

Report on an announced inspection of

# **HMP & YOI Doncaster**

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**10–21 July 2017**

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



Crown copyright 2017

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

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

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at the address below or: [hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:hmiprisons.enquiries@hmiprisons.gsi.gov.uk)

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

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

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
About this inspection and report	9
Summary	11
Section 1. Safety	19
Section 2. Respect	29
Section 3. Purposeful activity	41
Section 4. Resettlement	47
Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice	55
Section 6. Appendices	61
Appendix I: Inspection team	61
Appendix II: Progress on recommendations from the last report	63
Appendix III: Prison population profile	71
Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	75

### **Glossary of terms**

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

# Introduction

HMP & YOI Doncaster is a category B local and resettlement prison situated near to the centre of Doncaster, and is operated by Serco. At the time of the inspection the prison held just over 1,100 adult and young adult males. The prison was last inspected in October 2015. In view of the significant concerns raised by that inspection and reported on in January 2016, it was decided by HM Inspectorate of Prisons that the establishment should be the subject of an announced inspection in July 2017. This report details the findings of that inspection, and records that while there has been significant progress in some areas, much remains to be done.

The summary section of this report gives a flavour of life in HMP & YOI Doncaster, but I would invite the reader to look at the report itself to gain a much fuller understanding of what has been achieved and not achieved. In this introduction I shall focus on the major concerns that arose from this inspection, but in so doing it is only right to give due credit to the leadership and staff at Doncaster whose hard work, in less than two years since the last inspection, has produced some impressive results. An indication of the very real effort that has obviously been directed towards securing improvement is that 32 out of the 58 recommendations made at the last inspection have been achieved or partially achieved in the intervening period.

Too many prisoners felt unsafe, and although levels of violence had reduced significantly, they were still too high. There had been some very good work done to reduce violence but this needed to continue and all elements of the violence reduction policy needed to be implemented. There were a large number of prisoners who were assessed as being at risk of suicide and self-harm, and the prison needed to ensure that there was a consistently high level of care afforded to them. In light of the high levels of self-harm, it was reassuring to see that the establishment had taken recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman (PPO) seriously.

A major concern at the last inspection was that some staff struggled to maintain control on the residential units. This time we found a more stable prison overall, but staff supervision on some of the units remained a concern. As a consequence, it was sometimes the case that proper professional boundaries were not maintained, and prisoners did not always follow rules or instructions. This inevitably led to inconsistency and was unsettling for prisoners and staff alike. Clearly, staffing levels were a factor in this, but it needed to be addressed as a serious issue so that inappropriate behaviour by prisoners is challenged in a confident manner.

There was one issue which, to my mind, overshadowed many of the other challenges facing HMP & YOI Doncaster, and it has come about as a result of a change in the profile of the population at the prison. Over the course of the previous year, the number of men on remand for, or convicted of, sex offences had trebled, and many of them were longer-term, high-risk offenders. I was told that this was a deliberate policy in order to help to stabilise the prison in light of the serious problems with violence that had been identified at the last inspection. However, the support, offender management and programmes intended to reduce the risk both in custody and on release presented by this population were not present. In effect, this large cohort of men was being denied the opportunity to make progress. While it is perhaps understandable that, as a matter of policy, it might be decided that a prison should have a particular population profile, this should not be done in such a way that offender management of those prisoners is neglected.

A great deal has been achieved at Doncaster, and the challenge for the leadership of the prison now is to ensure that those achievements do not prove to be either fragile or transitory. The improvements need to be consolidated and built upon.

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

September 2017



# Fact page

**Task of the establishment**

HMP & YOI Doncaster is a category B local and resettlement prison accommodating young adult (18–21 years) and adult male prisoners.

**Prison status**

Private, managed by Serco

**Region/Department**

Yorkshire & Humberside

**Number held**

1,115

**Certified normal accommodation**

738

**Operational capacity**

1,145

**Date of last full inspection**

October 2015

**Brief history**

Built by the Prison Service on the site of a former power station on an island in Doncaster town centre, the prison opened in June 1994.

**Short description of residential units**

HMP & YOI Doncaster has three large house blocks, each with four wings. Two units within the health care building provide additional space for prisoners needing social care support, and the segregation unit has 22 cells.

**Name of director**

Jerry Spencer

**Escort contractor**

GEOAmey

**Health service provider**

Nottingham Healthcare NHS Trust

**Learning and skills providers**

Novus

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Sarah Crossland

**Community rehabilitation company (CRC)**

South Yorkshire CRC





# About this inspection and report

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

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

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

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

A4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. There are four possible judgements: In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

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

# Summary

## Safety

S1 *Early days processes were welcoming and had a good focus on safety. Peer supporters provided valuable additional support. Too many prisoners felt unsafe. Levels of violence had reduced but remained too high, and higher than in similar prisons. The strategic and operational focus on identifying and tackling violence had improved and action was being taken to make the prison safer. Levels of self-harm were high and processes to support those at risk of self-harm required improvement. The prison was more stable overall, but the lack of staff supervision and control on some house blocks remained a concern. The number of adjudications was similar to that elsewhere but the number of incidents of force, although reduced, was still higher than at other prisons. Managerial oversight of use of force was now good. Prisoners stayed too long in segregation, with a poor regime. Substance misuse services had improved but were still not good enough. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S2 *At the last inspection in October 2015 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Doncaster were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 19 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and 11 had not been achieved.*

S3 The reception area was well maintained and welcoming. Most prisoners said that they were treated well there, and the processes we observed were efficient and thorough. Private interviews with prisoners were well focused on wellbeing and safety.

S4 Most new prisoners moved relatively swiftly to the first night centre, where they were greeted by a team of trained Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life), who provided some key initial information to assist in settling them in on their first night. Cells in the first night centre were reasonably clean and the Insiders ensured that they were all well equipped. Staff conducted a further safety interview before lock-up.

S5 A newly introduced comprehensive two-day induction programme was delivered by the Insiders, along with Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners), 'buddies' (prisoners who provide informal support across a range of issues) and staff. A new tracking system monitored induction completions and there was a system of follow-up contacts to provide ongoing support.

S6 In our survey, too many prisoners, and more than at similar prisons, said that they felt unsafe and were victimised by other prisoners. Levels of violence had reduced sharply but they were still too high, and too many assaults were serious. There was a good, and improved, strategic and operational focus on violence reduction. The collection and analysis of data to help to identify patterns and trends of violence were effective, and links between safer custody staff and the security department were very good. The recently reviewed violence reduction policy was comprehensive and many actions to reduce violence were being delivered, although some key elements had not yet been fully implemented. The social responsibility unit (SRU), which aimed to move prisoners involved in antisocial behaviour away from the mainstream prison population and address their behaviour, had potential but had not been fully implemented. Most prisoners on the SRU were kept in isolation, spending nearly all day locked in their cells, without adequate safeguards in place.

- S7 The regime for vulnerable prisoners on house block I was reasonably good and these prisoners were kept safe.
- S8 There had been two self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection. A range of actions had been implemented in response to the recommendations from the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman, and actions from previous reports were also monitored regularly, to ensure ongoing compliance.
- S9 Levels of self-harm were much higher than at similar prisons. At the time of the inspection, there were 66 prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management for prisoners at risk of suicide or self-harm, which was exceptionally high, and staff struggled to provide adequate support. Managerial focus on self-harm had led to some improvements but the quality of some ACCT documents remained inadequate, with poor care plans and poorly attended reviews.
- S10 The use of constant supervision cells on the segregation unit was inappropriate for prisoners in crisis. There were too few Listeners to meet the needs of the prison but the many buddies on each house block provided some informal support for issues such as feelings of low mood and potential self-harm.
- S11 Procedural security, including searching and supervision of movements, had improved and was proportionate to the prevailing risks. Security-led meetings were given a high priority and attendance had improved. The prison was suitably focused on their main risks of violence and drugs. The management of security intelligence was good. The number of security-related incidents had reduced considerably, and the prison was more stable and controlled overall, but the supervision of prisoners on some of the house blocks was often poor and remained a concern.
- S12 Intelligence, finds and mandatory drug testing results indicated that drugs, particularly new psychoactive substances (NPS; new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects), were easily available. In our survey, over half of prisoners said that it was easy to obtain drugs at the prison, and almost a third that alcohol was easily available. Supply reduction interventions had been strengthened, and there was an NPS-specific strategy.
- S13 Despite recent efforts to revitalise the incentives and earned privileges scheme, it was not yet used effectively by staff to manage behaviour. However, an innovative house block incentives scheme, designed to encourage collective good behaviour, had begun to engage prisoners.
- S14 The number of adjudications carried out was similar to that at comparable prisons but too many, particularly those for violent offences, were dismissed or not proceeded with, and few referrals to the police resulted in a charge. This undermined the prison's attempts to tackle antisocial behaviour.
- S15 The number of incidents involving the use of force had reduced but was still higher than we find at similar prisons. Managerial oversight had improved and was good. Written accounts from officers usually demonstrated that de-escalation was used as a preferred option. The use of special accommodation had reduced considerably and authorisation was properly recorded.
- S16 Relationships between staff and prisoners on the segregation unit were reasonably good but the regime was impoverished and the unit was consistently full. Reintegration planning was,

on the whole, inadequate and we had concerns about the length of time that a large number of prisoners had been kept in isolation.

- S17 The range of psychosocial support for prisoners with substance misuse issues had improved but remained inadequate. The focus was appropriately on continuity of care into the community. The recovery unit was not functioning effectively and not all prisoners who required stabilisation support were located on the stabilisation unit. Clinical support had generally improved but was still not sufficiently flexible.

## Respect

S18 *Living conditions and access to basic essentials had improved and were mostly good. Most prisoners said that staff treated them respectfully, but staff were stretched and some failed to challenge poor behaviour. Equality and diversity provision had improved recently, but in our survey prisoners from some minority groups reported less favourable treatment than others, and in some cases needs were not met. Faith provision was adequate. Complaints were well managed. Health services had improved considerably and were reasonably good overall. The food provided was good. **Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.***

S19 *At the last inspection in October 2015 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Doncaster were poor against this healthy prison test. We made 20 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, three had been partially achieved and seven had not been achieved.*

S20 Living conditions had improved substantially since the previous inspection. Outside and communal areas were generally clean and most cells were in a decent condition. Many prisoners took pride in their cells. Access to showers, televisions, kettles, clean bedding and a weekly laundry service was good. However, too many toilets were unacceptably dirty, and on some house blocks access to prison-issue clothing and cleaning materials was disorganised and inconsistent. Staff often took too long to respond to cell call bells. Prisoners continued to benefit from in-cell telephones, and the electronic kiosk ('ATM') system, which allowed prisoners to manage many aspects of their lives, was being developed further. The prisoner-run 'prisoner assist line' (PAL) telephone line offered advice and information to prisoners and was well used.

S21 In our survey, most prisoners, and more than at similar prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection, said that staff treated them respectfully. We saw some very good and supportive interactions between staff and prisoners. Continuing staff shortages resulted in a lack of staff presence on the house blocks. Residential staff were stretched and sometimes worked alone. At times, staff struggled to meet the needs of prisoners. Too often, poor behaviour from prisoners went unchallenged and staff failed to maintain suitable boundaries of behaviour. The prison had recognised these deficiencies and established an innovative cultural leader programme, to instil confidence in staff at all grades; this looked promising but it was too early to judge its effectiveness.

S22 There was effective prisoner consultation through the weekly prisoner information and activity committee (PIAC) meeting, which was chaired by the director.

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

- S23 There was a clear structure for governance and accountability for equality. The director took an active lead, and the equality team had been strengthened.
- S24 Forums had only recently started for all protected characteristics. Equality monitoring was too limited and often too outdated to be of use. Reported incidents of discrimination were investigated appropriately. There had been a few good events – for example, celebrating Traveller traditions – but otherwise there was not sufficient visible affirmation of diversity.
- S25 In our survey, black and minority ethnic prisoners did not differ greatly from others in their perceptions of treatment and conditions but Muslim prisoners were less positive, especially on issues of safety, and many felt that staff did not understand their needs well.
- S26 Support for foreign national prisoners was well established, with good use of professional telephone interpreting services but only a limited amount of translated material.
- S27 In our survey, prisoners with disabilities were particularly negative about their treatment. We found that prisoners assessed as requiring formal social care were well cared for but care for others was more limited; insufficient reasonable adjustments had been made and residential staff were not always aware of the care needs of these prisoners.
- S28 Older prisoners felt well provided for. The number of young adults had grown and a recent survey has been carried out, and there were some actions planned in consequence.
- S29 Gay and bisexual prisoners spoke highly of management support, although less highly of frontline staff. Transgender prisoners were settled in locations where they felt reasonably safe and supported, with adequate provision for their needs.
- S30 There was an almost complete chaplaincy team, which was meeting most core needs of faith groups for worship and instruction. They saw all those who had been put on an ACCT, and were gradually becoming more engaged with the broader life of the prison.
- S31 The handling of complaints had improved markedly. Replies were timely in almost all cases, quality assurance was thorough and replies were courteous and to the point.
- S32 There was better provision of information and support on bail, appeals and other legal issues than at many prisons.
- S33 Health services had improved, and working relationships with other prison departments were better. A wide range of primary care services was available and waiting lists were generally short, although too many patients failed to attend appointments. The management of prisoners with long-term conditions had improved, with several specially trained staff available to patients. The 24-hour in-house paramedic service was an example of good practice.
- S34 Pharmacy services were underdeveloped. Some patients experienced delays in receiving their medications and some tradable medicines were prescribed in-possession. Medicines administration was, at times, disorderly. Dental provision was of a good standard and waiting times were acceptable. Mental health services had improved and mental health awareness training for custody staff had been established. However, too many prisoners waiting for a transfer to secure psychiatric facilities were inappropriately located in segregation, and transfers took too long. Prisoners had insufficient access to counselling. Social care provision was very good, with a dedicated residential unit.
- S35 In our survey, prisoners were much more positive than at similar prisons about the food provided, and the food we tasted was good. Mealtime queues were poorly supervised.

- S36 The on-site shop ordering facilities, including access to a range of catalogues, were very good and prisoners had quick access to the shop on arrival, which reduced the potential for accruing debt.

## Purposeful activity

- S37 *There was too little time unlocked for most prisoners. The leadership and management of learning and skills and work had improved but there was too little suitable, purposeful activity to meet the needs of the population, and the range of provision had not increased and was too limited. Opportunities to accredit work and employability skills were missed. There was a good focus on English and mathematics. The quality of teaching and learning was mostly good. Prisoners behaved well in sessions. Too many prisoners failed to complete their qualifications. Library services were reasonable but access was not good enough. PE provision was very good and well used. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***
- S38 *At the last inspection in October 2015 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Doncaster were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test. We made seven recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved and two had not been achieved.*

- S39 Most prisoners had too little time unlocked. The few full-time workers could expect about eight hours out of their cell each day, while unemployed prisoners experienced about three and a half hours. During our roll checks, an average of 40% of men were locked up during the working day, which was better than we found at the previous inspection but still too many. Prisoners were locked up and unlocked on time but the regime was too tight, and prisoners were routinely late for work and activities.
- S40 Prison leaders had set a clear direction in seeking to address the learning and skills and education concerns raised at the previous inspection, and had made progress. Good partnership working had improved allocation processes and attendance. However, the range of provision did not meet the needs of the current population, with too little vocational training and work. Work and employability skills gained at work were often not accredited. There were insufficient suitable purposeful activity places for the population. Over 130 prisoners were unemployed and most work places were based on the house blocks and did not keep prisoners busy enough. A strong emphasis was placed on developing prisoners' English and mathematics skills.
- S41 Most teaching was of good quality. Teachers planned their lessons well and had high expectations of learners. Most prisoners made good progress. Feedback given by teachers was clear and positive, and helped prisoners to improve their work. The print and textiles workshops were well equipped to industry standards, and prisoners developed good technical skills, meeting demanding quality standards and deadlines. The 'passport to employment' was used well in most workplaces, helping prisoners to recognise their developing employment skills. Support for open and distance learning students was underdeveloped.
- S42 Prisoners' behaviour in classrooms and workplaces was consistently good and they demonstrated high levels of respect for each other and for staff. Attendance had improved but was variable and overall not sufficiently good. Too many sessions were interrupted by other activities, and poor punctuality led to delays at the start of each session. Prisoner mentors were used well across a range of roles.

- S43 Achievements on most vocational training courses had been poor in 2015/16. On a number of courses, no prisoners had achieved a pass. There were signs of some limited improvement in the current year but dropout rates remained high. In the current year, too many prisoners had dropped out of English and mathematics courses before completing them, particularly on lower-level courses, although retention and achievement had improved at level 1. Prisoners demonstrated good standards of work in vocational areas and education classes.
- S44 There had been an improvement in library attendance, which had been boosted by education class visits. However, opening hours were too limited and access for those prisoners who were not on education courses was poor. Data gathered on library usage were not used to help to make improvements or promote participation by different groups of prisoners.
- S45 The gym facilities were good. The busy and inclusive PE timetable was adjusted daily to meet prisoners' requirements and promote engagement of the wider population. Data were used well to monitor non-attendance, and participation rates were high, at 67% of the population. PE staff worked closely with the health care department and SRU to expand participation. A small number of vocational qualifications were delivered, achieving good results.

