheduled to start once the training of facilitators had been completed.
- 4.55** Programme attendance was well managed and supported. Sessions were scheduled in consultation with activities staff, so that prisoners in jobs or undertaking courses were not disadvantaged, and pay rates for attendance were equitable. Prisoners who had successfully completed offending behaviour programmes were appointed as mentors on the residential units. They met new arrivals to inform them about programmes and provided valuable support for their peers who were considering programmes or participating currently.

- 4.56** Progression for some prisoners had been held up by delays in the provision of post-programme risk assessments ('structured assessment of risk and need' (SARN) reports) by forensic psychologists. At the time of the inspection, seven reports were three months overdue.
- 4.57** The programme team had identified 30 prisoners with treatment needs who were not suitable for the new programmes. These prisoners were offered individual work with psychologists to reduce their risk.
- 4.58** The eight-week healthy living course provided by the education department was a valuable and popular provision, particularly for prisoners who were unsuitable for accredited programmes. It included modules on decision making and relationship skills which were appropriate for the population.

Recommendation

- 4.59** **There should be adequate forensic psychologist resources to ensure that individual work and timely post-programme reports are provided.**

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 quality of assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management should be improved, including better and more accurate risk assessments, comprehensive care maps with clear goals, and support that continues until evidence shows that the prisoner's personal crisis has been fully managed and reduced. (S52)
- 5.2** The quality of offender management should be improved, to ensure a proactive approach to risk management and the delivery of sentence plan targets. Offender supervisor contact, particularly with the higher-risk prisoners, should be regular and meaningful. (S53)
- 5.3** All prisoners should have their resettlement needs addressed well in advance of their release. This should include a robust risk management plan which is developed in partnership with the community-based offender manager and, where relevant, multi-agency public protection meetings. (S54)

Recommendation

To HMPPS

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.4** Prisoners should not be sent to the establishment without a full risk assessment and sentence plan to inform the prison of their risk and treatment needs. (4.13)

Recommendations

To the governor

Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.5** Prisoners on escort vehicles should be offered toilet breaks during long journeys. (1.3)

Early days in custody

- 5.6** Induction orderlies should receive training and regular supervision. (1.13)

Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.7** Outcomes of investigations into incidents of bullying or violence should be clearly recorded and there should be sufficient challenge and management of perpetrators, and support for victims. (1.18)

Self-harm and suicide

- 5.8** The constant supervision cell should not be located on the segregation unit. (1.24)
- 5.9** Listeners should have dedicated rooms to accommodate callouts. (1.25)

Safeguarding

- 5.10** Comprehensive adult safeguarding procedures should be introduced and embedded throughout the prison. (1.29)

Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.11** Prisoners' pay should not be determined by their incentives and earned privileges (IEP) level. (1.38, repeated recommendation 1.47)

Discipline

- 5.12** The use of force committee should scrutinise every use of force promptly and robustly. (1.45)
- 5.13** The segregation exercise yards should be re-modelled to provide a decent environment. (1.51, repeated recommendation 1.58)

Equality and diversity

- 5.14** Discrimination incident report forms should be freely available on all residential units and the timeliness of responses should be improved. (2.19)
- 5.15** Black and minority ethnic prisoner representatives should be trained and understand their role and responsibilities through regular meetings. (2.27)

Complaints

- 5.16** Complaint forms should be readily available beside complaints boxes on all residential units. (2.35)

Health services

- 5.17** Newly initiated medicines should be ordered and supplied in a timely manner, to ensure that treatment begins promptly. (2.62)
- 5.18** Medicines requiring cold storage that are found to be kept outside the recommended range should be managed appropriately. (2.63)
- 5.19** The application of transdermal patches should be in line with manufacturer's instructions. (2.64)
- 5.20** Referrals from any health professional should be considered and assessed directly by the mental health team. (2.73)
- 5.21** All mental health caseloads, particularly those involving overlapping or shared care, should be reviewed regularly in a multidisciplinary and multiagency clinical forum. (2.74)

Purchases

- 5.22** Prisoners should be able to buy items from the shop within 24 hours of arrival. (2.83)
- 5.23** Prisoners should not be charged an administration fee on catalogue orders. (2.84)

Time out of cell

- 5.24** All prisoners should have the opportunity to spend at least 60 minutes in the open air each day (3.4).

Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.25** The prison allocations board should be provided with up-to-date information about the available activity places. (3.12)
- 5.26** More vocational training courses should be provided, with higher-level qualifications, and the work available should be purposeful and fully occupy prisoners throughout the day. (3.16)
- 5.27** Areas used for training and work should have suitable facilities to be able to operate safely, hygienically and effectively. (3.24)
- 5.28** Detailed written feedback should be provided, to inform learners about how to improve. (3.25)
- 5.29** Individual learning plans should clearly state the prior learning and attainment of each prisoner and accurately record the development of their skills, progress and achievements. (3.26, repeated recommendation 3.21)
- 5.30** The strategies to help prisoners with learning support needs should be agreed, recorded, implemented and regularly reviewed. (3.27, repeated recommendation 3.20)
- 5.31** The employability skills attained by prisoners in work areas should be assessed, recorded and accredited. (3.32)
- 5.32** The sequencing of regime appointments should be modified, to minimise interruptions to education, training and work. (3.33)
- 5.33** All learners should be suitably stretched and challenged to achieve to the best of their ability. (3.39)

Physical education and healthy living

- 5.34** Prisoners located on the segregation unit should be provided with recreational PE which is supervised by qualified staff, and PE should not be cancelled owing to staff redeployment. (3.50)

Strategic management of resettlement

- 5.35** Offender supervisors should be trained and managers should have oversight of all their work, especially in high-risk cases. (4.14)

Offender management and planning

- 5.36** There should be effective agreements with receiving establishments, to ensure that suitable prisoners are transferred in a timely manner. (4.22)
- 5.37** Specific provision for indeterminate-sentenced prisoners should be developed, based on an analysis of their needs. (4.27)

Reintegration planning

- 5.38** All prisoners' resettlement needs should be assessed in good time for release and adequate support should be provided to them. (4.31)
- 5.39** Prisoners due to be released should be allowed to access the virtual campus for job search. (4.38)
- 5.40** Visits procedures should be improved, to ensure that all visits start on time. (4.51)
- 5.41** Provision to help prisoners to rebuild and maintain family ties, and wider support networks, should be improved. (4.52)
- 5.42** There should be adequate forensic psychologist resources to ensure that individual work and timely post-programme reports are provided. (4.59)