## Resettlement

S46 *Reducing reoffending work lacked a comprehensive needs analysis to inform delivery, or a strategy to manage the large number of sex offenders. Offender management was reasonably good overall but higher-risk cases needed more focus on challenging offending behaviour and promoting sentence progression. Home detention curfew and categorisation processes were good. Basic public protection measures were sound but there were delays in child contact arrangements. Risk management and planning for some high-risk cases due for release were limited. Restrictions in the community rehabilitation company contract meant that access to resettlement provision was minimal for many. Advice and support were adequate across most of the resettlement pathways, and particularly good family support was offered. **Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.***

S47 *At the last inspection in October 2015 we found that outcomes for prisoners in Doncaster were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 12 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that four of the recommendations had been achieved, two had been partially achieved and six had not been achieved.*

- S48 The prison population had become more complex over the previous year, with a substantial increase in the number of longer-term, high-risk sex offenders alongside a more typical population of remand and short-term prisoners. Strategic oversight of reducing reoffending was underdeveloped and lacked a comprehensive needs analysis and action plan. There was not yet a formal strategy for the management of sex offenders, to reduce their risk of harm to others and promote their sentence progression.
- S49 Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments which were the responsibility of the prison were up to date but there was a backlog of National Probation Service assessments for a small proportion of higher-risk cases, which was a concern. Offender management was reasonably good overall. In the cases we looked at, the frequency of contact was mostly good but not enough had been done to ensure that the quality of contact in higher-risk cases was adequately focused on challenging offending behaviour and promoting sentence progression.



- S50 Steps had been taken to improve the home detention curfew processes, including the timeliness of report submission. However, too many assessments were concluded late, although this was mainly because of issues beyond the control of the prison.
- S51 Public protection restrictions were applied and reviewed appropriately but applications for child contact were hampered by delays by partner agencies. There was too little communication with offender managers about the multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) management level for most prisoners due for release, which potentially limited the prison's contribution to risk management planning. The role of the interdepartmental risk management team meeting was too limited and not all high-risk prisoners were reviewed in the months leading up to their release.
- S52 Categorisation work was up to date and of a reasonably good quality. Some category B prisoners, particularly sex offenders, had little opportunity to move on because of the lack of prison places nationally.
- S53 The demand for resettlement services was very high, with about 130 releases a month. Most of the sentenced men received only a minimal level of resettlement support under the community rehabilitation company (CRC) contract. Further restrictions in the contract meant that Nacro (the provider of CRC services) was not able to provide help formally throughout the sentenced period when the need arose. We were not confident that all prisoners had their resettlement plan reviewed before release, and poor recording made it difficult for us to evidence whether needs were being met. The effectiveness of accommodation and education, training and employment provision was not monitored.
- S54 The range of support for prisoners with housing problems was adequate but significantly hindered by the lack of provision in the community. Support for prisoners requiring help in finding work or training on release was reasonably good. Prisoners' skills were assessed on arrival and this informed their allocation to activities. Several agencies provided help with employability, including job-search skills, disclosure requirements and CV production but the provision was not sufficiently well coordinated. Good support for prisoners with additional problems was provided by WISE Ability, which achieved successful results.
- S55 Health care pre-release planning was reasonably good. Strong links with local community services supported effective pre-release planning for prisoners with substance misuse issues.
- S56 Prisoners with finance and debt concerns could access an adequate range of advice and support, and could open a bank account.
- S57 Visits facilities were welcoming and of a good standard. Support for families was much better than we often see. Families First provided an exceptionally wide range of appropriate services for visiting families, covering children of all ages, and excellent support to strengthen family life.
- S58 A small number of offending behaviour programmes was delivered but their suitability had not yet been established through a comprehensive analysis and there was no provision for the large number of sex offenders.

## Main concerns and recommendations

S59 Concern: Too many prisoners felt unsafe and levels of violence were high. Good violence reduction plans were in place but not all actions had been fully implemented and actions were not yet making the prison safe enough.

**Recommendation: The focus on violence should continue and violence reduction plans should be applied swiftly and robustly, and should be monitored for their effectiveness.**

S60 Concern: The number prisoners identified as being at risk of suicide and self-harm, and requiring support from the ACCT process, was high. The quality of care given to them was not always good enough.

**Recommendation: Staff should understand how to identify and understand the risks of suicide and self-harm. Prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm should be supported and this should be reflected in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documentation.**

S61 Concern: There was a continuing lack of staff control and supervision on the units, which we had identified as a major concern at the previous inspection. Staff did not always use authority appropriately and they did not always maintain appropriate professional boundaries. Efforts had been made to recruit more staff, but the lack of staff remained a critical shortcoming.

**Recommendation: There should be sufficient staff on the house blocks to ensure consistent and confident supervision and care of all prisoners. Staff should challenge inappropriate conduct by prisoners and maintain professional boundaries.** (Repeated recommendation S41)

S62 Concern: The range and amount of learning and skills and work activities did not meet the needs of the populations, with insufficient work and vocational training available.

**Recommendation: The current learning and skills and work curriculum should be reviewed, and the amount and range of vocational training and work should be expanded to meet the needs of the population.**

S63 Concern: The large number of long-term, high-risk sex offenders introduced since the last inspection did not have adequate offender management or programmes in place to enable them to reduce their risk of harm or progress.

**Recommendation: HMPPS should support and resource the prison in developing a comprehensive strategy which clearly identifies how men convicted of a sexual offence will be offender managed; how their risk of harm will be reduced; how they will progress through their sentence; and how the public will be protected during custody and on release.**

# Section 1. Safety

## Courts, escorts and transfers

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.1 Prisoners waited too long in court cells before travelling to the prison. Escort vehicles were clean and well equipped, and most prisoners in our survey said that they had been treated well by escort staff, although many still had problems with property not arriving with them. Prisoners were removed from escort vehicles quickly and searching procedures were proportionate.
- I.2 There were two video courts at the prison, and these were used effectively to reduce the necessity for appearance at court. They were also used well to facilitate inter-prison visits and parole hearings, and for other offender management purposes.

### Recommendation

- I.3 **Prisoners should not have long waits locked in court cells before travelling to the prison.**

## Early days in custody

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.4 The reception area was well maintained and welcoming but there was little useful information in holding rooms.
- I.5 Processes had improved and all arrivals underwent a thorough interview, conducted in private. The interviews we observed focused appropriately on safety and wellbeing, and included a new cell sharing risk assessment. Staff were appropriately sighted on risk factors in relation to self-harm.
- I.6 All new arrivals were offered a shower, free telephone call, bedding and clothing, when needed. Personal hygiene packs were issued, including provision for transgender prisoners.
- I.7 In our survey, most prisoners, and more than at similar prisons and at the time of the previous inspection, said that they had been treated well on arrival. The interactions we observed were friendly and prisoners were quickly put at ease by staff and the Insiders (prisoners who introduce new arrivals to prison life), who were an integral part of the reception process.
- I.8 The Insiders spoke to all arrivals in reception, to give them an insight into what was about to happen, and offered them a hot drink and, depending on the arrival time, a hot meal. They also accompanied new arrivals to the first night centre.

- I.9** Most prisoners (with the exception of some prisoners requiring substance misuse stabilisation) moved on to the first night centre on house block 3C reasonably quickly. Cells there were reasonably clean and the Insiders made sure that they were well prepared and equipped. They also provided the initial welcome onto the unit in a comfortable, newly refurbished room, giving a personal briefing on key information and what to expect over the following 24 hours. Residential staff then conducted a follow-up interview, to check on the wellbeing of new arrivals before they were locked up for the night. However, no additional welfare checks were carried out during the first night.
- I.10** The induction process had been restructured and was conducted over two days. It provided a comprehensive overview of the prison and ensured that prisoners gained a good understanding of what was available to them, local prison processes and what was required of them. It was delivered well by staff and a range of prisoners, including Insiders, Listeners (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to provide confidential emotional support to fellow prisoners), and 'buddies' (prisoners who provide informal support across a range of issues). A new tracking system monitored completions, and follow-up interviews by the Insiders provided ongoing support for new prisoners over their initial weeks at the prison.

## Bullying and violence reduction

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.11** In our survey, more prisoners than at similar prisons said that they had felt unsafe at the prison at some time (62% versus 52%) and that they currently felt unsafe (29% versus 24%), and nearly half (46%) said that they had been victimised by other prisoners.
- I.12** Although levels of violence had reduced sharply, they remained high and too many assaults were serious. For example, there had been 241 assaults in the previous six months (47 assaults on staff and 194 on prisoners), compared with 365 over the same period at the time of the previous inspection.
- I.13** There was a good, and improved, strategic and operational focus on violence reduction. A review of the violence reduction strategy had taken place and, as a result, a new violence reduction policy document and action plan had been published. Its content was relevant and based on a detailed analysis of the patterns of violence in the prison. Many actions to reduce violence were being delivered but some key elements had not yet been fully implemented (see main recommendation S59).
- I.14** Links between the security department and safer custody had improved considerably and were effective, with an unrestricted flow of intelligence and security reports to the safer custody team. There was good recording and analysis of violence to identify patterns and trends, and good investigations of incidents by the violence reduction coordinator.
- I.15** A monthly safer custody committee monitored overall progress of both the violence reduction and suicide prevention strategies. Meetings were well attended and minutes reflected appropriately focused discussions, about all forms of violence.
- I.16** The weekly multidisciplinary incident review meeting to discuss and respond to recent incidents of violence and plan support for victims that we had seen at the previous inspection

had embedded. Attendance was good, agreed actions were monitored, and the identification of perpetrators and support for victims was improving.

- I.17 A network of trained prisoner representatives (violence reduction buddies) on each house block supported the safer custody team. The scheme was well supported by staff, and prisoners we spoke to said that buddies offered an important service. There was good oversight of the buddies, through the violence reduction coordinator.
- I.18 The social responsibility unit (SRU) aimed to move prisoners involved in antisocial behaviour away from the mainstream population and address their behaviour. Plans to introduce a number of interventions on the unit, designed to address aspects of their violent and antisocial behaviour, such as one-to-one work, conflict resolution and self-reflection, were well developed and had the potential to be effective, but had not yet been fully implemented. In practice, most prisoners on the unit were locked in their cells, nearly all day, and kept segregated from the main population. This informal segregation lacked adequate safeguards or managerial oversight (see main recommendation S59).
- I.19 Vulnerable prisoners were located on house block I, separated from mainstream prisoners, and were generally protected from abuse and kept safe. Their regime was reasonably good.

## Recommendation

- I.20 **The regime for prisoners on the social responsibility unit should be improved and include structured interventions and activities aimed at reducing antisocial behaviour, with sufficient time out of cell.**

## Self-harm and suicide prevention

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.21 There had been two self-inflicted deaths since the previous inspection. An appropriate range of actions had been taken in response to the Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations, and actions from previous reports were reviewed regularly, to monitor ongoing compliance. Near-fatal incidents of self-harm were investigated thoroughly.
- I.22 The number of self-harm incidents in the previous six months was far higher than at similar prisons, and had increased since the previous inspection. There were 66 prisoners subject to assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) case management procedures at the time of the inspection. This was exceptionally high and staff struggled to provide adequate support and monitoring to so many.
- I.23 Managerial focus on self-harm had led to some improvements: a wide range of demographic data was now considered, a daily briefing was provided to all staff to identify those subject to ACCT procedures, and training had improved.
- I.24 There had been a renewed effort to improve the quality of ACCT procedures but we still found too many poor-quality risk assessments. Case reviews were often not sufficiently multidisciplinary, care plans were poor and ongoing observations, especially those at night, were far too basic, often repetitive and predictable (see main recommendation S60).

- I.25** Two constant supervision cells were located on the social care unit but the use of those on the segregation unit was inappropriate for those in crisis.
- I.26** There were only four Listeners, which was far too few to meet need, and there was only one care suite, so sessions were often conducted in cells. This was mitigated to some extent by the support provided by the buddies on each house block, who provided informal help for issues such as low mood and potential self-harm. However, they were untrained in crisis management and were not able to provide the same level of care and support as the Listeners.

## Recommendation

- I.27** There should be sufficient Listeners to meet the needs of the population.

## Safeguarding (protection of adults at risk)

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.28** There had been tentative contact with the local safeguarding adults board but there was still no formal arrangement.
- I.29** Some elements of safeguarding, such as the identification, care and support of at-risk prisoners, were in place but the formal safeguarding policy had yet to be published and not all contact staff were aware of whom to contact to raise concerns. Social care elements were good and the health care department had developed excellent links with external agencies (see section on social care).

## Recommendation

- I.30** Comprehensive adult safeguarding procedures should be introduced and embedded across the prison.

## Security

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.31** Procedural security had improved. Fabric checks of cells were more effective; routine and target searches were timely; and telephone monitoring was appropriate. The free-flow system that allowed prisoners to move to and from activities at fixed times was effective and

---

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

restrictions on unescorted movement at other times had been fully implemented, which was proportionate to the prevailing risks. Physical security had also improved, with security gates fitted along the main secure corridor and an improvement to the closed-circuit television coverage of outside areas.

- I.32** The level of contribution at monthly security committee meetings had also improved, and reflected the higher priority given to the use of security information and intelligence. Attendance at meetings had improved and was good, and links between security and related departments, such as the drug strategy team and safer custody managers, were effective. Monthly security objectives were agreed through the appropriate consideration of intelligence, and the prison was suitably focused on the main risks of violence and drugs.
- I.33** The number of security-related incidents had reduced considerably and the prison was more stable and controlled overall. The security risk assessments and subsequent management systems we reviewed were effective and included information about prisoners' custodial behaviour as well as historical data. However, gaps remained in some important elements of day-to-day security. Staffing levels were too low at times and some officers were overwhelmed by dealing with requests from prisoners, and often did not maintain clear professional boundaries (see also section on staff–prisoner relationships). The supervision of prisoners on the house blocks when they were unlocked was often poor, and on some of the house blocks staff struggled to control poor behaviour (see main recommendation S61).
- I.34** In our survey, 51% of prisoners said that it was easy to get illegal drugs at the prison, and 31% that alcohol was easily available, both of which figures were higher than the comparators and than at the time of the previous inspection. Despite an improved strategic approach to supply reduction since the previous inspection, intelligence, finds, mandatory drug testing (MDT) results, reports from staff and prisoners, and our own observations confirmed that illicit drugs, particularly new psychoactive substances (NPS; new drugs that are developed or chosen to mimic the effects of illegal drugs such as cannabis, heroin or amphetamines and may have unpredictable and life-threatening effects), were very accessible. A comprehensive NPS-specific strategy had been introduced in May 2017, along with a supply reduction action plan; the latter was reviewed regularly but lacked clear performance measures.
- I.35** At the time of the inspection, the random positive MDT rate was running under target for the first time in over two years, at 8.46%, against a target of 9%, for the six months to June 17; however, this increased to 23.75% if NPS positive results were included. Suspicion testing took place consistently and the positive rate of 77.6% for the same period was impressively high, although most tests were not completed promptly. Referrals to substance misuse services took place consistently both for positive MDT results and suspected NPS-related incidents. MDT facilities were satisfactory.

## Recommendation

- I.36** **Drug supply reduction measures should be applied swiftly and robustly, should have clear performance measures and be monitored for effectiveness.**

## Incentives and earned privileges

### Expected outcomes:

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

- I.37** Despite recent efforts to revitalise the IEP scheme, it was not yet used effectively to manage behaviour. Staff were sometimes unaware of prisoners' IEP levels and electronic case notes did not reflect progress at reviews. Too often, adjudications were used to manage behaviour, when the IEP system would have been more appropriate (see also paragraph I.41).
- I.38** Incentives for enhanced prisoners included the chance to live on the enhanced residential units, with more time out of cell. However, these units lacked a clear purpose and not all residents were on the enhanced level of the IEP scheme. Unemployed prisoners on the basic regime were locked up for more than 22 hours a day and had little opportunity to demonstrate improved behaviour.
- I.39** An innovative house block incentives scheme, designed to encourage collective good behaviour, had begun to engage prisoners. If prisoners kept the wing and food trolleys clean, avoided violent incidents and met a number of other criteria, there were a variety of rewards, including additional hot meals and the chance to influence how money for their house block was spent.

### Recommendation

- I.40** **The incentives and earned privileges scheme should clearly promote and reward positive behaviour. Behaviour should be reviewed regularly and prisoners should have opportunities to behave well.**

## Discipline

### Expected outcomes:

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

### Disciplinary procedures

- I.41** There had been 1,417 adjudications in the previous six months, which was fewer than at the time of the previous inspection and similar to the number at comparable prisons. Prisoners were too often placed on report when the matter could have been dealt with more appropriately using the IEP system (see also paragraph I.37).
- I.42** Too many adjudications were dismissed or not proceeded with; in 2016, this had occurred for 37% of adjudications overall, and 45% of those concerning violence. This was often caused by procedural errors or the lack of attendance by the reporting officer. In 2016, only 10% of referrals to the local police had resulted in a criminal charge, and in 2017 to date, this figure stood at 3%. This undermined the prison's attempts to tackle antisocial behaviour, as prisoners knew that violent behaviour might well have no significant consequences for them.



- I.43** There was a quarterly adjudications standardisation meeting, and the supporting data analysis was mostly sound. However, it had so far failed to resolve the afore-mentioned issues.

## Recommendations

- I.44** The adjudications system should provide an effective deterrent to antisocial behaviour.
- I.45** Adjudications should be dealt with promptly.

## The use of force

- I.46** The number of incidents involving the use of force had reduced slightly, from 295 in the six months before the previous inspection, to 273 in the same period before the current one. However, this was still slightly higher than we find at similar prisons.
- I.47** Governance arrangements had improved and were generally good. A well-constructed committee oversaw processes and provided oversight. All incidents were discussed, and samples of video recordings were scrutinised. Control and restraint coordinators examined all use of force paperwork, and poor reporting was identified and dealt with.
- I.48** Spontaneous and planned interventions were well organised and carried out appropriately, and proper authority was recorded. The documentation and video recordings we looked at evidenced that de-escalation was often used as a preferred option, and planned interventions were well supervised by staff.
- I.49** Special accommodation had been used three times in the previous six months, which was far less than at the time of the previous inspection. Authorisation paperwork gave assurance that use had been justified and for short periods.

## Segregation

- I.50** The use of segregation had reduced since the previous inspection but remained higher than we find at similar prisons. The unit was consistently full and lengths of stay were too long for many. At the time of the inspection, 19 prisoners were segregated under Prison Rule 45 for good order, and one as punishment. Half had been segregated in isolation for more than 21 days, some for more than 42 days and one for 81 days.
- I.51** Although relationships between staff and prisoners on the unit were reasonably good, the regime was impoverished. Prisoners could only receive a shower and 30 minutes of exercise a day. Regardless of the reason for their segregation, prisoners had no access to education classes or the gym, were not permitted televisions for distraction and some did not even have a radio.
- I.52** Living conditions on the unit were poor. Although, communal areas were reasonably clean, some cells were dirty and poorly furnished. Many in-cell telephones were broken and some toilets and showers were dirty.
- I.53** The exercise yards were clean but bleak and prisoners were unable to exercise together, regardless of their risk.

- I.54** Although segregation reviews took place on time, there was limited reintegration planning, with no specific multidisciplinary approach to identifying and addressing reasons for segregation and managing prisoners back to normal location.
- I.55** Quarterly segregation management meetings were usually well attended, and information about the amount of segregation and prisoners' length of stay was analysed. However, there was little evidence that these meetings were having much impact on raising operating standards or improving living conditions.

## Recommendations

- I.56** **The segregation unit should be well maintained, and the regime should allow prisoners access to constructive activity.** (Repeated recommendation I.59)
- I.57** **Good order or discipline and care and reintegration planning reviews should be attended by staff from relevant departments, address the prisoner's individual circumstances and focus on their reintegration into the prison.** (Repeated recommendation I.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.**

- I.58** Nottinghamshire Health Care NHS Foundation Trust provided integrated psychosocial and clinical support services, which generally worked effectively. The overall drug strategy was still not informed by a needs assessment, although the latest health needs assessment had influenced the 2017 NPS strategy.
- I.59** The range of psychosocial support had increased but remained inadequate, mainly due to high demand, staffing shortages and time lost to support medication administration. The team was appropriately focused on prompt assessments, risk management and discharge planning. In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they had received help with a drug or alcohol problem while at the prison, although fewer said that it had been helpful (64% versus 73% and 81% respectively).
- I.60** Most prisoners on the recovery unit were not there for recovery reasons, and the unit lacked a recovery ethos, regime and dedicated staffing group.
- I.61** Only residents on the recovery unit and house block 1 could access psychosocial group work, and no higher-intensity groups were provided, which adversely affected those who were in the prison for longer periods. Despite ongoing efforts, mutual aid groups were still not available. Peer support was developing well.
- I.62** Clinical support had generally improved. First night prescribing was provided, although on a few occasions prisoners had not received their medication until the following day. Night-time observations on the stabilisation unit took place consistently; however, some prisoners requiring withdrawal monitoring were not located on this unit because of a lack of places.

- I.63** As at the previous two inspections, substance misuse prescribing policies remained inflexible, although prescribing often deviated from these, and was mostly individualised. Five-day and 13-week prescribing reviews took place consistently.
- I.64** A dedicated nurse provided prompt support to prisoners with concurrent substance misuse and mental health issues who were in crisis.
- I.65** Buprenorphine was administered in private and was well supervised but the supervision of methadone administration was inconsistent (see section on pharmacy). Prisoners being treated for alcohol withdrawal were given two of their four doses of medication in possession, which created the risk of diversion, bullying and prisoners not taking them as prescribed (see also paragraph 2.22).

## Recommendations

- I.66** All prisoners with substance misuse issues should have easy access to an appropriate range of psychosocial support services throughout their stay, including mutual aid and groups of varying intensity.
- I.67** All new prisoners with drug or alcohol dependency should be located on the stabilisation unit.
- I.68** Local policies and prescribing for substance misuse needs should be individualised, reflect current national guidance and start on prisoners' first night at the establishment.



## 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** Living conditions had improved substantially since the previous inspection. Outside and communal areas were generally clean, apart from some litter in exercise yards, and most cells were in a decent condition. All house blocks and cells had been repainted and the prisoners who worked on the house blocks had largely maintained this progress. Many prisoners clearly took pride in the condition of their cells.
- 2.2** Prisoners continued to benefit from in-cell telephones, which allowed them to make calls in the evenings, partly mitigating the impact of so much time spent in their cells. Some significant improvements to daily life on the house blocks had been made. Access to showers, televisions, kettles, clean bedding and the weekly laundry service was good, and this was reflected in our survey results. Notably, at the previous inspection only 24% of prisoners had said that they got clean sheets every week, but this had now increased to 87%. Unusually, prisoners were issued with a tea towel – a simple innovation which contributed to overall decency.
- 2.3** However, too many toilets in cells were unacceptably dirty. The prison had recognised this and there was a replacement programme in place. There had been repairs to the communal showers, including new privacy doors. Managers had also tried to improve the ventilation system but shower rooms were poorly designed and completely internal, so remained musty and damp.
- 2.4** On house blocks 2 and 3, access to prison-issue clothing and cleaning materials was disorganised and inconsistent, and store rooms were messy and poorly stocked. There was plenty of stock in the main store, although prison-issue clothing was only ordered in extra-large sizes; this was rectified during the inspection.
- 2.5** In our survey, only 17% of prisoners said that their cell bell was answered promptly, which was far fewer than at similar prisons. Responses to call bells were now monitored, and so far in 2017 only 55% had been answered within five minutes, and some response times were far longer. Due to the poor design of the system, residential staff had to rely on communications staff to alert them on the radio to outstanding cell call bell summons.
- 2.6** Electronic kiosks, known as ATMs, were located on every house block and allowed prisoners to manage many aspects of their lives, such as menu choices and prison shop ordering. They could even report any repairs needed to their cell. The kiosks eased the daily running of prison life and the system was being developed further, to allow prisoners to make requests to different departments. However, this process was not yet comprehensive and needed refining. The prison aimed to phase out the inefficient paper-based applications system.
- 2.7** The prisoner-run ‘prisoner assist line’ (PAL) telephone line, available from in-cell telephones, offered valuable advice and information to prisoners and was well used, with about 350 enquiries each month. Prisoners’ requests were forwarded to the relevant department, and the PAL team communicated responses back to the individual in writing.

## Recommendation

### **2.8 Cell call bells should be responded to within five minutes.**

## Good practice

**2.9** *New arrivals were issued with their own tea towel, which aimed to improve basic decency.*

**2.10** *Prisoners were able to request cell repairs using the electronic kiosks on the house blocks.*

## 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.**

**2.11** In our survey, most prisoners, and far more than at similar prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection, said that staff treated them respectfully and that there was a member of staff they could turn to for help. We saw some very good and supportive interactions between staff and prisoners. The design of the house blocks meant that staff were out and about at all times among the prisoners in their care, although this could lead to them being overwhelmed with requests.

**2.12** Many staff were new in post but continuing shortages led to a lack of staff presence on the house blocks. They were often too stretched, especially on house blocks 2 and 3, sometimes working alone. At times, staff were frustrated and struggled to meet the needs of prisoners. Too often, poor behaviour from prisoners went unchallenged and staff failed to maintain suitable boundaries of behaviour. Prisoners gathered in cells, smoked on the landings, walked around partially clothed and ignored staff instruction without fear of reprimand (see main recommendation S61).

**2.13** The prison had recognised these deficiencies and had recently established an innovative cultural leader programme, to instil confidence in staff at all grades and encourage greater challenge. It was too early to judge its effectiveness but the programme showed promise. There was also effective prisoner consultation through the weekly prisoner information and activity committee (PIAC) meeting, which was chaired by the director.

**2.14** As staff were busy on the house blocks and did not have easy access to P-Nomis (electronic case notes) terminals, personal officer contacts were not always recorded.

## Equality and diversity

### Expected outcomes:

**The prison demonstrates a clear and coordinated approach to eliminating discrimination, promoting equitable outcomes and fostering good relations, and ensures that no prisoner is unfairly disadvantaged. This is underpinned by effective processes to identify and resolve any inequality. The distinct needs of each protected characteristic<sup>4</sup> are recognised and addressed: these include race equality, nationality, religion, disability (including mental, physical and learning disabilities and difficulties), gender, transgender issues, sexual orientation and age.**

### Strategic management

- 2.15** The equality team had been strengthened, and the focus on equality had improved. This was evidenced in policies and plans, and in a practical prioritising of diversity and mutual respect, led by the director and carried out by senior managers, who took responsibility for each protected characteristic and for better support of the equality officer. However, many of these developments were recent, and it was too soon to be confident that all were thoroughly embedded.
- 2.16** Managers were aware of the deficiencies of the national equality monitoring system; this did not include some key topics and the data from which arrived too late to be of practical use. They had therefore begun to carry out their own monitoring in areas not covered by the national system; however, there was not yet sufficient use of such monitoring to drive change.
- 2.17** Forums had recently started for all protected characteristics but there was little visible affirmation of diversity in displays or events.
- 2.18** The system of discrimination incident reporting was working much better, and the increase in volume (from an average of fewer than three report forms each month from prisoners in 2016 to 10 per month in 2017 to date) evidenced increasing trust in the process. Investigations were thorough and were properly checked for quality.

### Protected characteristics

- 2.19** Prisoners from black and minority ethnic backgrounds comprised 25% of the prison population, and in our survey their perceptions of treatment and conditions did not differ greatly from those of other prisoners. Forums had been held for this group, and additional consultation had taken place with prisoners from Traveller communities. There had been a popular event celebrating Traveller food and traditions, and some other events marking cultural landmarks, such as Black History Month, but such events were not sufficiently regular or high profile.
- 2.20** Muslim prisoners reported more negative perceptions than others in our survey. Sixty-two per cent said that staff treated them respectfully, against 83% of non-Muslims, and they told us that a number of staff did not understand the requirements of their faith. Fewer Muslim respondents said that the incentives and earned privileges scheme worked fairly and effectively, and 50% of them said that they had been victimised by staff, compared with 29% of non-Muslims.

---

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

- 2.21** A capable foreign national officer was giving good support. There was effective liaison with the Home Office on immigration issues, and an immigration officer came into the prison each week. There was almost no translated material on display, and the availability of material in different languages on the electronic ATMs (see paragraph 2.6) did not sufficiently compensate for this. However, professional telephone interpreting services had been used almost 300 times in the previous 12 months, and face-to-face interpreters were brought in about once a month for confidential occasions, such as medical appointments and adjudications.
- 2.22** Prisoners with disabilities had less positive perceptions than others in our survey, across a range of issues. For example, they were more negative than others about the attitudes and behaviour of staff; 70% had felt unsafe at the establishment at some time, and 44% (against 25% of others) said that they had been victimised by staff. Those with assessed social care needs received very good support from social care staff, including those on the dedicated social care unit (SCU) (see also section on social care) but also some on main house blocks. For those who did not meet this threshold, provision was much more inconsistent. There were prisoner helpers paid to support men with disabilities; they had job descriptions and were reasonably well supervised by staff, to avoid abuse of trust, but they had little training. Physical provision for the needs of those with mobility difficulties was not good on the house blocks, with no adapted cells, and residential staff were not always aware of the care needs of these prisoners.
- 2.23** Prisoners over the age of 50 were notably positive in their responses to our survey questions; compared with those under 50, fewer said that they currently felt unsafe (16% versus 31%) and that they had been victimised by staff (8% versus 35%), and 96% (against 78% of younger prisoners) said that most staff treated them respectfully. There were a few activities specifically for this age group but little systematic focus on providing for their needs.
- 2.24** At the time of the inspection, about 15% of the prison population was under 21. The perceptions of this group had generally improved but only 48% said that there was a member of staff they could turn to with a problem, against 76% of over-21s. During the inspection, the prison issued the report of a survey of this group of prisoners, with some actions planned in consequence.
- 2.25** Gay and bisexual prisoners supported each other well. They told us that managers were supportive, although felt that some staff could be guarded or inappropriate in their interactions with them.
- 2.26** Two transgender prisoners were being held at the establishment at the time of the inspection, and considerable attention had been paid to their needs. These prisoners were content in the locations where they were living and appreciated the ability to obtain items they needed, although they still felt that they experienced prejudicial attitudes from some staff and prisoners.

## Recommendations

- 2.27** **A thorough needs analysis of all prisoners with disabilities should be completed, leading to practical measures, including reasonable adjustments in response to individual need, and a sound system of peer supporters.**
- 2.28** **A clear strategy should be implemented for the management of young adults, based on identification of needs and priorities specific to this group.**



## Faith and religious activity

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.29** A team of 17 chaplains, including 10 volunteers, covered all faiths except Buddhism and Mormonism, although chaplains for both of these had been appointed and were waiting to start. A wide range of services and classes took place and a bereavement counselling service was offered by volunteers.
- 2.30** In our survey, prisoners were more positive about access to religious services and to chaplains than at the time of the previous inspection. Chaplains aimed to see all new arrivals, and our survey showed that this had improved considerably, although fewer than at comparable prisons said that they had seen a chaplain on arrival. Chaplains went to see all those who had been put onto assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) procedures but did not often attend the reviews.
- 2.31** Chaplains appeared to work well together as a team. Some gradual progress had been made but there was room for improvement in the profile of the chaplaincy, the visibility of chaplains among the prisoners at times such as association, and the team's engagement with the broader life of the prison. Links with faith communities outside the prison were not strong.

### Recommendation

- 2.32** The chaplaincy, in consultation with managers, should develop and implement a strategy for making a more visible and positive contribution to the life of the prison.

## 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.**

- 2.33** The complaints handling system had improved markedly. Over 95% of complaints were replied to within the time limit, partly because all complaints were allocated to a named manager on the morning after receipt.
- 2.34** Quality assurance was more thorough, with feedback given to all respondents in the 15% sample that we checked. The quality of replies was good in almost all cases, written politely and addressing the issues raised. Complaint forms were freely available, although forms for complaints to the Independent Monitoring Board were not present on all house blocks.
- 2.35** Complaints were answered by staff at the level of seniority appropriate to the matter in hand, especially where the complaint was against a member of staff, but there was no external scrutiny of responses. There was good monthly analysis of complaints data; for example, complaints about property were broken down into eight sub-categories, and this information had been used effectively by the senior management team.

## Good practice

- 2.36** *A new system for handling complaints had been embedded which ensured excellent timeliness and thorough quality control of responses.*

## 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.**

- 2.37** Although, in our survey, prisoners were less positive than at the time of the previous inspection about access to legal services, a good service was offered, which was better than we normally see. An experienced member of staff worked three days a week on giving help and information about bail, while another staff member dealt with appeals. Help was also given with lodging fines.
- 2.38** There were two laptop computers available for working on complex legal cases. These had been loaned to prisoners recently, and the process for applying for them was clear.
- 2.39** Arrangements for legal visits and video-link were effective.

## 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.**

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

## Governance arrangements

- 2.41** The CQC found no breaches of the relevant regulations.
- 2.42** NHS England commissioned Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust (Notts) to provide health services. Governance and contract monitoring meetings were in place, and relationships between Notts and the prison had improved, although attendance at the meetings was inconsistent.
- 2.43** Service developments related to the 2016 prisoner health needs assessment and the changing population of the prison. There was an impressive range of learning opportunities from

---

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

incidents and events, including a 'learning the lessons' bulletin and weekly peer reflective practice meetings.