Section 6. Appendices

Appendix I: Inspection team

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Sandra Fieldhouse	Team leader
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Andrew Rooke	Inspector
Maneer Afsar	Inspector
Francesca Cooney	Inspector
Jonathan Tickner	Inspector
Patricia Taflan	Researcher
Ellis Cowling	Researcher
Emma Seymour	Researcher
Alissa Redmond	Researcher
Steve Eley	Health services inspector
Ann Regan (CQC)	Pharmacist
Gary Turney	Care Quality Commission inspector
John Grimmer	Ofsted inspector
Gerard McGrath	Ofsted inspector
Alan Shaw	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, some journeys to the prison were long but most prisoners were positive about the way escort staff treated them. Reception, first night and induction procedures were good. Most prisoners felt safe and the number of incidents was low but too many reported feeling victimised by staff and prisoners. Levels of self-harm were low and support for prisoners considered to be vulnerable was good. Security was mostly well managed but some arrangements were disproportionate. Prisoners were negative about the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme. Few were segregated and the environment and relationships were good. Use of force was very low. Substance misuse services were in transition but prisoners were positive about the support provided. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Recommendations

Prisoners on long journeys should be given toilet breaks at least every two and a half hours. (1.4)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be given sufficient notice of planned transfers and information about the prison to which they are being transferred. (1.5)

Not achieved

The reception orderly should be a trained Listener or Insider. (1.10)

Achieved

A survey of prisoners should be completed to understand prisoners' perceptions of victimisation and the findings acted on. (1.19)

Not achieved

The standard of entries in assessment, care in custody and teamwork documentation should be of a consistently high quality. (1.29)

Not achieved

Support for the Listener scheme should be improved. (1.30)

Achieved

The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.33)

Not achieved

The prison should review its searching procedures, and ensure that strip- searches and the use of dogs are appropriately authorised, take place only if intelligence indicates a need and the rationale for their use is recorded. (1.41)

Not achieved

Moves between the IEP levels should take place as soon as a prisoner meets his agreed and recorded behaviour targets. (1.46)

Achieved

Prisoners' pay should not be determined by their IEP level. (1.47)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.38)

Arrangements for the monitoring and scrutiny of use of force should be established. (1.54)

Achieved

The segregation exercise yards should be re-modelled to provide a decent environment. (1.58)

Not achieved (recommendation repeated, 1.51)

Drug and alcohol group work programmes should be introduced as soon as possible. (1.68)

Achieved

Respect

Prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity.

At the last inspection, in 2013, living conditions and outside areas were good. Relationships were generally respectful and most prisoners knew a member of staff who would help them. Equality and diversity support was good for most, including the large number of older and disabled prisoners, but black and minority ethnic prisoners were negative about a range of important outcomes. Faith services were good. Complaints were well managed. Legal services support was limited. Health services were reasonable and many prisoners were positive about them. Mental health provision needed better integration and arrangements for supplying and collecting medications needed urgent attention. Despite efforts to provide a healthy diet many prisoners did not like the food and some were negative about the range of goods available from the canteen. Outcomes for prisoners were good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

The governor and head of health care should ensure that prisoners are not turned away from the medicine queue before they receive their medication, and dispensing arrangements should be reviewed to ensure that prisoners receive accurately dispensed medicines within a realistic timeframe. (S40)

Achieved

Recommendations

Toilets in single cells should be screened to afford suitable privacy. (2.13)

Achieved

Prisoners should have the opportunity to have agreed items of property sent in or exchanged. (2.14)

Partially achieved

Personal officers should be aware of the main issues identified in the sentence plans of those prisoners they are responsible for, and seek to discuss progress in achieving these targets at least on a monthly basis. (2.20)

Not achieved

The equality and diversity policy should provide specific guidance on how key responsibilities under each protected characteristic will be delivered for the population at Bure, and the EAT and associated action plan should address these protected characteristics consistently. (2.27)

Achieved

Prison monitoring should cover all protected characteristics and this full range of data should be used to inform the equality impact assessments of policies. (2.36, repeated recommendation 4.9)

Achieved

Staff should continue to engage with black and minority ethnic prisoners as a matter of priority to address their negative perceptions of their treatment. (2.37)

Not achieved

A specialist advice service for foreign nationals should be resumed to meet identified needs. (2.38)

Not achieved

The prison should provide adapted cell chairs for prisoners assessed as requiring them. (2.39)

Achieved

Facilities for legal visits should be improved and ensure adequate privacy. (2.53)

Achieved

There should be sufficient emergency equipment across the site and sufficient staff who know how to use it. (2.61)

Achieved

The governor and head of health care should ensure prisoners do not have to wait outdoors for their medicine. (2.62)

Achieved

The use of space in the health care department should be reviewed so a full range of physical and mental health services can be offered in a timely manner. (2.71)

Achieved

The NHS commissioner should review the funding arrangements so that the full range of smoking cessation services can be provided. (2.72)

Achieved

The timing of medication rounds should be reviewed to provide the best clinical outcomes for patients rather than to be the most convenient fit for the prison regime. (2.79)

Achieved

Action should be taken to reduce the overall waiting list for routine dental appointments. (2.84)

Achieved

There should be suitable air conditioning throughout the health care department. (2.85)

Achieved

Serco Health and Partnerships in Care should work together to implement a strongly integrated primary and secondary mental health service. (2.89)

Achieved

Prisoners meeting the criteria for transfer to a secure psychiatric unit should be transferred within two weeks. (2.90)

Achieved

Access to a wide range of counselling services should be available. (2.91)

Achieved

Breakfast packs should be issued on the morning of consumption. (2.97)

Not achieved

The views of the black and minority ethnic population should be regularly sought to ensure the canteen list reflects their needs. (2.103)

Achieved

Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2013, most prisoners had good time out of cell, and association and exercise were rarely cancelled. The leadership and management of learning and skills needed to improve. There was a significant shortfall in the number of activity places available. Reasonable use was made of the opportunities available and some achievements were good. There was an appropriate focus on employability but limited life skills support. Too much teaching was just satisfactory and opportunities were limited by the facilities available. The library and gym were good. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendations

The systems to quality assure teaching and learning and to appraise staff should be improved so that the overall quality of learning and skills achievement is adequate for all prisoners, regardless of their ability. (S41)

Achieved

The number of activity places for prisoners should be sufficient to meet the needs of the population fully. (S41)

Achieved

Recommendations

The strategies to help prisoners with learning support needs should be agreed, recorded, implemented and regularly reviewed. (3.20)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 3.27)

Individual learning plans should clearly state the prior learning and attainment of each prisoner and accurately record the development of their skills, progress and achievements. (3.21)