- 2.44** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator establishments and than at the time of the previous inspection said that they were satisfied with the overall quality of health services (40% versus 33% and 23%, respectively). There was good, regular consultation with prisoner representatives and an ongoing patient satisfaction survey, both of which informed service improvements.
- 2.45** Health-related complaints were dealt with confidentially. A total of 136 complaints or concerns had been submitted in the previous six months. The most common issues were about adequacy of treatment, prescribing and waiting times. The responses we sampled were timely, polite and addressed the issues raised. If the complainant remained dissatisfied, a clinical matron would go to see him, to attempt to resolve the matter face to face.
- 2.46** Nurses were available 24 hours a day, with two members of staff available at night, including a paramedic. On-call doctors were rarely used. Health services staff were clearly identifiable, and the interactions we observed with patients were good-natured and caring. The clinical manager had improved the service considerably, and there was a rich skill mix, with no staff shortages. Mandatory staff training, access to professional development, and clinical supervision were managed effectively. An appropriate range of policies, including communicable disease management, adult safeguarding and information sharing, were in place.
- 2.47** Age-appropriate screening for under-25s and older prisoners took place, and a senior nurse monitored the care of older patients.
- 2.48** Health services were delivered in the health centre and on the house blocks. The environment was generally good, although some treatment rooms on the house blocks did not have sinks, and so were used for non-invasive procedures.
- 2.49** The service had been enhanced with the introduction of a unique 24-hour in-house paramedic service. Paramedics maintained emergency resuscitation equipment to the highest standard, and provided emergency responses and minor injury clinics. Although 73% of custody staff had received training in first aid, they could not access the automated external defibrillators.
- 2.50** There was a wide range of health promotion in key areas of the prison, and quarterly health promotion events were held, with contributions from an appropriately diverse range of departments, including substance misuse, gym and dentistry. Specialists, such as the visiting hepatitis nurse, were also involved.
- 2.51** Patients could access relevant information and testing on a wide range of conditions, including blood pressure and cholesterol checks; age appropriate immunisations and bowel screening; information and appointments for blood-borne virus treatment; cancers; healthy diet; stroke; dementia; sepsis and anticoagulants. The waiting times for smoking cessation treatment were short, and barrier protection was available and well advertised.

## Good practice

- 2.52** *Face-to-face meetings to address patients' unresolved complaints and concerns enabled them to be heard and their feelings to be acknowledged.*
- 2.53** *The introduction of a 24-hour paramedic service ensured rapid access to the best practice response in emergency medical situations.*

## Delivery of care (physical health)

- 2.54** New arrivals received a comprehensive health screening, including for mental health and substance misuse issues. There was excellent access to health care, via paper applications handed to health services staff, the in-cell telephone or the ATMs on the house blocks (see paragraph 2.6).
- 2.55** Opportunities for primary care assessment and treatment had been transformed with daily triage clinics on the house blocks, and access to advanced nurse practitioners, assistant practitioners, non-medical prescribers and GP appointments as required. A range of clinics was delivered, and several nurses specialised in particular treatments, such as for diabetes and asthma. Additionally, there were visiting specialists in practice areas such as sexual health. The monitoring and care of patients with long-term conditions was particularly good, and the X-ray facility was well used. Waiting times were generally good but the non-attendance rate for the doctor, dentist and optician had been 26.6% in the previous six months, which was unacceptably high.
- 2.56** Some patients waited too long in the sparse waiting rooms before and after their appointment. Discussions had started on the potential to introduce mobile diagnostic services and telemedicine, both of which we would encourage.
- 2.57** Entries on SystemOne (the electronic clinical record) were of a good standard, and audited regularly. Care plans were in place and the content was more personalised than at the time of the previous inspection. The assessment templates reflected national clinical guidance.
- 2.58** Prisoner access to external hospital appointments had improved, with rare cancellations by the prison. However, clinicians told us that the four daily allocated slots were insufficient to meet need.

## Pharmacy

- 2.59** Pharmacy services required improvement. A pharmacist had been recruited and had begun to make changes but these were not yet fully embedded. There had been only six medicine-use reviews in the previous six months and there were no pharmacy clinics. The pharmacist did not check and reconcile medicines for new patients at reception. There was insufficient pharmacist time, although there were several pharmacy technicians in the prison. There was a wide range of prescribers on the staff, and patient group directions (to enable nurses and paramedics to supply and administer prescription-only medicine) were available.
- 2.60** Medicines were supplied by a local pharmacy but not always received on time. There was some provision for the supply of urgent medicines. Overall, outside of the pharmacy, general stock medicines were not clearly separated from those used for minor ailments, and there were no formal date checking procedures or stock reconciliation procedures on the house blocks.

- 2.61** Drug prescribing and administration were recorded on SystmOne, and most medicines were supplied on a named-patient basis, under supervision, at 8am, 1pm and 5pm. This regime did not allow an eight-hourly dosage schedule to be administered, which is recommended as optimal for some medicines, such as gabapentin (an analgesic), and sometimes this was given twice daily. It also did not allow the recognised pain management ladder to be adopted, and encouraged sub-optimal prescribing. However, night-time medicines could be taken to the cells if deemed necessary. Medicine queues were well supervised, although there was congestion near the hatch in house block 3, which could have led to trading or bullying, and the barred gate in the health centre did not present enough of a barrier, posing a potential safety risk to staff.
- 2.62** Only 30% of patients received their medicines in-possession, mostly for seven days. These were mainly ordered by the staff, thereby denying patients the responsibility for managing their own health. In-possession risk assessments were completed appropriately. Contrary to current conventional practice, around 30 prisoners received highly tradable medicines such as gabapentin, pregabalin and quetiapine for seven days in-possession. Steps were taken during the inspection to address this issue.
- 2.63** Some aspects of medicines management were poor. For example, in the controlled drugs cabinet in the health centre, there were two loose oxycodone (a controlled drug) tablets in an unlabelled plastic cup, and we observed methadone in a urine sample bottle. The temperature of the refrigerator had been recorded outside of the acceptable range on 13 occasions in July 2017 but it was unclear what steps had been taken to address this. We also found a date-expired naloxone injection and loose tablet blisters in treatment rooms on the house blocks, making precise auditing impossible.
- 2.64** Written procedures and protocols were in place. There were well-attended bimonthly medicines management meetings. Issues raised were escalated and acted on appropriately. The formulary (a list of medications used to inform prescribing) was appropriate.

## Recommendations

- 2.65** **Patients should receive their medications promptly to ensure they continue appropriate treatment.** (Repeated recommendation 2.70)
- 2.66** **Medicines should be administered and supervised in line with established recommended dosage schedules for optimal care.**
- 2.67** **Medicines management should be improved, including the ordering and safe storage of medicines, with increased professional oversight by the pharmacist.**

## Dentistry

- 2.68** Notts subcontracted Time for Teeth to provide the dental service. Prisoners had timely access to this service, and waiting lists were managed well. Treatments were delivered efficiently, including oral health promotion, and emergencies were managed appropriately.
- 2.69** The dental surgery was shabby and cramped, and it was difficult to maintain an appropriate room temperature there. However, it was due to be refurbished. Although there was no separate decontamination room, decontamination of equipment, safety checks and disposal of waste were all well managed.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

- 2.70** Mental health services had improved. A good programme of mental health awareness training for officers had been implemented, and 51% had been trained since 2015. Officers who had received this training said that they felt more confident in dealing with prisoners with mental health issues, and in making referrals.
- 2.71** The recruitment and retention of staff had improved. An experienced manager led the service, which was now provided seven days a week, with extended daily hours until 6pm. Patients were positive about the service provided, with 52% in our survey saying that they had been helped, compared with only 40% at comparator establishments and 38% at the time of the previous inspection.
- 2.72** We found that the previously crisis-led service was now delivering more strategically planned care, from better integrated primary and secondary teams, with weekly visits by psychiatrists.
- 2.73** Demand for support was high, with about 285 patients in contact with the service at any time. The care programme approach was used appropriately to monitor patients with more complex disorders. A reasonable range of therapies was available, including individual and group cognitive and solution-based approaches. A good 'wellbeing' group was also available, covering sleep hygiene and other lifestyle issues. Links with the chaplaincy were effective and patients experiencing bereavement were referred to their weekly group, run by volunteers. However, professional counselling was unavailable, despite recommendations from the previous two inspection reports.
- 2.74** Patients waited too long to be transferred to secure hospitals, and too many were inappropriately located on the segregation unit. In the previous six months, 19 patients had been listed for transfer, with an average wait of 11 weeks (against a target of two weeks), with a range of two days to 21 weeks, which was an unacceptable situation.

## Recommendations

- 2.75** **Patients should have access to professional counselling services.**
- 2.76** **Transfers of patients to mental health services should take place within the current time guideline.** (Repeated recommendation 2.81)

## Social care

- 2.77** Social care for prisoners had improved. Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council contracted Notts to provide social care services, with two dedicated social workers providing support to the prisons in the Doncaster prison cluster. Assessments were made in a timely manner, commensurate with those in the community. Social workers attended the prison at least once a week, and 145 patients had been referred for social care assessment since 2015, of whom 15 had received social care packages supported by the Council. At the time of the inspection, three social care assistants provided 13 hours of daily care to five prisoners on full social care packages, and to 11 others requiring some support, both on the SCU and in other locations around the prison.
- 2.78** The SCU provided a discrete residential unit for 26 prisoners, most of whom had severe mobility or social care needs, which were met by local authority funding. A separate unit, known as 'the loft', also had provision for up to 14 prisoners with social care needs but was

being used to house prisoners with a variety of requirements, including mental health and self-harm, making the environment more challenging. A decision was made during the inspection to change the loft into a dedicated additional SCU for patients with lower-level needs, which we welcomed.

## 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.**

- 2.79** In our survey, more prisoners than at similar prisons said that the food provided was good (42% versus 21%). The food we tasted was appetising and we heard few complaints about it during the inspection.
- 2.80** Special diets were catered for on request, and supplementary packs were offered. Fruit was offered with most meals. The kitchen was cleaner than at the time of the previous inspection.
- 2.81** There was good consultation about the food, with a regular PIAC meeting devoted to it. However, in our survey, fewer black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners than their respective counterparts said that the food provided was good.
- 2.82** Prisoners were able to dine out on association but meals were served too early, with lunch at 11.30am and dinner at 4.30pm. Breakfast packs were meagre, and given out with dinner on the evening before consumption.
- 2.83** Servery queues were poorly supervised as staff were often busy elsewhere on the house block, so portion control was not always fair. Servery workers did not always wear whites and some food was left out on tables for prisoners to help themselves to, which was not hygienic.

### Recommendations

- 2.84** **Black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners' negative perceptions of the food provided should be investigated and acted on.**
- 2.85** **Staff should always supervise mealtimes, to ensure that servery queues are well ordered and that food is given out fairly and hygienically.**

## Purchases

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.86** In our survey, more prisoners than at comparator prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection said that the prison shop sold a wide enough range of goods to meet their needs. The facilities for placing shop orders, via the ATMs on the house blocks (see paragraph 2.6), were well managed. New arrivals had access to their first full shop order on the day after arrival, which contributed to reducing the potential for accruing debt.

**2.87** Shop consultation arrangements were effective, with a monthly prisoner/staff meeting to discuss products and services. There was good access to a range of catalogues, and prisoners no longer had to pay a 50 pence administration charge.



## Section 3. Purposeful activity

### Time out of cell

#### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.1** Most prisoners had too little time unlocked. On weekdays, a minority of full-time workers could expect about eight hours a day out of their cell. Unemployed prisoners experienced only three and a half hours out of cell each day and those on the basic incentives and earned privileges regime were unlocked for only one and a half hours.
- 3.2** During our roll checks, an average of 40% of men were locked in their cell during the working day, which, although better than we found at the previous inspection, was still far too many.
- 3.3** In our survey, more prisoners than at similar prisons said that they went on association more than five times each week (62% versus 42%). There was no evening association but workers had a good amount of time once back on their house block to eat and shower before lock-up at 5.45pm.
- 3.4** The regime was rarely curtailed. Prisoners were locked up and unlocked on time but were slow to cooperate with staff, and the regime was too tight. This resulted in prisoners routinely arriving late for work and activities (see recommendation 3.29).

#### Recommendation

- 3.5 Prisoners should be unlocked for at least 10 hours a day.**

---

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

## 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.**

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

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

### Management of learning and skills and work

- 3.7** The management of learning and skills required improvement. The director and senior managers had provided good leadership and set a clear direction in seeking to address the learning and skills and education issues raised at the previous inspection. Communication with staff and partners had consistently emphasised the need to make better use of the activity places available, and allocation to places was good. Efforts to improve attendance by prisoners had led to significant improvement, although attendance was not yet good in all areas.
- 3.8** The number and range of purposeful activity places were inadequate and they did not provide sufficient challenge and progression to the new, longer-term, vulnerable prisoner population. Managers were planning to carry out a curriculum review but this had yet to take place. Very few jobs gave prisoners the opportunity to gain qualifications at work. Managers were seeking to develop links with employers in order to bring in more purposeful work for prisoners but these contacts were still in their early stages (see main recommendation S62).
- 3.9** Novus, the education and vocational training provider, had responded well to the prison's changing requirements – for example, by providing on-the-job training in the kitchens and staff mess. Education managers worked closely with the prison and partners such as the National Careers Service (NCS) to manage the high number of new receptions. Managers' use of data to monitor attendance was good and had helped to drive improvements.
- 3.10** Quality assurance arrangements required improvement. Meetings of the quality improvement group were regular and involved all partners but they did not concentrate sufficiently on quality and performance issues. Lesson observations were carried out thoroughly but they

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

did not focus enough on the impact of teaching on the progress of learners. The self-assessment report was insufficiently evaluative – for example, failing to recognise weaknesses in qualification achievement rates. The resulting improvement plan did not provide an adequate basis for securing improvements.

## Recommendation

- 3.11 Managers should improve quality assurance monitoring and reporting of its education and training provision, to ensure that prison managers are well aware of the strengths and areas for improvement.**

## Provision of activities

- 3.12** The provision of activities required improvement. There were just over 1,000 activity places, which, in theory, was enough to offer activity to almost all prisoners. However, too many prisoners, around 130, were unemployed. Most activity places were part time and too many, over 400, were jobs based on the house blocks, such as cleaning and serving food on the wings, which did not fully occupy prisoners' time, and were not effective in preparing them for resettlement (see main recommendation S62).
- 3.13** Prison industries offered work in printing, textiles, the kitchens and laundry, cleaning, recycling and horticulture. Work in these areas provided good skills development, and prisoners achieved particularly high standards in the printing and textiles workshops. However, there were not enough opportunities to achieve qualifications (see below).
- 3.14** In the education provision, the range of courses was too narrow and did not offer sufficient progression. There was good promotion of English and mathematical skills, and prisoners were required to achieve level 1 in these subjects before participating in other work or vocational training. There was little education provision for learners who had already attained level 1. There were some vocational training courses offered at level 2 but the range was narrow, and had not improved since the previous inspection (see main recommendation S62).
- 3.15** Creative media training and graphic design courses were offered by SevenThreeOne, a not-for-profit training provider. Learners developed skills in radio and television production, producing programmes for the in-cell channels and a prison magazine. The NCS had recently introduced opportunities to study by open learning, with support from the college.
- 3.16** The allocation process was fair and efficient, taking account of the NCS skills action plan and the initial assessment of English and mathematical skills, to place prisoners in the most appropriate activity. Managers had reviewed pay rates for prisoners and had revised them to provide increased incentive to attend education courses.

## Quality of provision

- 3.17** The education and vocational training provision provided by Novus was good. Learning and skills induction was good. Prisoners received accurate information about the range of education, training and employment opportunities. Prisoner mentors were used effectively to make prisoners feel welcome and to enable the prison to assess each person's needs individually.

- 3.18** Most teaching was of good quality. Tutors had high expectations of learners and planned classes well, so that learners were motivated, engaged enthusiastically in activities and made good progress. Activities in most lessons were interesting, using learning technologies skilfully to stimulate and enhance learning. Teachers regularly emphasised the importance of accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- 3.19** Teachers monitored learners' progress thoroughly and gave clear and positive feedback that helped learners to understand how to improve their work. Most used individual learning plans effectively to set curriculum and personal targets for learners. They quickly identified those learners who needed extra help with their studies, and provided effective support that enabled them to make good progress. In most lessons, learners kept detailed daily learning logs of personal progress, helping them to focus on achievement objectives.
- 3.20** Novus provided administrative support for the small number of learners studying on Open University and distance learning courses. However, learners were not provided with support to develop their study skills to help them to succeed.
- 3.21** Teachers in mathematics were particularly effective and their learners made good progress. However, in other classes, and in work and vocational training, teachers did not take advantage of opportunities to help learners to apply and consolidate their practical mathematical skills. An exception was the staff restaurant, where English and mathematical skills were integrated well with the catering work.
- 3.22** Staff in vocational training and work areas were enthusiastic and used their industrial knowledge well to support learners in gaining valuable understanding and practical skills. In the print and textiles workshops, prisoners used up-to-date, industry-standard equipment to produce work of a high standard and meet demanding deadlines. In the staff restaurant, prisoners developed a wide range of vocationally relevant skills in food production and customer service. In other work areas, learners developed good skills and awareness of health and safety, and personal protective equipment requirements.
- 3.23** Tutors' promotion of equality and diversity was good. Learners developed an awareness of the importance of listening to the views of other people and being sensitive to their differences.