Partially achieved (recommendation repeated, 3.26)

The success rates for functional skills should be improved. (3.26)

Achieved

The resources for painting and decorating and for industrial cleaning should be improved. (3.27)

No longer relevant

Lessons should start on time. (3.28)

Achieved

The size of the library should be increased to better accommodate all functions of the service, including book clubs, DVD and CD displays and the provision of an appropriate area for quiet reading, study and research. (3.33)

Achieved

The library opening hours should be extended and there should be access in the evenings and at weekends, particularly for those in work or education. (3.34)

No longer relevant

The range of available team sport opportunities and health education training should be improved by filling the outstanding staff vacancy. (3.41)

Achieved

Resettlement

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

At the last inspection, in 2013, the strategic management of resettlement was reasonable and developing. Resettlement and offender management unit (OMU) workers were well integrated and the drop-in facility was an excellent initiative. All prisoners were seen on arrival and at the pre-release stage. Not all prisoners had a regular sentence planning board, some reviews were not up to date and supervision of high risk cases needed to improve. Public protection arrangements were robust. Reintegration work was generally well developed, with a good range of resettlement provision available, although support to help prisoners maintain contact with family and friends needed to improve. Prisoners complained about delays in accessing offending behaviour programmes but the limited number available were allocated according to a sensible set of criteria. There was some promising early work to address issues around denial. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

Main recommendation

There should be routine management oversight of assessment and sentence planning in all high risk of harm cases and those involving child protection issues to ensure everything possible is being done to manage and reduce the risk of re-offending. (S43)

Not achieved

Recommendations

The resettlement strategy should be reviewed in the light of the current needs assessment data, and the new strategy should include service evaluation and improvement activities. (4.6)

Achieved

All prisoners should receive a sentence planning review when there has been a significant change or event for example, a transfer. (4.14)

Not achieved

Management information on the work of the OMU, including quality assurance data, should be regularly analysed to improve performance. (4.15)

Not achieved

Prisoners should be informed when they are subject to telephone or mail monitoring, except in exceptional circumstances. (4.25)

Achieved

The prison should attend all MAPPA 3 meetings to which they are invited, either in person or via video link. (4.26)

Achieved

The type of accommodation used by prisoners and the success of placements should be monitored. (4.37)

Not achieved

There should be an opportunity for prisoners to learn money management skills prior to release. (4.42)

Achieved

There should be a dedicated lead staff member for the children and families pathway, who is responsible for setting strategic direction, coordinating delivery and monitoring performance. (4.52)

Achieved

The visiting environment should be made more comfortable and welcoming for both prisoners and visitors: adequate refreshments should be provided, prisoners should not have to wear bibs, and visits should start on time. (4.53)

Achieved

The volume of sex offender treatment available should be increased in line with assessed need. (4.60)

Achieved

Appendix III: Prison population profile

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

Status	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Sentenced		607	94.4
Recall		33	5.1
Convicted unsentenced			
Remand			
Civil prisoners			
Detainees		3	0.5
Total		643	100

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced		3	0.47
Less than six months			0.00
six months to less than 12 months		4	0.62
12 months to less than 2 years		12	1.87
2 years to less than 4 years		91	14.15
4 years to less than 10 years		307	47.74
10 years and over (not life)		94	14.62
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)		82	12.75
Life		50	7.78
Total		643	100

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here:	21	2.79
Under 21 years	0	0.00
21 years to 29 years	104	13.83
30 years to 39 years	135	17.95
40 years to 49 years	117	15.56
50 years to 59 years	124	16.49
60 years to 69 years	93	12.37
70 plus years	70	9.31
Please state maximum age here:	88	11.70
Total	643	100

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British		591	91.9
Foreign nationals		52	8.1
Total		643	100

Security category	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Uncategorised unsentenced			
Uncategorised sentenced			
Category A			
Category B			
Category C		635	98.8
Category D		8	1.2
Other			
Total		643	100

Ethnicity	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
White		533	82.9
British		485	75.4
Irish		13	2.0
Gypsy/Irish Traveller		10	1.6
Other white		25	3.8
Mixed		8	1.2
White and black Caribbean		2	0.3
White and black African		1	0.2
White and Asian		1	0.2
Other mixed		4	0.6
Asian or Asian British		38	5.9
Indian		11	1.7
Pakistani		10	1.6
Bangladeshi		7	1.1
Chinese		1	0.2
Other Asian		9	1.4
Black or black British		53	8.2
Caribbean		25	3.8
African		18	2.8
Other black		10	1.6
Other ethnic group		6	0.9
Arab		0	
Other ethnic group		6	0.9
Not stated		5	0.8
Total		643	100

Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist		7	1.09
Church of England		169	26.28
Roman Catholic		88	13.69
Other Christian denominations		102	15.86
Muslim		50	7.78
Sikh		5	0.78
Hindu		5	0.78
Buddhist		17	2.64
Jewish		9	1.40
Other		19	2.95
No religion		172	26.75
Total		643	100

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)		62	9.8
Total			

Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month			35	5.44
1 month to 3 months			50	7.78
3 months to six months			86	13.37
six months to 1 year			127	19.75
1 year to 2 years			142	22.08
2 years to 4 years			140	21.77
4 years or more			63	9.80
Total			643	100

Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry		2	0.3
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).		538	83.7
Total			

Main offence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person		1	0.2
Sexual offences		622	96.7
Burglary		2	0.3
Robbery		2	0.3
Theft and handling			
Fraud and forgery			
Drugs offences			
Other offences		16	2.5
Civil offences			
Offence not recorded /holding warrant			
Total		643	100

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 establishment⁸. Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. We also ensured that the proportion of black and minority ethnic prisoners in the sample reflected the proportion in the prison as a whole.

Distributing and collecting questionnaires

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to respondents individually. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the purpose of the survey and to answer respondents' questions. We also stressed the voluntary nature of the survey and provided assurances about confidentiality and the independence of the Inspectorate. This information is also provided in writing on the front cover of the questionnaire.

Our questionnaire is available in a number of different languages and via a telephone translation service for respondents who do not read English. Respondents with literacy difficulties were offered the option of an interview.

Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to seal their completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and either hand it back to a member of the research team at a specified time or leave it in their room for collection.

Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them.

Survey response

At the time of the survey on 27 March 2017 the prisoner population at HMP Bure was 643. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 201 prisoners.

We received a total of 184 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 92%. Eleven respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and six questionnaires were not returned.

⁸ 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.

Residential unit	Number of completed survey returns
1	24
2	22
3	25
4	25
5	27
6	25
7	35
Segregation unit	1

Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages, we present the survey results for HMP Bure.