## Recommendation

- 3.24 Study skills support for open and distance learners should be provided.**

## Personal development and behaviour

- 3.25** Learners' behaviour in classrooms and workplaces was consistently good. They demonstrated high levels of respect for each other and for staff. Most enjoyed learning and made good progress, developing their employment and life skills. They participated enthusiastically in activities and generally were confident to ask questions and take part in discussions.
- 3.26** Those in work areas and vocational training showed pride in the standards they were achieving and could explain accurately and with confidence the skills and knowledge they had developed in their work settings.

- 3.27** Most learners were able to make informed decisions about the next steps in their education, employment, self-employment or training. Information, advice and guidance, provided by the careers service provider, were generally good.
- 3.28** In education classes, attendance had improved since the previous inspection and was generally good. Some workshops were less well attended, and attendance records showed that this remained variable overall. Punctuality remained an area for improvement, with delays of around half an hour at the start of each session. Sessions also finished early in some cases and there were too many interruptions by other activities.

## Recommendation

- 3.29 Prisoners should attend their classes and workshops on time, and not leave sessions before the end.**

## Education and vocational achievements

- 3.30** Prisoners gained good practical skills in most work areas. There were no qualifications available to prisoners in the main work areas but there were opportunities to gain appropriate vocational qualifications in cleaning, the kitchens and in horticulture. Most of the workers in jobs on the house blocks had no opportunities for training or accreditation. The 'passport to employment' had recently been introduced to work areas, and was beginning to improve learners' awareness of their developing employment skills and employers' requirements.
- 3.31** Achievements on many vocational training courses had been poor in 2015/16; no learners had achieved a pass on the barbering, media, employability or cleaning services courses. Results had been better in information technology (IT) user skills, and railway engineering. In the current year, the pass rates for those completing vocational courses were poor in barbering, cleaning services, customer service and employability. There were better results in IT, food preparation and horticulture but dropout rates remained very high, with more than half the learners failing to complete their course in many cases. However, the achievement rate for prisoners working in the kitchens was high.
- 3.32** Achievements in English and mathematics had been poor in 2015/16 but the pass rate for those who completed their courses had improved significantly in the current year. Too many learners dropped out before completing their course, particularly on lower-level courses, but retention and achievement were much improved on level 1 courses. The pass rates for learners on these courses was good. The standard of learners' written work in education classes was good.

## Recommendation

- 3.33 The number of learners who complete and pass their courses should be improved.**

## Library

- 3.34** Serco ran the library, which provided a wide range of newspapers, books, journals and DVDs, as well as an appropriate range of legal textbooks and Prison Service Instructions.

There was an adequate range of books for prisoners whose first language was not English, and a stock of publications to support education and training courses.

- 3.35** During the inspection, a small satellite library was opened on the vulnerable prisoner house block, to improve their access to reading materials. Peer mentors offered an informal book delivery service to prisoners unable to leave the house blocks.
- 3.36** Library membership had improved since the previous inspection to a reasonably good level. Visitor numbers and lending rates had increased, partly because learners on education courses visited the library every week. There was insufficient access for prisoners who were not on education courses. Library opening hours were short and there was no weekend opening. Managers gathered data about library usage but these were not used to help to make improvements or promote participation by different groups of prisoners.
- 3.37** Learners studying open and distance learning courses made good use of the library's learning resources. The librarian coordinated the Shannon Trust reading plan, and mentors were used effectively to promote reading and help prisoners with research activities.

## Recommendation

- 3.38 All prisoners should be able to access the library at least once a week.**

## Physical education and healthy living

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 3.39** The gym/sports centre provided good facilities, with well-maintained indoor and outdoor gym equipment and all-weather sports pitches. A wide range of fitness activities was offered, including weight training, cardiovascular training, circuit training and team sports. PE staff were enthusiastic and provided good advice and coaching to prisoners, with a focus on encouraging them to develop healthy lifestyles and wellbeing. The centre's timetable was adjusted daily, to meet prisoners' requirements, maximise use of the facilities and provide additional gym access as a reward for good behaviour. Links between the sports centre and health care department were good, ensuring that appropriate remedial activity was provided for prisoners with medical referrals.
- 3.40** An appropriate induction programme promoted participation in exercise. Prisoners were given detailed information identifying opportunities to access the facilities and activities which suited their needs. PE staff collected data to monitor attendance by different house blocks, and cooperated with other departments, such as the social responsibility unit, in initiatives designed to engage non-attenders. Data analysis showed that a large proportion of the prison's population (67%) used the sports centre.
- 3.41** A range of vocational qualifications, including First Aid and Community Sports Leadership, were delivered. Achievement rates were very high, although the numbers of prisoners engaged was low.

## 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 population had become far more complex over the previous year. The number of men on remand for, or convicted of, sex offences had trebled and many were longer-term, high-risk offenders. There was also a more typical substantial population of other remand and short-term prisoners who stayed at the establishment for only a short time.
- 4.2 Strategic oversight of reducing reoffending was underdeveloped. Strategic management was not sufficiently well planned, in order to meet the different needs within the population. There was not yet a comprehensive needs analysis of the different types of prisoner held at the establishment, or action plan. Limited analysis of some of the resettlement pathways had been undertaken but this was not thorough enough as it relied solely on prisoner views.
- 4.3 The reducing reoffending strategy only covered the resettlement pathways and did not include offender management as the hub for all the work aimed at reducing reoffending. The strategy was not supported by an action plan to set out the priorities and timescales for achievement, which made it difficult to see how progress was monitored.
- 4.4 Some oversight was provided through the quality improvement group meeting, which was reasonably well attended but lacked the involvement of some key departments, such as health care. A partnership meeting was held to develop joint working across the resettlement pathways. The links between offender management and resettlement work had also improved.
- 4.5 Despite the large increase in the sex offender population, there was no formal offender management strategy or specific offending behaviour programmes to reduce their risk of harm to others and promote their sentence progression (see main recommendation S63).

#### Recommendation

- 4.6 **The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a comprehensive analysis of the needs of the different types of prisoner held at the establishment and should be supported by a detailed action plan which is regularly reviewed to evidence the progress made.**

## 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.**

- 4.7** Offender management was delivered by Catch22. Higher-risk cases were managed by more experienced caseworkers, which was an appropriate model. Staff were not operational, so were not hindered by cross-deployment to other duties around the prison. In our survey, more prisoners than at similar prisons and than at the time of the previous inspection (58% versus 31% and 46%, respectively) said that they had an offender supervisor, and this was far higher (71%) for men on house block I (which held mostly sex offenders).
- 4.8** Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments which were the responsibility of the prison were up to date. However, there was a backlog of assessments for a number of National Probation Service cases, which was a concern as these tended to be the high-risk prisoners who were serving longer sentences and needed more focus on progression planning.
- 4.9** The quality of OASys assessments was reasonably good, on the whole, but some of the risk management plans we looked at were less well developed as they did not always include actions to be taken during the custodial phase of the sentence. The quality of sentence plans completed by Catch22 staff were not good enough as objectives tended to be too generic, focusing on complying with the prison regime and not sufficiently tailored to individual prisoners to make them more meaningful.
- 4.10** The frequency of offender supervisor contact was reasonably good overall. In our survey, more prisoners than elsewhere said that their offender supervisor was helping them to achieve their sentence plan targets. However, in the cases we looked at, not enough had been done to ensure good-quality contact, particularly in high-risk cases. Most contacts focused on the regime and behavioural details. Few entries showed discussion about individual progression against sentence plans or a reduction in the risk of harm, and they were rarely supported by evidence from other departments, or of offence-focused work. This was particularly apparent in cases where a prisoner was in denial of his conviction, and some case workers struggled to know what to do with these men. Some basic training was planned to try to address this issue but there was insufficient oversight of, and guidance about, the quality of work needed.
- 4.11** Home detention curfew (HDC) assessments started about 10 weeks before the eligibility date. Processes were well managed by staff, who chased late or missing reports, and steps had been taken to improve the timeliness of report submission. The number of prisoners wishing to be assessed for HDC had improved recently, following changes to the application process. However, too many assessments were concluded late, although this was mainly because of issues beyond the control of the prison – for example, the prisoner having too little time left to serve and difficulties in getting the offender manager to submit their report.

### Recommendation

- 4.12 Case workers should be supported in delivering good-quality offender management to the prisoners on their caseload, including contact that is focused on offending behaviour, risk of harm and progression.**



## Public protection

- 4.13 The most recent public protection manual issued by HMPPS in 2016 had not been implemented but steps were being taken during the inspection to rectify this.
- 4.14 Public protection restrictions were applied appropriately and a weekly meeting was held to review mail and telephone monitoring. These restrictions were removed when evidence suggested that it was safe to do so.
- 4.15 There was a large backlog of child contact applications from prisoners, some of which dated back several months. We were told that post-conviction risk assessments from social services were not provided, which meant that the application could not be progressed by the prison.
- 4.16 There was too little recorded evidence of the Catch22 case worker regularly passing on information to the offender manager in the community about the prisoner's behaviour and attitudes while in custody. This resulted in the offender manager not reviewing the case well enough ahead of release or considering the level of management needed under multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA), which potentially hindered the prison's involvement in risk management planning for release.
- 4.17 The interdepartmental risk management team (IRMT) meeting was not sufficiently effective. Attendance was inadequate and its role was too limited. It reviewed only prisoners who had been allocated to a higher level of management under MAPPA (levels 2 and 3), rather than reviewing all high-risk prisoners. It also failed to review the MAPPA management level in the six months before their release, so that information could be exchanged and robust plans developed.

## Recommendations

- 4.18 **The lack of reports from social services should be rectified, to enable child contact applications to be dealt with promptly.**
- 4.19 **The effectiveness of the interdepartmental risk management team should be improved, to ensure that all high risk of harm cases due for release are reviewed regularly and that this results in a high-quality risk management plan.**

## Categorisation

- 4.20 Initial categorisation and reviews were up to date and of a reasonably good quality. Approval was appropriately provided by the head of the OMU.
- 4.21 A large number of transfers were completed each month but few prisoners were transferred in or out of the establishment to access local resettlement help in the last three months of their sentence. Some category B prisoners, particularly sex offenders, had little opportunity to move on owing to the lack of prison places nationally.

## Recommendation

- 4.22 **More places should be available nationally, to ensure that all prisoners, including category B prisoners, are located in the most appropriate prison in order to progress or prepare for release.**

## Indeterminate sentence prisoners

- 4.23** At the time of the inspection, only 32 prisoners were serving an indeterminate sentence, and they were managed by the more experienced Catch22 caseworkers. Provision for them was not based on a needs analysis and there were no specific events or support networks in place.

## Reintegration planning

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.24** The demand for resettlement services was very high, with about 130 releases a month and a large number of new arrivals.
- 4.25** The community rehabilitation company (CRC) contract provided restricted support to most prisoners. Those who would be managed by the South Yorkshire CRC on release (20% of the population) could access a reasonably good amount of support but provision for the majority (80%) was limited to a total of about two hours of support, in addition to the time taken to develop and review the resettlement plan. Additional support was only given when the offender manager in the community approved payment for it, and, to date, this had never happened. Due to further restrictions in the contract, Nacro (the provider of CRC services) was not funded to provide ongoing help during the sentenced period when the need arose, which further hindered support to prisoners.
- 4.26** The small number of Nacro case workers tried hard to manage their large caseloads but, in reality, this was proving difficult because of the high turnover of the population. We were not confident that all prisoners had their resettlement plan reviewed before release. In addition, there was little follow-up of referrals or evidence of action taken to address the problems identified, so we could not see if the support provided had been effective.
- 4.27** An in-reach resource from South Yorkshire CRC provided additional support to high-need cases but only for those from the South Yorkshire CRC area; this focused mainly on housing and debt issues for this very small number of prisoners.
- 4.28** About 20% of prisoners did not attend their resettlement appointments with Nacro, and outcomes for the accommodation and education, training and employment provision were not monitored well enough, which made it difficult to evidence the effectiveness of the provision.

## Recommendations

- 4.29** The resettlement needs of all prisoners should be thoroughly addressed throughout the duration of the sentence.
- 4.30** The accommodation and education, training and employment outcomes for those released should be monitored over time, to provide more robust evidence of the effectiveness of the provision.

## Accommodation

- 4.31** Nacro provided support to address housing problems both on arrival and before release. This included help to maintain or close down tenancies. However, it was difficult to access housing before release, as some local authorities would not accept prisoners as homeless until after their release and the amount of supported housing provision was very limited. Data on the number of men released homeless were not collated reliably (see recommendation 4.30).
- 4.32** The Nacro in-reach team and WISE Ability provided some additional help with accommodation, particularly for those with more complex problems.

## Education, training and employment

- 4.33** The National Careers Service (NCS), provided by Prospects on behalf of the Careers Yorkshire and Humberside consortium, was good. Assessments were carried out on arrival and skills action plans were of good quality, with copies sent to the allocations unit, to ensure that prisoners were placed in the activity which best met their needs.
- 4.34** Several agencies provided help with employability, including job-search skills, disclosure requirements and CV production. The service had also arranged talks by motivational speakers, to help prisoners to adopt positive attitudes as they prepared for release. However, there were weaknesses in the coordination of the work. There was no information sharing, to provide a single coherent service to prisoners.
- 4.35** Good education, training and employment support for prisoners with additional problems was provided by WISE Ability.

## Recommendation

- 4.36** **Education, training and employment resettlement work should be better coordinated, to improve the efficiency of the service.**

## Health care

- 4.37** Health services staff saw prisoners before their discharge and gave them a week's supply of medication where necessary. However, staff reported regular problems with the unplanned release of prisoners from court; no community-style FP10 prescriptions were issued to enable continuity of care after release.
- 4.38** Pre-release planning for prisoners with enduring mental health needs was timely and effective, and appropriate liaison with community services ensured continuity of care.
- 4.39** There were suitable links with community palliative care services.

## Recommendation

- 4.40** **Procedures should be put in place to ensure that there is no disruption in the supply of medicines to a patient following his unexpected release from court.**

## Drugs and alcohol

- 4.41 Release planning for those with substance use problems was good, and included effective liaison with community services. Joint working with OMU and prison-based resettlement services had improved.
- 4.42 Individual harm reduction support was provided pre-release. However, overdose management training and naloxone (an opiate reversal agent) were not available.

## Recommendation

- 4.43 **Before release, prisoners with substance misuse issues should be able to access training on overdose management, including the use of naloxone.**

## Finance, benefit and debt

- 4.44 Prisoners with finance and debt concerns could access an adequate range of advice and support, including some specialist help from Doncaster West Development Trust. Jobcentre Plus staff were also on site, and could set up fresh benefit claims before release. Prisoners could open bank accounts but the number who had been successful was not monitored.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

- 4.45 The support for children and families was a major strength of the establishment.
- 4.46 There was a wide range of visiting times, and the booking system worked well. The visitors centre was appropriate and staff were helpful. The visits hall was spacious, bright and welcoming, with play facilities for children of different ages, a playleader and a cafe (staffed by prisoners) serving hot food, as well as snacks and drinks.
- 4.47 A family support worker had been introduced, supporting families both in the community and in their visits to the prison. She worked closely with the five Families First staff, who offered an impressively comprehensive range of activities, including parents with newborn babies, those with toddlers and those with school-aged children, who could bring their homework in.
- 4.48 Parenting and relationships courses continued alongside these activities, and the 'social kitchen' was used to build prisoners' confidence in preparing meals.
- 4.49 The Prison Advice and Care Trust (PACT) was also in the early stages of delivering 'through-the-gate' support to families.

## Good practice

- 4.50 *A wide range of family activities was delivered, all with a practical focus on resettlement and on strengthening family ties. These activities were complemented by staff giving support and care in the community as well as within the prison.*

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

- 4.51** The thinking skills programme, A–Z (a motivational group work programme aimed at setting goals and developing plans to achieve them) and Timewise (a programme aimed at violence within prison) were delivered. Dropout rates were high but these were being addressed by the programmes team.
- 4.52** There was not yet a comprehensive needs analysis to inform offending behaviour provision but this was under way at the time of the inspection, and was already showing the need for provision for sex offenders (see main recommendation S63).
- 4.53** The psychology team also provided some additional support across the prison, including staff training, individual work with prisoners on the social responsibility unit, and completing assessments of the risk posed by prisoners who had been convicted of a sexual offence.
- 4.54** Some small-scale restorative justice work was available but there was no other structured intervention aimed at developing victim awareness. The use of in-cell workbooks was not managed well enough to promote change.

## Recommendation

- 4.55** **A needs analysis should be completed and used to inform offending behaviour programme provision, including the use of structured one-to-one work aimed at changing attitudes, thinking and behaviour.**

## Additional resettlement services

- 4.56** A Catch22 worker held monthly support forums for veterans in custody, and was trying to develop the support available to them.