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 differences⁹ 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 Bure 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 local prisons since April 2013.
- The current survey responses from HMP Bure in 2017 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP Bure 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 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.
- The current survey responses from HMP Bure in 2017 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other category B and C sex offender prisons.

⁹ 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

Q1.1	What wing or houseblock are you currently living on? See survey methodology.	
Q1.2	How old are you?	
	Under 21	0 (0%)
	21 - 29.....	32 (17%)
	30 - 39.....	41 (22%)
	40 - 49.....	29 (16%)
	50 - 59.....	34 (19%)
	60 - 69.....	24 (13%)
	70 and over	23 (13%)
Q1.3	Are you sentenced?	
	Yes	171 (93%)
	Yes - on recall.....	12 (7%)
	No - awaiting trial.....	0 (0%)
	No - awaiting sentence	0 (0%)
	No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)
Q1.4	How long is your sentence?	
	Not sentenced.....	0 (0%)
	Less than 6 months	3 (2%)
	6 months to less than 1 year	4 (2%)
	1 year to less than 2 years	16 (9%)
	2 years to less than 4 years	39 (21%)
	4 years to less than 10 years.....	57 (31%)
	10 years or more.....	31 (17%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	20 (11%)
	Life.....	12 (7%)
Q1.5	Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?	
	Yes	16 (9%)
	No.....	165 (91%)
Q1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	
	Yes	179 (99%)
	No.....	1 (1%)
Q1.7	Do you understand written English?	
	Yes	177 (98%)
	No.....	4 (2%)

Q1.8	What is your ethnic origin?		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	130 (72%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 0 (0%)
	White - Irish	5 (3%)	Asian or Asian British - other
	White - other.....	12 (7%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean .
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	10 (6%)	Mixed race - white and black African.....
	Black or black British - African	5 (3%)	Mixed race - white and Asian.....
	Black or black British - other	0 (0%)	Mixed race - other
	Asian or Asian British - Indian	3 (2%)	Arab
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	0 (0%)	Other ethnic group.....
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	2 (1%)	
Q1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?		
	Yes		5 (3%)
	No.....		177 (97%)
Q1.10	What is your religion?		
	None.....	47 (26%)	Hindu..... 3 (2%)
	Church of England	64 (35%)	Jewish..... 1 (1%)
	Catholic	23 (13%)	Muslim..... 14 (8%)
	Protestant.....	3 (2%)	Sikh..... 1 (1%)
	Other Christian denomination	12 (7%)	Other
	Buddhist	4 (2%)	9 (5%)
Q1.11	How would you describe your sexual orientation?		
	Heterosexual/ Straight		163 (90%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		9 (5%)
	Bisexual.....		9 (5%)
Q1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?		
	Yes		53 (29%)
	No.....		130 (71%)
Q1.13	Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?		
	Yes		26 (15%)
	No.....		153 (85%)
Q1.14	Is this your first time in prison?		
	Yes		127 (69%)
	No.....		56 (31%)
Q1.15	Do you have children under the age of 18?		
	Yes		65 (36%)
	No.....		118 (64%)

Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?		
	Less than 2 hours		53 (29%)
	2 hours or longer		119 (65%)
	Don't remember		12 (7%)

Q2.2	On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	53 (29%)
	Yes	97 (53%)
	No.....	26 (14%)
	Don't remember	6 (3%)
Q2.3	On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i>	53 (29%)
	Yes	10 (5%)
	No.....	116 (63%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes	127 (69%)
	No.....	44 (24%)
	Don't remember	13 (7%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes	133 (73%)
	No.....	43 (24%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	<i>Very well</i>	57 (31%)
	<i>Well</i>	79 (43%)
	<i>Neither</i>	30 (16%)
	<i>Badly</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Very badly</i>	3 (2%)
	Don't remember	7 (4%)
Q2.7	Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i>	107 (58%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i>	60 (33%)
	Don't remember	5 (3%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes	149 (81%)
	No.....	30 (16%)
	Don't remember	4 (2%)

Section 3: Reception, first night and induction

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	114 (62%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i>	56 (31%)
	Don't remember	13 (7%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes	159 (88%)
	No	15 (8%)
	Don't remember	6 (3%)

Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?		
	Very well.....	64 (35%)	
	Well.....	88 (48%)	
	Neither.....	20 (11%)	
	Badly.....	7 (4%)	
	Very badly.....	1 (1%)	
	Don't remember.....	3 (2%)	
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Loss of property.....	34 (19%)	Physical health.....
	Housing problems.....	11 (6%)	Mental health.....
	Contacting employers.....	2 (1%)	Needing protection from other prisoners..
	Contacting family.....	45 (25%)	Getting phone numbers.....
	Childcare.....	2 (1%)	Other.....
	Money worries.....	24 (13%)	Did not have any problems.....
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	35 (20%)	
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?		
	Yes.....	57 (31%)	
	No.....	68 (38%)	
	Did not have any problems.....	56 (31%)	
Q3.6	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Tobacco.....	84 (46%)	
	A shower.....	38 (21%)	
	A free telephone call.....	16 (9%)	
	Something to eat.....	92 (51%)	
	PIN phone credit.....	18 (10%)	
	Toiletries/ basic items.....	105 (58%)	
	Did not receive anything.....	27 (15%)	
Q3.7	When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	Chaplain.....	88 (48%)	
	Someone from health services.....	119 (65%)	
	A Listener/Samaritans.....	92 (51%)	
	Prison shop/ canteen.....	35 (19%)	
	Did not have access to any of these.....	38 (21%)	
Q3.8	When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)		
	What was going to happen to you.....	89 (51%)	
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	86 (49%)	
	How to make routine requests (applications).....	86 (49%)	
	Your entitlement to visits.....	66 (38%)	
	Health services.....	106 (60%)	
	Chaplaincy.....	83 (47%)	
	Not offered any information.....	32 (18%)	
Q3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?		
	Yes.....	156 (85%)	
	No.....	19 (10%)	
	Don't remember.....	9 (5%)	

Q3.10	How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	136 (74%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	9 (5%)
Q3.11	Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i>	18 (10%)
	<i>Yes</i>	100 (56%)
	<i>No</i>	48 (27%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	14 (8%)
Q3.12	How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i>	17 (9%)
	<i>Within the first week</i>	85 (46%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	68 (37%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	14 (8%)

Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to.....					
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	18 (10%)	47 (26%)	23 (13%)	23 (13%)	16 (9%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	14 (9%)	31 (19%)	20 (12%)	16 (10%)	13 (8%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	2 (1%)	5 (3%)	12 (8%)	9 (6%)	9 (6%)
						51 (29%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?					
	<i>Not had any letters</i>					45 (25%)
	<i>Yes</i>					59 (33%)
	<i>No</i>					75 (42%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?					
	<i>Yes</i>					102 (56%)
	<i>No</i>					7 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i>					72 (40%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:					
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	155 (86%)	24 (13%)	1 (1%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	173 (96%)	7 (4%)	1 (1%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	162 (90%)	16 (9%)	3 (2%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	133 (73%)	44 (24%)	4 (2%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	74 (41%)	48 (27%)	59 (33%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	138 (78%)	40 (22%)	0 (0%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	69 (38%)	48 (27%)	63 (35%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?					
	<i>Very good</i>					4 (2%)
	<i>Good</i>					68 (38%)
	<i>Neither</i>					50 (28%)
	<i>Bad</i>					33 (18%)
	<i>Very bad</i>					24 (13%)

Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i>	3 (2%)
	Yes.....	74 (42%)
	No.....	101 (57%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	
	Yes.....	126 (70%)
	No.....	7 (4%)
	Don't know.....	48 (27%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	
	Yes.....	107 (60%)
	No.....	12 (7%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	60 (34%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?	
	Yes.....	108 (59%)
	No.....	7 (4%)
	Don't know/ N/A.....	67 (37%)
Q4.10	How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i>	60 (33%)
	Very easy.....	41 (23%)
	Easy.....	47 (26%)
	Neither.....	6 (3%)
	Difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Don't know.....	18 (10%)

Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1	Is it easy to make an application?			
	Yes.....	157 (86%)		
	No.....	16 (9%)		
	Don't know.....	9 (5%)		
Q5.2	Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one		
		Yes		
		No		
	Are applications dealt with fairly?	14 (8%)	110 (64%)	48 (28%)
	Are applications dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	14 (8%)	84 (50%)	71 (42%)
Q5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?			
	Yes.....	105 (58%)		
	No.....	33 (18%)		
	Don't know.....	42 (23%)		
Q5.4	Please answer the following questions about complaints. (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)			
		Not made one		
		Yes		
		No		
	Are complaints dealt with fairly?	69 (39%)	48 (27%)	62 (35%)
	Are complaints dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	69 (39%)	38 (22%)	68 (39%)

Q5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	
	Yes	32 (18%)
	No.....	144 (82%)
Q5.6	How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i>	55 (31%)
	Very easy.....	10 (6%)
	Easy	42 (23%)
	Neither	45 (25%)
	Difficult.....	14 (8%)
	Very difficult.....	13 (7%)

Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1	Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	7 (4%)
	Yes	85 (47%)
	No	70 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	18 (10%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i>	7 (4%)
	Yes	65 (38%)
	No.....	83 (48%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	17 (10%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes	1 (1%)
	No.....	178 (99%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i>	164 (95%)
	Very well.....	2 (1%)
	Well	2 (1%)
	Neither	3 (2%)
	Badly.....	1 (1%)
	Very badly	0 (0%)

Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes	137 (77%)
	No.....	41 (23%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes	128 (72%)
	No.....	49 (28%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes	52 (29%)
	No.....	129 (71%)

Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>Never</i>	45 (25%)
	<i>Rarely</i>	57 (32%)
	<i>Some of the time</i>	45 (25%)
	<i>Most of the time</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>All of the time</i>	9 (5%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i>	24 (13%)
	<i>In the first week</i>	57 (32%)
	<i>More than a week</i>	77 (43%)
	<i>Don't remember</i>	21 (12%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Very helpful</i>	29 (17%)
	<i>Helpful</i>	53 (30%)
	<i>Neither</i>	32 (18%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i>	17 (10%)

Section 8: Safety

Q8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	64 (36%)
	<i>No</i>	116 (64%)
Q8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	
	<i>Yes</i>	26 (15%)
	<i>No</i>	150 (85%)
Q8.3	In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i>	116 (66%)
	<i>Everywhere</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Association areas</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>Reception area</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>At the gym</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i>	23 (13%)
	<i>At work</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>During movement</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>At education</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>At meal times</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>At health services</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Visits area</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>In wing showers</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>In gym showers</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i>	14 (8%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>In your cell</i>	13 (7%)
	<i>At religious services</i>	1 (1%)
Q8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	
	<i>Yes</i>	62 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	117 (65%)

Q8.5	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	32 (18%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken.....</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Medication.....</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs.....</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your age.....</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>You have a disability.....</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>You were new here.....</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	17 (9%)
	<i>Gang related issues.....</i>	5 (3%)
Q8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	
	Yes	51 (28%)
	No.....	128 (72%)
Q8.7	If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends)</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i>	24 (13%)
	<i>Medication.....</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>Drugs.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your nationality</i>	1 (1%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Your age.....</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability.....</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>You were new here.....</i>	6 (3%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i>	22 (12%)
	<i>Gang related issues.....</i>	4 (2%)
Q8.8	If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?	
	Not been victimised.....	97 (56%)
	Yes	34 (20%)
	No.....	42 (24%)

Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?:						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	7 (4%)	26 (15%)	70 (40%)	26 (15%)	38 (22%)	9 (5%)
	The nurse	7 (4%)	47 (27%)	83 (47%)	21 (12%)	14 (8%)	5 (3%)
	The dentist	30 (17%)	14 (8%)	33 (19%)	24 (14%)	39 (22%)	37 (21%)
Q9.2	What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?:						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	13 (7%)	38 (21%)	76 (42%)	24 (13%)	21 (12%)	7 (4%)
	The nurse	7 (4%)	53 (29%)	82 (46%)	25 (14%)	7 (4%)	6 (3%)
	The dentist	43 (24%)	29 (16%)	60 (34%)	25 (14%)	12 (7%)	7 (4%)
Q9.3	What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?						
	<i>Not been</i>						3 (2%)
	<i>Very good</i>						26 (14%)
	<i>Good</i>						83 (46%)
	<i>Neither</i>						35 (19%)
	<i>Bad</i>						23 (13%)
	<i>Very bad</i>						11 (6%)
Q9.4	Are you currently taking medication?						
	Yes						116 (64%)
	No						65 (36%)
Q9.5	If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?						
	<i>Not taking medication</i>						65 (36%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i>						92 (51%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i>						16 (9%)
	<i>No</i>						9 (5%)
Q9.6	Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?						
	Yes						63 (35%)
	No						119 (65%)
Q9.7	Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i>						119 (68%)
	Yes						32 (18%)
	No						25 (14%)

Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	24 (13%)
	No	158 (87%)
Q10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	
	Yes	24 (13%)
	No	158 (87%)