# Section 5. Summary of recommendations and good practice

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

## Main recommendation

To HMPPS

- 5.1** HMPPS should support and resource the prison in developing a comprehensive strategy which clearly identifies how men convicted of a sexual offence will be offender managed; how their risk of harm will be reduced; how they will progress through their sentence; and how the public will be protected during custody and on release. (S63)

## Main recommendations

To the director

- 5.2** The focus on violence should continue and violence reduction plans should be applied swiftly and robustly, and should be monitored for their effectiveness. (S59)
- 5.3** Staff should understand how to identify and understand the risks of suicide and self-harm. Prisoners at risk of suicide and self-harm should be supported and this should be reflected in assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) documentation. (S60)
- 5.4** There should be sufficient staff on the house blocks to ensure consistent and confident supervision and care of all prisoners. Staff should challenge inappropriate conduct by prisoners and maintain professional boundaries. (S61, repeated recommendation S41)
- 5.5** The current learning and skills and work curriculum should be reviewed, and the amount and range of vocational training and work should be expanded to meet the needs of the population. (S62)

## Recommendation

To HMPPS

### Offender management and planning

- 5.6** More places should be available nationally, to ensure that all prisoners, including category B prisoners, are located in the most appropriate prison in order to progress or prepare for release. (4.22)

## Recommendation

To Prisoner Escort and Custody Services (PECS)

### Courts, escort and transfers

- 5.7** Prisoners should not have long waits locked in court cells before travelling to the prison. (1.3)

## Recommendations

To the director

### Bullying and violence reduction

- 5.8** The regime for prisoners on the social responsibility unit should be improved and include structured interventions and activities aimed at reducing antisocial behaviour, with sufficient time out of cell. (1.20)

### Self-harm and suicide

- 5.9** There should be sufficient Listeners to meet the needs of the population. (1.27)

### Safeguarding

- 5.10** Comprehensive adult safeguarding procedures should be introduced and embedded across the prison. (1.30)

### Security

- 5.11** Drug supply reduction measures should be applied swiftly and robustly, should have clear performance measures and be monitored for effectiveness. (1.36)

### Incentives and earned privileges

- 5.12** The incentives and earned privileges scheme should clearly promote and reward positive behaviour. Behaviour should be reviewed regularly and prisoners should have opportunities to behave well. (1.40)

### Discipline

- 5.13** The adjudications system should provide an effective deterrent to antisocial behaviour. (1.44)
- 5.14** Adjudications should be dealt with promptly. (1.45)
- 5.15** The segregation unit should be well maintained, and the regime should allow prisoners access to constructive activity. (1.56, repeated recommendation 1.59)
- 5.16** Good order or discipline and care and reintegration planning reviews should be attended by staff from relevant departments, address the prisoner's individual circumstances and focus on their reintegration into the prison. (1.57, repeated recommendation 1.58)

### Substance misuse

- 5.17** All prisoners with substance misuse issues should have easy access to an appropriate range of psychosocial support services throughout their stay, including mutual aid and groups of varying intensity. (1.66)
- 5.18** All new prisoners with drug or alcohol dependency should be located on the stabilisation unit. (1.67)
- 5.19** Local policies and prescribing for substance misuse needs should be individualised, reflect current national guidance and start on prisoners' first night at the establishment. (1.68)



## Residential units

- 5.20** Cell call bells should be responded to within five minutes. (2.8)

## Equality and diversity

- 5.21** A thorough needs analysis of all prisoners with disabilities should be completed, leading to practical measures, including reasonable adjustments in response to individual need, and a sound system of peer supporters. (2.27)
- 5.22** A clear strategy should be implemented for the management of young adults, based on identification of needs and priorities specific to this group. (2.28)

## Faith and religious activity

- 5.23** The chaplaincy, in consultation with managers, should develop and implement a strategy for making a more visible and positive contribution to the life of the prison. (2.32)

## Health services

- 5.24** Patients should receive their medications promptly to ensure they continue appropriate treatment. (2.65, repeated recommendation 2.70)
- 5.25** Medicines should be administered and supervised in line with established recommended dosage schedules for optimal care. (2.66)
- 5.26** Medicines management should be improved, including the ordering and safe storage of medicines, with increased professional oversight by the pharmacist. (2.67)
- 5.27** Patients should have access to professional counselling services. (2.75)
- 5.28** Transfers of patients to mental health services should take place within the current time guideline. (2.76, repeated recommendation 2.81)

## Catering

- 5.29** Black and minority ethnic and Muslim prisoners' negative perceptions of the food provided should be investigated and acted on. (2.84)
- 5.30** Staff should always supervise mealtimes, to ensure that servery queues are well ordered and that food is given out fairly and hygienically. (2.85)

## Time out of cell

- 5.31** Prisoners should be unlocked for at least 10 hours a day. (3.5)

## Learning and skills and work activities

- 5.32** Managers should improve quality assurance monitoring and reporting of its education and training provision, to ensure that prison managers are well aware of the strengths and areas for improvement. (3.11)
- 5.33** Study skills support for open and distance learners should be provided. (3.24)

- 5.34** Prisoners should attend their classes and workshops on time, and not leave sessions before the end. (3.29)
- 5.35** The number of learners who complete and pass their courses should be improved. (3.33)
- 5.36** All prisoners should be able to access the library at least once a week. (3.38)

#### **Strategic management of resettlement**

- 5.37** The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a comprehensive analysis of the needs of the different types of prisoner held at the establishment and should be supported by a detailed action plan which is regularly reviewed to evidence the progress made. (4.6)

#### **Offender management and planning**

- 5.38** Case workers should be supported in delivering good-quality offender management to the prisoners on their caseload, including contact that is focused on offending behaviour, risk of harm and progression. (4.12)
- 5.39** The lack of reports from social services should be rectified, to enable child contact applications to be dealt with promptly. (4.18)
- 5.40** The effectiveness of the interdepartmental risk management team should be improved, to ensure that all high risk of harm cases due for release are reviewed regularly and that this results in a high-quality risk management plan. (4.19)

#### **Reintegration planning**

- 5.41** The resettlement needs of all prisoners should be thoroughly addressed throughout the duration of the sentence. (4.29)
- 5.42** The accommodation and education, training and employment outcomes for those released should be monitored over time, to provide more robust evidence of the effectiveness of the provision. (4.30)
- 5.43** Education, training and employment resettlement work should be better coordinated, to improve the efficiency of the service. (4.36)
- 5.44** Procedures should be put in place to ensure that there is no disruption in the supply of medicines to a patient following his unexpected release from court. (4.40)
- 5.45** Before release, prisoners with substance misuse issues should be able to access training on overdose management, including the use of naloxone. (4.43)
- 5.46** A needs analysis should be completed and used to inform offending behaviour programme provision, including the use of structured one-to-one work aimed at changing attitudes, thinking and behaviour. (4.55)

## Examples of good practice

### Residential units

- 5.47** New arrivals were issued with their own tea towel, which aimed to improve basic decency. (2.9)
- 5.48** Prisoners were able to request cell repairs using the electronic kiosks on the house blocks. (2.10)

### Complaints

- 5.49** A new system for handling complaints had been embedded which ensured excellent timeliness and thorough quality control of responses. (2.36)

### Health services

- 5.50** Face-to-face meetings to address patients' unresolved complaints and concerns enabled them to be heard and their feelings to be acknowledged. (2.52)
- 5.51** The introduction of a 24-hour paramedic service ensured rapid access to the best practice response in emergency medical situations. (2.53)

### Reintegration planning

- 5.52** A wide range of family activities was delivered, all with a practical focus on resettlement and on strengthening family ties. These activities were complemented by staff giving support and care in the community as well as within the prison. (4.50)



## Section 6. Appendices

### Appendix I: Inspection team

Peter Clarke	Chief Inspector
Alison Perry	Team leader
Sandra Fieldhouse	Inspector
Paul Rowlands	Inspector
Jonathan Tickner	Inspector
Martin Kettle	Inspector
Gordon Riach	Inspector
Natalie-Anne Hall	Researcher
Emma Seymour	Researcher
Ellis Cowling	Researcher
Patricia Taflan	Researcher
Paul Tarbuck	Health and substance misuse services inspector
Paul Roberts	Health and substance misuse services inspector
Majella Pearce	Health and substance misuse services inspector
Deborah Hylands	Pharmacist
Catriona Reeves	Care Quality Commission inspector
Steve Oliver-Watts	Ofsted inspector
Dan Grant	Ofsted inspector
Keith Hughes	Ofsted inspector
Martyn Griffiths	Offender management and resettlement 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 2015, prisoners waited too long in courts cells before they arrived at the prison. Reception staff were welcoming and induction was adequate, but first night procedures were not consistent. There were a high number of violent incidents and a lack of control and supervision on the units. Staffing shortages were a critical problem. Prisoners at risk of self-harm were reasonably well cared for by individual staff but many spent too much time isolated in their cells without activities. There had been three self-inflicted deaths in the previous 18 months and important Prisons and Probation Ombudsman recommendations had not been implemented. There were some gaps in procedural security. Segregation was overused and use of force was high. Special cell use was very high and not always justified. Prisoners with substance misuse problems received an inadequate service. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test*

#### **Main recommendations**

All prisoners should have a private interview on arrival to identify needs and risks, and this should be followed up by systematic support on the first night and during the early days in the prison. (S38)

##### **Achieved**

Violence should be significantly reduced, and the prison should take a rigorous approach to identifying, investigating and dealing with violent incidents and supporting victims. (S39)

##### **Partially achieved**

Prisoners at risk of self-harm should have effective support, including through quick access to Listeners and appropriate activities. Their care should be guided by effective ACCT processes, and risks should be mitigated by swift implementation and continuing review of all recommendations following deaths in custody. (S40)

##### **Partially achieved**

#### **Recommendations**

Prisoners should not have long waits at court. (1.3)

##### **Not achieved**

The reception process should be completed quickly, and holding rooms should be more welcoming and contain useful information for prisoners. (1.10)

##### **Not achieved**

Prisoners on the vulnerable prisoner unit should be kept safe and free from abuse at all times, including during periods of exercise or when off the unit. (1.20)

##### **Achieved**

The director should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (I.29)

**Not achieved**

Managers should ensure that staff effectively implement all aspects of procedural and dynamic security. (I.37)

**Not achieved**

Security committee meetings should be attended by representatives of all relevant departments, and links between the security department and safer custody should be strengthened. (I.38)

**Achieved**

Mandatory and suspicion drug tests should be carried out promptly on receipt of appropriate intelligence. (I.39)

**Partially achieved**

The drug strategy committee should meet regularly and oversee a substance misuse strategy containing detailed action plans and performance measures for both supply and demand reduction initiatives. (I.40)

**Achieved**

The incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme should motivate prisoners to change the way they behave. It should be applied consistently and fairly, and those on the basic regime should be given every opportunity to demonstrate improved behaviour. (I.44)

**Not achieved**

Adjudications should be dealt with promptly and be subject to formal quality assurance. (I.48)

**Not achieved**

Use of force and special accommodation should be justified, fully documented, and subject to quality assurance and rigorous scrutiny at regular use of force meetings. (I.52)

**Achieved**

Prisoners should only be held in the segregation unit pending adjudication or for reasons of self-harm risk if they cannot be safely managed on the wings. (I.57)

**Not achieved**

Good order or discipline and care and reintegration planning reviews should be attended by staff from relevant departments, address the prisoner's individual circumstances and focus on their reintegration into the prison. (I.58)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.57)

The care and separation unit should be well maintained, and the regime should allow prisoners access to constructive activity. (I.59)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, I.56)

An up-to-date needs analysis should be completed and service provision adjusted to meet emerging needs. (I.68)

**Not achieved**

Prisoners undergoing opiate or alcohol detoxification regimes should receive a high level of support to ensure safe outcomes. Prescribing regimes should be flexible, based on individual need and adhere to national guidance, and discipline staff should supervise medication administration effectively. (I.69)

**Not achieved**



## Respect

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

*At the last inspection, in 2015, many parts of the prison were dirty and the condition of many cells was unacceptable. Prisoners were reasonably positive about staff, but there were not enough staff and they did not always challenge prisoners. The management of equality and diversity work was improving but outcomes were still poor for many minority groups. Faith provision was adequate. Many responses to prisoner complaints were unacceptably poor. Health services had deteriorated and there were areas of significant concern. The standard of food was good. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendations

There should be sufficient staff on wings to ensure consistent and confident supervision and care of all prisoners. Staff should challenge inappropriate conduct by prisoners and maintain professional boundaries. (S41)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, S61)

Prison cells and the general environment should provide clean, safe and decent living conditions for all prisoners. (S42)

**Achieved**

### Recommendations

Cell bells should be responded to quickly and there should be management oversight of response times. (2.8)

**Not achieved**

The diversity and equality action plan should be implemented, diversity should be promoted, and disparities emerging from equality monitoring data systematically addressed. (2.18)

**Not achieved**

There should be regular consultation with all minority groups and their concerns should be acted on. In particular, the specific needs of the young adult population should be identified and met. (2.25)

**Partially achieved**

Immigration detainees should be transferred to immigration removal centres and not be held in prisons unless an individual risk assessment suggests otherwise. (2.26)

**Not achieved**

There should be robust quality assurance of complaints that ensures that all responses are handled by the appropriate staff member, and are timely and of good quality. (2.36)

**Achieved**

Staffing shortages and skills-mix gaps should be addressed to ensure clinical services are safe and meet prisoners' health needs. (2.52)

**Achieved**

All clinical areas should fully comply with infection control standards. (2.53)

**Achieved**

Custody staff should be reminded of the emergency protocol and always call an ambulance when required. (2.54)

**Achieved**

Prisoners with lifelong conditions should receive regular reviews from appropriately trained and supervised staff that generate an evidence-based care plan. (2.63)

**Achieved**

There should be adequate escort arrangements for prisoners to attend hospital appointments, and the health care department and the prison should monitor external hospital appointments jointly and robustly. (2.64)

**Not achieved**

Patients should receive their medications promptly to ensure they continue appropriate treatment. (2.70)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.65)

In-possession medicines risk assessments, which consider the risks of the drug as well as the patient, should be completed routinely and consistently. The in-possession policy should be robustly followed, and the status and reasons for the determination recorded accurately on SystemOne. (2.71)

**Achieved**

Lockable cupboards should be provided in cells for patients prescribed in-possession medication, and there should be adequate supervision of all medicines administration to ensure confidentiality and prevent diversion. (2.72)

**Partially achieved**

Mental health patients should have access to all clinically indicated psychological and group interventions, including professional counselling. (2.80)

**Partially achieved**

Transfers of patients to mental health services should take place within the current time guideline. (2.81)

**Not achieved** (recommendation repeated, 2.76)

There should be a rolling programme of mental health awareness training for all discipline staff. (2.82)

**Achieved**

Acceptable standards of hygiene should be maintained in the kitchen and on food trolleys and the communal microwaves. (2.87)

**Achieved**

Prisoners' catalogue orders should be processed promptly, and they should not be charged for such orders. (2.91)

**Achieved**

## Purposeful activity

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

*At the last inspection, in 2015, time out of cell was poorly recorded and managed. Although there were enough activity spaces for the population, attendance was low, especially in education, and some good facilities were poorly used. There was some purposeful workshop provision, and the quality of education and vocational training was good, as were prisoner achievements. Library and PE provision were good but access was too limited. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.*

### Main recommendation

All prisoners who are able to participate in activities should be purposefully occupied during the day. Activity places should be filled and attendance significantly increased. Officers should actively encourage prisoners to attend and challenge those who refuse. (S43)

**Not achieved**

### Recommendations

Accurate data covering all aspects of learning and skills and work should be available to managers so that they can make timely and informed judgements about all aspects of the provision. (3.9)

**Achieved**

The achievements of young adult prisoners should be monitored and analysed separately from those of adult prisoners, and effective action taken to remedy any underperformance. (3.10, repeated recommendation 3.15)

**Achieved**

Tutors should apply higher and consistent standards to the marking of learners' work and the feedback they provide to help them improve. (3.22)

**Achieved**

Prisoners' achievement of English at entry level should be improved so that it is at least good. (3.28)

**Not achieved**

Managers should ensure that prisoners are able to visit the gym and library at their allotted times. (3.37)

**Achieved**

The PE department should collect and analyse data on gym attendance to identify any groups of prisoners who do not participate in PE and to encourage them to take part. (3.38)

**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 2015, there was insufficient integration of resettlement services, but resettlement outcomes were reasonably good. Most prisoners had good caseworker contact, and assessments and sentence plans were completed well. Public protection work was not sufficiently rigorous. Reintegration work was generally appropriate. Visits provision was good, although sessions were not well managed. Work to promote family ties was very good, although they excluded vulnerable prisoners. Outcomes for prisoners were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.*

#### **Main recommendation**

All prisoners subject to multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPA) should have their risk level clarified six months before release and be reviewed regularly by the inter-departmental risk management team thereafter. Information should be updated on P-Nomis to ensure that all staff are aware of the risks posed by such prisoners. (S44)

**Not achieved**

#### **Recommendations**

The prison should develop a clear strategic approach to offender management and resettlement, based on an up-to-date needs analysis, that clearly outlines the role of each department, how work should be integrated and how the needs of prisoners can be consistently met. (4.6)

**Not achieved**

Basic custody screenings, sentence and resettlement plans should include relevant information from all departments, which should centrally record the work that they are undertaking. Prisoners should receive a copy of their plans. (4.14)