Q10.3	Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	10 (6%)
	Easy.....	17 (9%)
	Neither.....	9 (5%)
	Difficult.....	6 (3%)
	Very difficult.....	7 (4%)
	Don't know.....	132 (73%)
Q10.4	Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?	
	Very easy.....	9 (5%)
	Easy.....	14 (8%)
	Neither.....	11 (6%)
	Difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	8 (4%)
	Don't know.....	136 (75%)
Q10.5	Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	2 (1%)
	No.....	179 (99%)
Q10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	
	Yes.....	6 (3%)
	No.....	174 (97%)
Q10.7	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem.....	154 (88%)
	Yes.....	17 (10%)
	No.....	5 (3%)
Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?	
	Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....	158 (88%)
	Yes.....	16 (9%)
	No.....	6 (3%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help.....	151 (87%)
	Yes.....	16 (9%)
	No.....	7 (4%)

Section II: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	19 (11%)	29 (17%)	71 (41%)	25 (14%)	24 (14%)	6 (3%)
	Vocational or skills training	36 (22%)	16 (10%)	49 (30%)	28 (17%)	24 (14%)	13 (8%)
	Education (including basic skills)	24 (14%)	26 (15%)	72 (43%)	27 (16%)	14 (8%)	5 (3%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	61 (36%)	13 (8%)	30 (18%)	28 (17%)	19 (11%)	18 (11%)

Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)				
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i>				31 (17%)
	Prison job				121 (67%)
	Vocational or skills training.....				20 (11%)
	Education (including basic skills).....				52 (29%)
	Offending behaviour programmes				13 (7%)
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	21 (13%)	43 (26%)	84 (51%)	16 (10%)
	Vocational or skills training	34 (24%)	45 (32%)	45 (32%)	16 (11%)
	Education (including basic skills)	24 (16%)	69 (45%)	49 (32%)	12 (8%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	46 (33%)	36 (26%)	40 (29%)	17 (12%)
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				15 (8%)
	<i>Never</i>				14 (8%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i>				35 (19%)
	<i>About once a week</i>				56 (31%)
	<i>More than once a week</i>				60 (33%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?				
	<i>Don't use it</i>				26 (15%)
	<i>Yes</i>				87 (49%)
	<i>No</i>				66 (37%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				52 (29%)
	<i>0</i>				40 (22%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				33 (18%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				46 (25%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				10 (6%)
Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				14 (8%)
	<i>0</i>				10 (5%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				56 (31%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				50 (27%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				52 (29%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?				
	<i>Don't want to go</i>				23 (13%)
	<i>0</i>				14 (8%)
	<i>1 to 2</i>				18 (10%)
	<i>3 to 5</i>				24 (13%)
	<i>More than 5</i>				100 (56%)

Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i>	21 (12%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i>	32 (18%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i>	35 (19%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i>	34 (19%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i>	29 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	10 (6%)

Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	61 (35%)
	<i>No</i>	115 (65%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i>	74 (41%)
	<i>No</i>	107 (59%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i>	39 (22%)
	<i>No</i>	141 (78%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i>	36 (20%)
	<i>Very easy</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Easy</i>	16 (9%)
	<i>Neither</i>	8 (4%)
	<i>Difficult</i>	35 (19%)
	<i>Very difficult</i>	71 (39%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	3 (2%)

Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	152 (86%)
	<i>No</i>	24 (14%)
Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>No contact</i>	36 (21%)
	<i>Letter</i>	56 (33%)
	<i>Phone</i>	61 (36%)
	<i>Visit</i>	36 (21%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i>	159 (90%)
	<i>No</i>	18 (10%)

Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Yes</i>	107 (61%)
	<i>No</i>	67 (39%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	67 (39%)
	<i>Very involved</i>	11 (6%)
	<i>Involved</i>	37 (21%)
	<i>Neither</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Not very involved</i>	19 (11%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i>	31 (18%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	67 (40%)
	<i>Nobody</i>	42 (25%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i>	47 (28%)
	<i>Offender manager</i>	31 (18%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i>	12 (7%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	67 (39%)
	<i>Yes</i>	53 (30%)
	<i>No</i>	27 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	27 (16%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	67 (38%)
	<i>Yes</i>	17 (10%)
	<i>No</i>	59 (34%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	32 (18%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i>	67 (39%)
	<i>Yes</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>No</i>	35 (20%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	47 (27%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	<i>Yes</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>No</i>	61 (34%)
	<i>Don't know</i>	110 (61%)
Q13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?	
	<i>Yes</i>	20 (11%)
	<i>No</i>	158 (89%)

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

	<i>Do not need help</i>	Yes	No
Employment	51 (29%)	33 (19%)	89 (51%)
Accommodation	52 (29%)	31 (18%)	94 (53%)
Benefits	41 (23%)	42 (24%)	92 (53%)
Finances	46 (27%)	33 (19%)	91 (54%)
Education	58 (34%)	32 (19%)	79 (47%)
Drugs and alcohol	79 (48%)	27 (16%)	59 (36%)

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

<i>Not sentenced</i>	0 (0%)
Yes	89 (54%)
No.....	76 (46%)

Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMP Bure 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 Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 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				
Number of completed questionnaires returned		184	6,527	184	177
SECTION 1: General information					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	2%	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	9%	7%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	7%	4%	1%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	11%	8%	11%	31%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	11%	9%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	98%	98%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	19%	26%	19%	23%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	5%	3%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	14%	8%	9%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	10%	4%	10%	15%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	29%	22%	29%	31%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	15%	6%	15%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	69%	39%	69%	57%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	36%	51%	36%	40%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	65%	45%	65%	83%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	75%	74%	75%	78%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	8%	8%	8%	13%
2.4	Was the van clean?	69%	60%	69%	69%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	73%	78%	73%	77%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	73%	74%	77%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	60%	59%	61%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	8%	12%	8%	18%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81%	84%	81%	88%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 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				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	62%	53%	62%	58%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	85%	88%	86%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	83%	75%	83%	85%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	69%	62%	69%	63%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	19%	19%	13%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	6%	13%	6%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	2%	1%	3%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	25%	18%	25%	27%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	2%	1%	2%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	13%	13%	13%	14%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	16%	20%	18%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	18%	13%	18%	17%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	18%	19%	18%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	3%	6%	3%	3%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%	15%	20%	27%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	46%	36%	46%	48%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	46%	75%	46%	62%
3.6	A shower?	21%	28%	21%	20%
3.6	A free telephone call?	9%	42%	9%	14%
3.6	Something to eat?	51%	57%	51%	52%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	10%	51%	10%	14%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	58%	48%	58%	49%

Key to tables

Main comparator and comparator to last time

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	48%	53%	48%	39%
3.7	Someone from health services?	65%	70%	65%	68%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	51%	33%	51%	33%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	19%	25%	19%	21%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	51%	50%	51%	44%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	49%	40%	49%	44%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	49%	44%	49%	40%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	38%	39%	38%	38%
3.8	Health services?	60%	52%	60%	58%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	47%	48%	47%	51%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	85%	79%	85%	84%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	90%	90%	98%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	62%	59%	62%	54%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	91%	84%	91%	94%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	37%	43%	37%	51%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	28%	45%	28%	42%
4.1	Get bail information?	5%	14%	5%	10%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	38%	33%	42%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	56%	40%	56%	63%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	86%	66%	86%	77%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	90%	96%	97%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	90%	68%	90%	88%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	73%	63%	73%	87%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	41%	33%	41%	47%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	78%	68%	78%	72%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	38%	22%	38%	47%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	40%	31%	40%	25%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	48%	42%	39%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	70%	55%	70%	65%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	60%	52%	60%	52%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59%	58%	59%	56%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	49%	49%	49%	51%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	80%	86%	86%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	70%	55%	70%	63%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	54%	38%	54%	46%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	58%	58%	63%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	44%	33%	44%	35%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	36%	27%	36%	38%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	19%	18%	18%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	29%	29%	29%	36%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	47%	48%	47%	49%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	45%	38%	37%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	1%	9%	1%	4%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	50%	36%	50%	50%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	79%	77%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72%	73%	72%	81%
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%	32%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	11%	21%	11%	22%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	87%	62%	87%	83%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	55%	62%	55%	59%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 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				
SECTION 8: Safety					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	36%	40%	36%	31%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	17%	15%	14%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	35%	28%	35%	32%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	11%	20%	16%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	9%	5%	6%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	16%	18%	14%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	8%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	4%	2%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	5%	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	5%	1%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%	3%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	6%	2%	6%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	6%	3%	6%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	3%	7%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	5%	5%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	4%	10%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	5%	3%	2%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		

SECTION 8: Safety continued

		HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 2013
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	28%	29%	36%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	10%	11%	15%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	4%	2%	4%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	12%	14%	16%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	4%	1%	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?	2%	4%	2%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	3%	2%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	3%	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	5%	1%	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	3%	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	4%	3%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	4%	13%	14%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%	2%	2%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	45%	40%	45%	49%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 2013
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
SECTION 9: Health services					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	55%	28%	55%	39%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	74%	49%	74%	74%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	27%	14%	27%	13%
	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?	69%	48%	69%	66%
9.2	The nurse?	78%	57%	78%	77%
9.2	The dentist?	67%	43%	67%	50%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	61%	42%	61%	65%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	64%	50%	64%	55%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	92%	83%	92%	95%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	35%	35%	35%	27%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	56%	50%	56%	58%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	13%	26%	13%	19%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	13%	16%	13%	25%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	15%	45%	15%	12%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	13%	26%	13%	7%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	1%	11%	1%	2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	7%	3%	6%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	78%	60%	78%	68%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	62%	73%	73%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	70%	75%	70%	93%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 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				
SECTION 11: Activities					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	58%	49%	58%	40%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	39%	42%	39%	37%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	58%	56%	58%	53%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	24%	25%	11%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	67%	59%	67%	61%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	11%	16%	11%	27%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	29%	21%	29%	46%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	11%	7%	12%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	87%	84%	87%	89%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	30%	43%	30%	46%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	76%	75%	76%	84%
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?	42%	57%	42%	52%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	84%	80%	84%	90%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	53%	58%	53%	57%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	67%	71%	67%	73%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	39%	49%	39%	50%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	65%	41%	65%	59%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	49%	45%	49%	57%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	33%	31%	28%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56%	54%	56%	52%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	56%	62%	56%	64%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	16%	17%	16%	19%
SECTION 12: Friends and family					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	35%	33%	35%	32%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	41%	43%	41%	38%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	21%	22%	21%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	16%	28%	16%	15%

Main comparator and comparator to last time

Key to tables

		HMP Bure 2017	Category C training prisons comparator	HMP Bure 2017	HMP Bure 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				
SECTION 13: Preparation for release					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	86%	80%	86%	95%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	25%	36%	25%	26%
13.2	Contact by letter?	38%	33%	38%	38%
13.2	Contact by phone?	42%	26%	42%	42%
13.2	Contact by visit?	25%	31%	25%	30%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	90%	75%	90%	93%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	61%	61%	61%	71%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	45%	54%	45%	52%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	42%	46%	42%	36%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	47%	38%	47%	54%
13.6	Offender manager?	31%	27%	31%	36%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	17%	12%	17%	14%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	12%	15%	12%	17%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	50%	61%	50%	62%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	16%	20%	16%	21%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	23%	28%	23%	29%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	6%	6%	7%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	11%	15%	11%	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?	27%	34%	27%	40%
13.12	Accommodation?	25%	36%	25%	43%
13.12	Benefits?	31%	37%	31%	50%
13.12	Finances?	27%	27%	27%	32%
13.12	Education?	29%	33%	29%	38%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	31%	41%	31%	43%
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?	54%	54%	54%	69%

Diversity analysis



Key question responses (ethnicity) HMP Bure 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

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		34	147
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	34%	3%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	91%	99%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)		
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	35%	1%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	20%	32%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	6%	17%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	77%	68%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	62%	77%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	53%	60%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	79%	91%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	74%	86%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	59%	71%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	71%	64%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	82%	86%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	88%	92%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	50%	33%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	85%	86%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	97%	95%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	49%	39%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	27%	43%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	39%	42%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	59%	72%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	80%	54%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	74%	57%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	80%	88%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	51%	60%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	30%	52%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	50%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	0%	1%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	75%	78%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	85%	70%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	3%	13%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	88%	86%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	47%	33%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	24%	12%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	37%	34%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	19%	18%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	13%	0%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	13%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	6%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	3%	8%

Diversity analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	24%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	15%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	3%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	51%	55%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	64%	75%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	47%	68%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	26%	37%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	16%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	53%	70%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	14%	10%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	32%	28%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	3%	8%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	59%	65%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	41%	29%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	32%	62%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	61%	55%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	9%	17%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	44%	40%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	24%	22%

Diversity Analysis



Key question responses (disability, age over 50) HMP Bure 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					
Number of completed questionnaires returned		53	130	81	102
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%	100%	100%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	6%	10%	4%	13%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	98%	100%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	13%	21%	11%	24%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	6%	2%	1%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	9%	7%	4%	10%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	-	-	36%	24%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	16%	14%	23%	8%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	68%	71%	71%	69%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	76%	78%	71%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	62%	57%	65%	53%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	86%	89%	92%	85%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	77%	85%	87%	80%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	84%	63%	68%	70%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	60%	67%	59%	70%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	72%	90%	84%	85%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	93%	85%	94%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	36%	42%	32%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	85%	87%	86%	86%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	89%	98%	95%	96%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	31%	45%	35%	45%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	39%	40%	41%	40%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	40%	42%	43%	40%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	66%	72%	64%	75%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	65%	57%	61%	59%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	57%	60%	56%	61%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	85%	87%	85%	87%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	60%	58%	60%	58%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	39%	50%	40%	52%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	38%	31%	43%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	2%	0%	0%	1%
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	68%	80%	79%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	62%	76%	70%	74%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	12%	11%	8%	14%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	80%	90%	81%	91%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	47%	31%	35%	36%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	18%	13%	16%	13%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	48%	29%	34%	35%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	23%	16%	17%	19%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	4%	2%	1%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	8%	2%	1%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	2%	3%	1%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	12%	4%	13%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	23%	0%	8%	6%

Diversity Analysis

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Consider themselves to have a disability	Do not consider themselves to have a disability	Prisoners aged 50 and over	Prisoners under the age of 50
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	25%	24%	31%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	21%	11%	14%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	2%	2%	1%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	1%	0%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	6%	2%	6%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	13%	1%	4%	5%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	59%	53%	56%	53%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	76%	72%	73%	74%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	87%	56%	82%	50%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	49%	29%	22%	45%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	15%	15%	8%	20%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	52%	74%	60%	74%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	8%	13%	12%	11%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	33%	28%	25%	32%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	8%	7%	8%	7%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	52%	70%	57%	70%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	15%	38%	11%	45%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	47%	60%	57%	56%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	52%	57%	43%	65%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	15%	16%	17%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	40%	41%	34%	47%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	21%	22%	14%	28%



Prisoner survey responses HMP Bure 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 Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
Number of completed questionnaires returned		184	1121
SECTION 1: General information			
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	0%	0%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	100%	100%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	6%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	4%	2%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	11%	17%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	9%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	100%	99%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	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.)	19%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	3%	3%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	8%	10%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	10%	10%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	29%	29%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	15%	11%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	69%	63%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	36%	41%
SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts			
On your most recent journey here:			
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	65%	57%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:			
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	75%	79%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	8%	12%
2.4	Was the van clean?	69%	70%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	73%	80%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	74%	79%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	59%	66%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	8%	12%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	81%	86%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HIMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	62%	60%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	88%	89%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	83%	85%
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	69%	57%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	15%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	6%	6%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	1%	1%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	25%	17%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	1%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	13%	11%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	20%	17%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	18%	14%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	18%	18%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	3%	2%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	20%	15%
	For those with problems:		
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	46%	47%
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	46%	62%
3.6	A shower?	21%	25%
3.6	A free telephone call?	9%	47%
3.6	Something to eat?	51%	57%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	10%	41%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	58%	54%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	48%	49%
3.7	Someone from health services?	65%	75%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	51%	47%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	19%	28%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	51%	57%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	49%	52%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	49%	56%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	38%	48%
3.8	Health services?	60%	63%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	47%	55%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	85%	87%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	90%	95%
	For those who have been on an induction course:		
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	62%	71%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	91%	89%
SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	37%	48%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	28%	45%
4.1	Get bail information?	5%	10%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	32%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	56%	54%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	86%	81%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	96%	95%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	90%	87%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	73%	75%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	41%	47%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	78%	78%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	38%	33%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	40%	56%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	42%	63%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	70%	77%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	60%	61%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	59%	62%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	49%	54%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HIMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 5: Applications and complaints			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	86%	87%
	For those who have made an application:		
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	70%	70%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	54%	49%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	58%	62%
	For those who have made a complaint:		
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	44%	44%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	36%	37%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	18%	14%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	29%	37%
SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	47%	58%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	38%	50%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	1%	4%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	50%	57%
SECTION 7: Relationships with staff			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	77%	84%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72%	80%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	29%	39%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	11%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	87%	78%
	For those with a personal officer:		
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	55%	66%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	36%	29%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	15%	10%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	35%	26%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	11%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	5%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	3%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	18%	15%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	6%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	6%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	7%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	10%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	3%	1%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 8: Safety continued			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	29%	26%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	9%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	2%	1%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	13%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	2%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	1%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	0%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	13%	8%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	1%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:		
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	45%	44%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 9: Health services			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	55%	42%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	74%	63%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	27%	19%
	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?	69%	67%
9.2	The nurse?	78%	72%
9.2	The dentist?	67%	52%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	61%	58%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	64%	62%
	For those currently taking medication:		
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	92%	93%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	35%	35%
	For those who have problems:		
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	56%	59%
SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	13%	13%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	13%	14%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	15%	19%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	13%	8%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	1%	2%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	3%	4%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:		
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	78%	71%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	73%	70%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:		
10.9	Was the support helpful?	70%	88%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 11: Activities			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	58%	53%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	39%	45%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	58%	59%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	25%	28%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	67%	64%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	11%	16%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	29%	26%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	7%	14%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	87%	87%
	For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	30%	51%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	76%	75%
	For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	42%	61%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	84%	83%
	For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:		
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	53%	65%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	67%	69%
	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?	39%	58%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	65%	55%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	49%	53%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	26%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	56%	46%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	56%	66%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	16%	23%
SECTION 12: Friends and family			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	35%	45%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	41%	33%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	22%	13%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	16%	26%

Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP Bure 2017	Category B and C sex offender prisons comparator
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
SECTION 13: Preparation for release			
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	86%	94%
	For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:		
13.2	No contact?	25%	23%
13.2	Contact by letter?	38%	36%
13.2	Contact by phone?	42%	37%
13.2	Contact by visit?	25%	38%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	90%	89%
	For those who are sentenced:		
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	61%	76%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	45%	54%
	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:		
13.6	Nobody?	42%	30%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	47%	51%
13.6	Offender manager?	31%	39%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	17%	19%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	12%	20%
	For those with a sentence plan:		
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	50%	61%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	16%	15%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	23%	27%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	6%	4%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	11%	20%
	For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:		
13.12	Employment?	27%	38%
13.12	Accommodation?	25%	35%
13.12	Benefits?	31%	39%
13.12	Finances?	27%	31%
13.12	Education?	29%	35%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	31%	39%
	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?	54%	64%