**Not achieved**

Caseworker professional development should include skills in engagement with prisoners to support work in challenging offending behaviour, assessing risk and reducing likelihood of reoffending. (4.15)

**Partially achieved**

All necessary reports relating to home detention curfew should be completed within agreed timescales, and there should be a process for escalating concerns about delays. (4.16)

**Partially achieved**

The prison should ensure there is clear monitoring data on prisoners' accommodation on release, and should resolve shortfalls in provision. (4.25)

**Not achieved**

The prison should establish links with a broader range of employers to improve prisoners' employment prospects on release. (4.28)

**Achieved**

The management of visitors and prisoners going in and out of the visits hall should be well coordinated and adequately supervised, and all visits should start on time. (4.35)

**Achieved**

The number of visits available to unconvicted prisoners should not be restricted. (4.36)

**Achieved**

Appropriate vulnerable prisoners should have access to Families First interventions, subject to a risk assessment and where there are no statutory safeguarding restrictions. (4.37)

**Achieved**

The prison should assess the effectiveness of its current offending behaviour programmes to ensure that they meet the reoffending reduction needs of the population, and seek alternative programmes if necessary. (4.41)

**Not achieved**

The prison should develop a strategy to address the management of and engagement with prisoners convicted of sex offences. (4.42)

**Not 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	79	630	63.6
Recall	7	89	8.6
Convicted unsentenced	0	0	0
Remand	32	118	13.5
Civil prisoners	0	0	0
Detainees	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Sentence	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Unsentenced	63	236	26.8
Less than six months	14	58	6.5
six months to less than 12 months	12	38	4.5
12 months to less than 2 years	11	74	7.6
2 years to less than 4 years	32	136	15.1
4 years to less than 10 years	15	168	16.4
10 years and over (not life)	2	222	20.1
ISPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)	0	13	1.2
Life	1	20	3.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Please state minimum age here: 18		
Under 21 years	150	13.5
21 years to 29 years	304	27.3
30 years to 39 years	328	29.4
40 years to 49 years	170	15.2
50 years to 59 years	85	7.6
60 years to 69 years	47	4.2
70 plus years	31	2.8
Please state maximum age here: 82		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,115</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Nationality	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
British	142	891	92.6
Foreign nationals	8	74	7.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<b>Security category</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
Uncategorised unsentenced	53	220	24.5
Uncategorised sentenced	0	0	0
Category A	0	0	0
Category B	0	223	20.0
Category C	0	505	45.3
Category D	0	16	1.4
Other	97	1	8.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>18–20-year-olds</b>	<b>21 and over</b>	<b>%</b>
White	101	788	79.7
British	95	734	74.3
Irish	0	3	0.3
Gypsy/Irish Traveller	3	20	2.1
Other white	3	31	3.0
Mixed	11	24	3.1
White and black Caribbean	9	18	2.4
White and black African	0	0	0
White and Asian	1	4	0.4
Other mixed	1	2	0.3
Asian or Asian British	28	87	10.3
Indian	0	11	1.0
Pakistani	23	57	7.2
Bangladeshi	0	2	0.2
Chinese	0	0	0
Other Asian	5	17	2.0
Black or black British	9	62	6.4
Caribbean	2	33	3.1
African	4	19	2.1
Other black	3	10	1.2
Other ethnic group	1	3	0.4
Arab	0	2	0.2
Other ethnic group	1	1	0.2
Not stated	0	1	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>100.0</b>



Religion	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Baptist	0	0	0
Church of England	7	197	18.3
Roman Catholic	19	133	13.6
Other Christian denominations	11	100	10.0
Muslim	32	119	13.5
Sikh	0	3	0.3
Hindu	0	2	0.2
Buddhist	0	7	0.6
Jewish	1	2	0.3
Other	0	3	0.3
No religion	80	397	42.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Other demographics	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Veteran (ex-armed services)			
<b>Total</b>			

### Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	31	2.8	133	11.9
1 month to 3 months	28	2.5	168	15.1
3 months to six months	17	1.5	176	15.8
six months to 1 year	9	0.8	177	15.9
1 year to 2 years	2	0.2	59	5.3
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	13	1.2
4 years or more	0	0.0	3	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>65.4</b>

### Sentenced prisoners only

	18–20-year-olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post sentence expiry	0	0	0.0
Public protection cases (this does not refer to public protection sentence categories but cases requiring monitoring/restrictions).	0	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

### Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20-year-olds		21 and over	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	17	1.5	90	8.1
1 month to 3 months	28	2.5	64	5.7
3 months to six months	15	1.3	63	5.7
six months to 1 year	3	0.3	16	1.4
1 year to 2 years	0	0.0	3	0.3
2 years to 4 years	0	0.0	0	0.0
4 years or more	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>21.2</b>

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

## Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

### Prisoner survey methodology

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

### Sampling

The prisoner survey was conducted on a representative sample of the prison population. Using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician we calculated the sample size required to ensure that our survey findings reflected the experiences of the entire population of the establishment.<sup>8</sup> Respondents were then randomly selected from a P-Nomis prisoner population printout using a 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 10 July 2017 the prisoner population at HMP & YOI Doncaster was 1,130. Using the method described above, questionnaires were distributed to a sample of 225 prisoners.

We received a total of 178 completed questionnaires, a response rate of 79%. This included two questionnaires completed via interview. Twenty-one respondents refused to complete a questionnaire and 26 questionnaires were not returned.

---

<sup>8</sup> 95% confidence interval with a sampling error of 7%. The formula assumes a 75% response rate (65% in open establishments) and we routinely 'oversample' to ensure we achieve the minimum number of responses required.

Wing/Unit	Number of completed survey returns
HB 1	66
HB 2	49
HB 3	51
Social care unit	9
Segregation unit	3

### Presentation of survey results and analyses

Over the following pages we present the survey results for HMP & YOI Doncaster.

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

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

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

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

The following comparative analyses are presented:

- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Doncaster in 2017 compared with responses from prisoners surveyed in all other local prisons. This comparator is based on all responses from prisoner surveys carried out in 33 local prisons since April 2014.
- The current survey responses from HMP & YOI Doncaster in 2017 compared with the responses of prisoners surveyed at HMP & YOI Doncaster in 2015.
- 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 Muslim prisoners and non-Muslim prisoners.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between those who are aged 50 and over and those under 50.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between those who are aged 21 and under and those over 21.
- A comparison within the 2017 survey between the responses of prisoners on house block 1 and the responses of prisoners on house blocks 2 and 3.

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

# Survey summary

## Section I: About You

<b>Q1.1</b>	<b>What wing or house block are you currently living on?</b> See survey methodology.	
<b>Q1.2</b>	<b>How old are you?</b>	
	Under 21 .....	25 (14%)
	21 - 29.....	54 (31%)
	30 - 39.....	52 (30%)
	40 - 49.....	19 (11%)
	50 - 59.....	13 (7%)
	60 - 69.....	7 (4%)
	70 and over .....	6 (3%)
<b>Q1.3</b>	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>	
	Yes .....	119 (69%)
	Yes - on recall.....	10 (6%)
	No - awaiting trial.....	31 (18%)
	No - awaiting sentence .....	12 (7%)
	No - awaiting deportation.....	0 (0%)
<b>Q1.4</b>	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>	
	Not sentenced.....	43 (25%)
	Less than 6 months.....	14 (8%)
	6 months to less than 1 year .....	7 (4%)
	1 year to less than 2 years .....	18 (10%)
	2 years to less than 4 years .....	29 (17%)
	4 years to less than 10 years.....	24 (14%)
	10 years or more.....	33 (19%)
	IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection) .....	2 (1%)
	Life.....	5 (3%)
<b>Q1.5</b>	<b>Are you a foreign national (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)?</b>	
	Yes.....	17 (10%)
	No.....	155 (90%)
<b>Q1.6</b>	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>	
	Yes.....	171 (97%)
	No.....	5 (3%)
<b>Q1.7</b>	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>	
	Yes .....	171 (98%)
	No.....	4 (2%)

<b>Q1.8</b>	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	White - British (English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish).....	129 (74%)	Asian or Asian British - Chinese..... 0 (0%)
	White - Irish .....	2 (1%)	Asian or Asian British - other .....
	White - other.....	11 (6%)	Mixed race - white and black Caribbean .
	Black or black British - Caribbean.....	2 (1%)	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 .....	2 (1%)	Arab .....
	Asian or Asian British - Pakistani.....	11 (6%)	Other ethnic group.....
	Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi.....	0 (0%)	
<b>Q1.9</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?</b>		
	Yes .....		12 (7%)
	No.....		160 (93%)
<b>Q1.10</b>	<b>What is your religion?</b>		
	None.....	61 (35%)	Hindu..... 0 (0%)
	Church of England .....	51 (29%)	Jewish..... 1 (1%)
	Catholic .....	25 (14%)	Muslim..... 23 (13%)
	Protestant.....	0 (0%)	Sikh .....
	Other Christian denomination .....	4 (2%)	Other .....
	Buddhist .....	1 (1%)	
<b>Q1.11</b>	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>		
	Heterosexual/ Straight .....		163 (95%)
	Homosexual/Gay.....		3 (2%)
	Bisexual.....		6 (3%)
<b>Q1.12</b>	<b>Do you consider yourself to have a disability (i.e. do you need help with any long term physical, mental or learning needs)?</b>		
	Yes .....		60 (34%)
	No.....		116 (66%)
<b>Q1.13</b>	<b>Are you a veteran (ex- armed services)?</b>		
	Yes .....		13 (7%)
	No.....		162 (93%)
<b>Q1.14</b>	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>		
	Yes .....		84 (49%)
	No.....		89 (51%)
<b>Q1.15</b>	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>		
	Yes .....		91 (53%)
	No.....		82 (47%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

<b>Q2.1</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>		
	Less than 2 hours .....		120 (68%)
	2 hours or longer .....		46 (26%)
	Don't remember .....		11 (6%)

<b>Q2.2</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered anything to eat or drink?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i> .....	120 (69%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	23 (13%)
	<i>No</i> .....	26 (15%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	6 (3%)
<b>Q2.3</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>	
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i> .....	120 (69%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>No</i> .....	43 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	6 (3%)
<b>Q2.4</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	88 (50%)
	<i>No</i> .....	75 (43%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	13 (7%)
<b>Q2.5</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	121 (70%)
	<i>No</i> .....	47 (27%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	6 (3%)
<b>Q2.6</b>	<b>On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?</b>	
	<i>Very well</i> .....	45 (25%)
	<i>Well</i> .....	74 (42%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	34 (19%)
	<i>Badly</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>Very badly</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	5 (3%)
<b>Q2.7</b>	<b>Before you arrived, were you given anything or told that you were coming here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Yes, someone told me</i> .....	112 (63%)
	<i>Yes, I received written information</i> .....	6 (3%)
	<i>No, I was not told anything</i> .....	48 (27%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	13 (7%)
<b>Q2.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	124 (71%)
	<i>No</i> .....	42 (24%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	9 (5%)

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

<b>Q3.1</b>	<b>How long were you in reception?</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	59 (33%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....	112 (63%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	6 (3%)
<b>Q3.2</b>	<b>When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	145 (81%)
	<i>No</i> .....	22 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	11 (6%)

<b>Q3.3</b>	<b>Overall, how were you treated in reception?</b>		
	Very well.....	42 (24%)	
	Well.....	84 (47%)	
	Neither.....	28 (16%)	
	Badly.....	13 (7%)	
	Very badly.....	7 (4%)	
	Don't remember.....	3 (2%)	
<b>Q3.4</b>	<b>Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	Loss of property.....	33 (19%)	Physical health.....
	Housing problems.....	30 (17%)	Mental health.....
	Contacting employers.....	3 (2%)	Needing protection from other prisoners.....
	Contacting family.....	41 (24%)	Getting phone numbers.....
	Childcare.....	2 (1%)	Other.....
	Money worries.....	37 (21%)	Did not have any problems.....
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	56 (32%)	
<b>Q3.5</b>	<b>Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?</b>		
	Yes.....	55 (32%)	
	No.....	77 (45%)	
	Did not have any problems.....	38 (22%)	
<b>Q3.6</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	Tobacco.....	151 (86%)	
	A shower.....	88 (50%)	
	A free telephone call.....	135 (77%)	
	Something to eat.....	135 (77%)	
	PIN phone credit.....	82 (47%)	
	Toiletries/ basic items.....	136 (77%)	
	Did not receive anything.....	3 (2%)	
<b>Q3.7</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	Chaplain.....	70 (41%)	
	Someone from health services.....	116 (68%)	
	A Listener/Samaritans.....	51 (30%)	
	Prison shop/ canteen.....	63 (37%)	
	Did not have access to any of these.....	31 (18%)	
<b>Q3.8</b>	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>		
	What was going to happen to you.....	66 (40%)	
	What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal.....	67 (41%)	
	How to make routine requests (applications).....	60 (37%)	
	Your entitlement to visits.....	60 (37%)	
	Health services.....	81 (50%)	
	Chaplaincy.....	60 (37%)	
	Not offered any information.....	51 (31%)	
<b>Q3.9</b>	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>		
	Yes.....	111 (65%)	
	No.....	54 (32%)	
	Don't remember.....	6 (4%)	



<b>Q3.10</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	29 (17%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	56 (33%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	73 (43%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	13 (8%)
<b>Q3.11</b>	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	29 (17%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	68 (40%)
	<i>No</i> .....	62 (37%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	10 (6%)
<b>Q3.12</b>	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i> .....	37 (22%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	35 (20%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	80 (47%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	19 (11%)

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

<b>Q4.1</b>	<b>How easy is it to.....</b>						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	33 (19%)	37 (22%)	12 (7%)	34 (20%)	31 (18%)	23 (14%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	35 (22%)	47 (29%)	24 (15%)	13 (8%)	14 (9%)	27 (17%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	13 (9%)	9 (6%)	25 (17%)	21 (14%)	27 (18%)	55 (37%)
<b>Q4.2</b>	<b>Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?</b>						
	<i>Not had any letters</i> .....						22 (13%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....						56 (34%)
	<i>No</i> .....						88 (53%)
<b>Q4.3</b>	<b>Can you get legal books in the library?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						53 (31%)
	<i>No</i> .....						15 (9%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....						102 (60%)
<b>Q4.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:</b>						
		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>			
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>	98 (57%)	70 (41%)	4 (2%)			
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>	159 (94%)	11 (6%)	0 (0%)			
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>	148 (87%)	21 (12%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>	75 (45%)	92 (55%)	1 (1%)			
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>	29 (17%)	133 (78%)	8 (5%)			
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>	70 (42%)	94 (57%)	2 (1%)			
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>	36 (22%)	75 (45%)	54 (33%)			
<b>Q4.5</b>	<b>What is the food like here?</b>						
	<i>Very good</i> .....						11 (6%)
	<i>Good</i> .....						60 (35%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....						46 (27%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....						35 (20%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....						19 (11%)

<b>Q4.6</b>	<b>Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?</b>	
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i> .....	8 (5%)
	Yes .....	99 (58%)
	No.....	64 (37%)
<b>Q4.7</b>	<b>Can you speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	86 (50%)
	No.....	31 (18%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	56 (32%)
<b>Q4.8</b>	<b>Are your religious beliefs respected?</b>	
	Yes .....	80 (46%)
	No.....	26 (15%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i> .....	67 (39%)
<b>Q4.9</b>	<b>Are you able to speak to a Chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?</b>	
	Yes .....	89 (53%)
	No.....	19 (11%)
	<i>Don't know/ N/A</i> .....	61 (36%)
<b>Q4.10</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?</b>	
	<i>I don't want to attend</i> .....	47 (27%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	38 (22%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	33 (19%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	11 (6%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	11 (6%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	25 (15%)

### Section 5: Applications and complaints

<b>Q5.1</b>	<b>Is it easy to make an application?</b>			
	Yes .....	113 (66%)		
	No .....	33 (19%)		
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	24 (14%)		
<b>Q5.2</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about applications. (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>			
		<i>Not made one</i>	Yes	
		No		
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	32 (19%)	60 (36%)	74 (45%)
	Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	32 (21%)	36 (23%)	88 (56%)
<b>Q5.3</b>	<b>Is it easy to make a complaint?</b>			
	Yes .....	89 (52%)		
	No .....	41 (24%)		
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	40 (24%)		
<b>Q5.4</b>	<b>Please answer the following questions about complaints. (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)</b>			
		<i>Not made one</i>	Yes	No
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	63 (38%)	32 (19%)	73 (43%)
	Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	63 (40%)	28 (18%)	68 (43%)

<b>Q5.5</b>	<b>Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?</b>	
	Yes .....	36 (22%)
	No.....	127 (78%)
<b>Q5.6</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?</b>	
	<i>Don't know who they are</i> .....	73 (44%)
	Very easy.....	11 (7%)
	Easy .....	19 (12%)
	Neither .....	29 (18%)
	Difficult.....	13 (8%)
	Very difficult.....	20 (12%)

### Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

<b>Q6.1</b>	<b>Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i> .....	17 (10%)
	Yes .....	90 (54%)
	No .....	43 (26%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	17 (10%)
<b>Q6.2</b>	<b>Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)</b>	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i> .....	17 (11%)
	Yes .....	79 (49%)
	No.....	53 (33%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	12 (7%)
<b>Q6.3</b>	<b>In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&amp;R)?</b>	
	Yes .....	22 (13%)
	No.....	142 (87%)
<b>Q6.4</b>	<b>If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?</b>	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i> .....	127 (77%)
	Very well.....	9 (5%)
	Well.....	8 (5%)
	Neither .....	4 (2%)
	Badly.....	5 (3%)
	Very badly .....	13 (8%)

### Section 7: Relationships with staff

<b>Q7.1</b>	<b>Do most staff treat you with respect?</b>	
	Yes .....	134 (80%)
	No.....	33 (20%)
<b>Q7.2</b>	<b>Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?</b>	
	Yes .....	116 (72%)
	No.....	45 (28%)
<b>Q7.3</b>	<b>Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?</b>	
	Yes .....	65 (39%)
	No.....	101 (61%)

<b>Q7.4</b>	<b>How often do staff normally speak to you during association?</b>	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	9 (5%)
	<i>Never</i> .....	24 (14%)
	<i>Rarely</i> .....	34 (20%)
	<i>Some of the time</i> .....	52 (31%)
	<i>Most of the time</i> .....	25 (15%)
	<i>All of the time</i> .....	22 (13%)
<b>Q7.5</b>	<b>When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	91 (55%)
	<i>In the first week</i> .....	34 (21%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	23 (14%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	17 (10%)
<b>Q7.6</b>	<b>How helpful is your personal (named) officer?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/ I have not met him/ her</i> .....	91 (56%)
	<i>Very helpful</i> .....	30 (19%)
	<i>Helpful</i> .....	21 (13%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>Not very helpful</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Not at all helpful</i> .....	7 (4%)

### Section 8: Safety

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....	105 (62%)		
	<i>No</i> .....	64 (38%)		
<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....	47 (29%)		
	<i>No</i> .....	115 (71%)		
<b>Q8.3</b>	<b>In which areas have you felt unsafe? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>			
	<i>Never felt unsafe</i> .....	64 (39%)	<i>At meal times</i> .....	29 (18%)
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	27 (17%)	<i>At health services</i> .....	24 (15%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i> .....	7 (4%)	<i>Visits area</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	39 (24%)	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	33 (20%)
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	15 (9%)	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	12 (7%)
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	14 (9%)	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	26 (16%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	27 (17%)	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	34 (21%)
	<i>At work</i> .....	14 (9%)	<i>In your cell</i> .....	21 (13%)
	<i>During movement</i> .....	48 (29%)	<i>At religious services</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>At education</i> .....	14 (9%)		
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>			
	<i>Yes</i> .....	78 (46%)		
	<i>No</i> .....	91 (54%)		

<b>Q8.5</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) .....</i>	33 (20%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted) .....</i>	37 (22%)
	<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated .....</i>	48 (28%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken .....</i>	24 (14%)
	<i>Medication .....</i>	8 (5%)
	<i>Debt.....</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Drugs .....</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin .....</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Your nationality.....</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others .....</i>	10 (6%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community .....</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation .....</i>	6 (4%)
	<i>Your age.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability .....</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You were new here .....</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime.....</i>	23 (14%)
	<i>Gang related issues.....</i>	16 (9%)
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>	
	Yes .....	53 (31%)
	No.....	116 (69%)
<b>Q8.7</b>	<b>If yes, what did the incident(s) involve/ what was it about? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Insulting remarks (about you or your family or friends) .....</i>	23 (14%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted).....</i>	11 (7%)
	<i>Sexual abuse.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated .....</i>	15 (9%)
	<i>Medication .....</i>	9 (5%)
	<i>Debt.....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>Drugs .....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin.....</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs.....</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality .....</i>	0 (0%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others.....</i>	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community .....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation.....</i>	2 (1%)
	<i>Your age.....</i>	3 (2%)
	<i>You have a disability .....</i>	4 (2%)
	<i>You were new here.....</i>	7 (4%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime .....</i>	12 (7%)
	<i>Gang related issues.....</i>	3 (2%)
<b>Q8.8</b>	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	Not been victimised.....	78 (52%)
	Yes .....	31 (21%)
	No.....	40 (27%)

## Section 9: Health services

<b>Q9.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to see the following people?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	The doctor	24 (15%)	10 (6%)	26 (16%)	18 (11%)	51 (31%)	36 (22%)
	The nurse	20 (12%)	16 (10%)	51 (31%)	25 (15%)	34 (21%)	17 (10%)
	The dentist	35 (22%)	10 (6%)	23 (14%)	21 (13%)	25 (16%)	47 (29%)
<b>Q9.2</b>	<b>What do you think of the quality of the health service from the following people?</b>						
		<i>Not been</i>	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Bad</i>	<i>Very bad</i>
	The doctor	35 (22%)	20 (12%)	37 (23%)	21 (13%)	26 (16%)	22 (14%)
	The nurse	25 (16%)	30 (19%)	46 (29%)	25 (16%)	19 (12%)	14 (9%)
	The dentist	56 (36%)	16 (10%)	24 (15%)	20 (13%)	19 (12%)	22 (14%)
<b>Q9.3</b>	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>						
	<i>Not been</i> .....						18 (11%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....						21 (13%)
	<i>Good</i> .....						37 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....						33 (20%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....						30 (18%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....						25 (15%)
<b>Q9.4</b>	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>						
	Yes .....						106 (63%)
	No .....						63 (37%)
<b>Q9.5</b>	<b>If you are taking medication, are you allowed to keep some/ all of it in your own cell?</b>						
	<i>Not taking medication</i> .....						63 (38%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i> .....						50 (30%)
	<i>Yes, some of my meds</i> .....						25 (15%)
	<i>No</i> .....						30 (18%)
<b>Q9.6</b>	<b>Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?</b>						
	Yes .....						85 (51%)
	No .....						83 (49%)
<b>Q9.7</b>	<b>Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?</b>						
	<i>Do not have any emotional or mental health problems</i> .....						83 (51%)
	Yes .....						42 (26%)
	No .....						39 (24%)

## Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

<b>Q10.1</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	49 (29%)
	No .....	120 (71%)
<b>Q10.2</b>	<b>Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	39 (23%)
	No .....	130 (77%)

<b>Q10.3</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy.....	61 (36%)
	Easy.....	26 (15%)
	Neither.....	4 (2%)
	Difficult.....	4 (2%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know.....	68 (40%)
<b>Q10.4</b>	<b>Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?</b>	
	Very easy.....	30 (18%)
	Easy.....	22 (13%)
	Neither.....	12 (7%)
	Difficult.....	13 (8%)
	Very difficult.....	6 (4%)
	Don't know.....	85 (51%)
<b>Q10.5</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes.....	18 (11%)
	No.....	149 (89%)
<b>Q10.6</b>	<b>Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?</b>	
	Yes.....	7 (4%)
	No.....	162 (96%)
<b>Q10.7</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?</b>	
	Did not / do not have a drug problem.....	113 (70%)
	Yes.....	32 (20%)
	No.....	17 (10%)
<b>Q10.8</b>	<b>Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, whilst in this prison?</b>	
	Did not / do not have an alcohol problem.....	130 (78%)
	Yes.....	26 (16%)
	No.....	10 (6%)
<b>Q10.9</b>	<b>Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?</b>	
	Did not have a problem/ did not receive help.....	123 (77%)
	Yes.....	23 (14%)
	No.....	13 (8%)

## Section II: Activities

<b>Q11.1</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?</b>						
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	14 (8%)	12 (7%)	27 (16%)	14 (8%)	44 (27%)	54 (33%)
	Vocational or skills training	33 (22%)	16 (11%)	27 (18%)	17 (11%)	35 (23%)	24 (16%)
	Education (including basic skills)	25 (16%)	26 (17%)	49 (32%)	17 (11%)	23 (15%)	15 (10%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	54 (35%)	9 (6%)	14 (9%)	19 (12%)	26 (17%)	32 (21%)

<b>Q11.2</b>	<b>Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>				
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i> .....				53 (34%)
	Prison job .....				79 (50%)
	Vocational or skills training.....				10 (6%)
	Education (including basic skills).....				46 (29%)
	Offending behaviour programmes .....				13 (8%)
<b>Q11.3</b>	<b>If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?</b>				
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>
	Prison job	54 (35%)	47 (31%)	44 (29%)	9 (6%)
	Vocational or skills training	62 (50%)	24 (19%)	30 (24%)	8 (6%)
	Education (including basic skills)	47 (34%)	38 (27%)	41 (29%)	13 (9%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	69 (55%)	17 (13%)	31 (25%)	9 (7%)
<b>Q11.4</b>	<b>How often do you usually go to the library?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				25 (15%)
	<i>Never</i> .....				63 (38%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....				28 (17%)
	<i>About once a week</i> .....				44 (27%)
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....				4 (2%)
<b>Q11.5</b>	<b>Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?</b>				
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....				73 (45%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....				43 (27%)
	<i>No</i> .....				46 (28%)
<b>Q11.6</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				46 (28%)
	<i>0</i> .....				35 (21%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....				33 (20%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....				44 (27%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....				6 (4%)
<b>Q11.7</b>	<b>How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				25 (15%)
	<i>0</i> .....				21 (13%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....				52 (31%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....				33 (20%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....				35 (21%)
<b>Q11.8</b>	<b>How many times do you usually have association each week?</b>				
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....				4 (2%)
	<i>0</i> .....				13 (8%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....				23 (14%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....				23 (14%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....				101 (62%)



<b>Q11.9</b>	<b>How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)</b>	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	29 (17%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....	31 (19%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....	24 (14%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....	24 (14%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....	16 (10%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....	25 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	17 (10%)

### Section 12: Contact with family and friends

<b>Q12.1</b>	<b>Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	65 (39%)
	No.....	101 (61%)
<b>Q12.2</b>	<b>Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?</b>	
	Yes .....	72 (44%)
	No.....	93 (56%)
<b>Q12.3</b>	<b>Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?</b>	
	Yes .....	34 (20%)
	No.....	134 (80%)
<b>Q12.4</b>	<b>How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?</b>	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	21 (13%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	35 (21%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	40 (24%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	21 (13%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	25 (15%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	24 (14%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	2 (1%)

### Section 13: Preparation for release

<b>Q13.1</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	43 (25%)
	Yes .....	102 (60%)
	No.....	25 (15%)
<b>Q13.2</b>	<b>What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced/ NA</i> .....	68 (40%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	32 (19%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	37 (22%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	22 (13%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	39 (23%)
<b>Q13.3</b>	<b>Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?</b>	
	Yes .....	91 (58%)
	No.....	65 (42%)

<b>Q13.4</b>	<b>Do you have a sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	43 (26%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	67 (40%)
	<i>No</i> .....	58 (35%)
<b>Q13.5</b>	<b>How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	101 (59%)
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	17 (10%)
	<i>Involved</i> .....	19 (11%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	7 (4%)
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	11 (6%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	15 (9%)
<b>Q13.6</b>	<b>Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	101 (60%)
	<i>Nobody</i> .....	27 (16%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i> .....	34 (20%)
	<i>Offender manager</i> .....	24 (14%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i> .....	9 (5%)
<b>Q13.7</b>	<b>Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	101 (60%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	39 (23%)
	<i>No</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	14 (8%)
<b>Q13.8</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	101 (61%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	16 (10%)
	<i>No</i> .....	27 (16%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	21 (13%)
<b>Q13.9</b>	<b>Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?</b>	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/ not sentenced</i> .....	101 (61%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	26 (16%)
	<i>No</i> .....	14 (8%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	25 (15%)
<b>Q13.10</b>	<b>Do you have a needs-based custody plan?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>No</i> .....	69 (45%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	79 (51%)
<b>Q13.11</b>	<b>Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for your release?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	24 (16%)
	<i>No</i> .....	130 (84%)

**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>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Employment	45 (30%)	46 (31%)	59 (39%)
Accommodation	41 (28%)	53 (36%)	54 (36%)
Benefits	37 (25%)	57 (39%)	54 (36%)
Finances	41 (28%)	44 (30%)	60 (41%)
Education	47 (32%)	39 (27%)	59 (41%)
Drugs and alcohol	58 (39%)	37 (25%)	53 (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> .....	43 (26%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	62 (38%)
<i>No</i> .....	59 (36%)

## Main comparator and comparator to last time



### Prisoner survey responses HMP & YOI Doncaster 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 & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>178</b>	<b>6,058</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	14%	5%	14%	17%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	75%	70%	75%	68%
1.3	Are you on recall?	6%	10%	6%	12%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	12%	20%	12%	27%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	1%	3%	1%	1%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	10%	13%	10%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	98%	97%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	96%	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.)	18%	25%	18%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	5%	7%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	13%	13%	13%	9%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	5%	3%	5%	2%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	34%	28%	34%	29%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	6%	8%	5%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	49%	33%	49%	36%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	53%	53%	53%	57%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>					
On your most recent journey here:					
2.1	Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	26%	24%	26%	31%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	42%	42%	42%	27%
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	9%	8%	9%	5%
2.4	Was the van clean?	50%	57%	50%	61%
2.5	Did you feel safe?	70%	73%	70%	74%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	67%	67%	67%	63%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	63%	63%	63%	65%
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	3%	3%	3%	4%
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	71%	78%	71%	77%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>					
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	33%	40%	33%	34%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	81%	77%	81%	79%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	71%	61%	71%	68%
When you first arrived:					
3.4	Did you have any problems?	78%	79%	78%	73%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	19%	17%	19%	12%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	17%	23%	17%	22%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	2%	6%	2%	5%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	24%	36%	24%	28%
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	1%	3%	1%	5%
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	21%	24%	21%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	32%	26%	32%	23%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	20%	19%	20%	17%
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	33%	29%	33%	30%
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	15%	9%	15%	15%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	21%	33%	21%	31%
For those with problems:					
3.5	Did you receive any help/ support from staff in dealing with these problems?	42%	31%	42%	30%
When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:					
3.6	Tobacco?	86%	74%	86%	86%
3.6	A shower?	50%	29%	50%	13%
3.6	A free telephone call?	77%	52%	77%	81%
3.6	Something to eat?	77%	71%	77%	71%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	47%	50%	47%	26%
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	77%	58%	77%	71%

## Key to tables

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

		HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>					
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:				
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	41%	45%	41%	29%
3.7	Someone from health services?	68%	65%	68%	67%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	30%	30%	30%	22%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	37%	22%	37%	24%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:				
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	41%	40%	41%	45%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	41%	35%	41%	32%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	37%	33%	37%	29%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	37%	32%	37%	32%
3.8	Health services?	50%	43%	50%	43%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	37%	40%	37%	34%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	65%	67%	65%	64%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	83%	75%	83%	78%
	For those who have been on an induction course:				
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	49%	49%	49%	52%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	78%	75%	78%	76%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>					
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:				
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	41%	34%	41%	49%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	51%	48%	51%	61%
4.1	Get bail information?	15%	15%	15%	26%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	34%	41%	34%	39%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	31%	34%	31%	20%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	57%	48%	57%	58%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	73%	94%	83%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	87%	62%	87%	24%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	45%	49%	45%	38%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	17%	22%	17%	11%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	42%	54%	42%	48%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	22%	18%	22%	18%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	42%	21%	42%	37%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	58%	46%	58%	52%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	50%	53%	50%	33%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?	46%	48%	46%	40%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	53%	50%	53%	43%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	41%	44%	41%	29%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>					
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	67%	71%	67%	58%
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	45%	45%	45%	44%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	29%	30%	29%	26%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	52%	47%	52%	41%
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	30%	25%	30%	20%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	29%	20%	29%	22%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	22%	22%	22%	25%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	18%	17%	18%	23%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentives and earned privileges scheme</b>					
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	54%	39%	54%	43%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	49%	38%	49%	36%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	13%	11%	13%	12%
6.4	In the last six months, if you have spent a night in the segregation/ care and separation unit, were you treated very well/ well by staff?	44%	33%	44%	41%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	80%	71%	80%	74%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	72%	67%	72%	66%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	39%	27%	39%	26%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	28%	17%	28%	19%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	45%	31%	45%	38%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	72%	64%	72%	72%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better					
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse					
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details					
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference					
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>					
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	52%	62%	54%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	29%	24%	29%	24%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	46%	32%	46%	40%
Since you have been here, have other prisoners:					
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	20%	14%	20%	20%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	22%	10%	22%	18%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	28%	18%	28%	26%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	14%	9%	14%	11%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	5%	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	5%	5%	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	7%	5%	7%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	4%	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	4%	5%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	5%	4%	5%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	6%	4%	6%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	3%	2%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	4%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	7%	7%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	14%	6%	14%	10%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	10%	6%	10%	8%



## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>					
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	31%	33%	31%	30%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	14%	13%	14%	12%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	7%	7%	7%	6%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%	2%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	9%	15%	9%	12%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	5%	6%	5%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	2%	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	3%	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	4%	3%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	4%	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	3%	3%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	2%	1%	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	1%	1%	1%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	3%	2%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	2%	4%	2%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	4%	5%	4%	5%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	5%	7%	6%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	3%	2%	5%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	44%	34%	44%	44%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	20%	22%	16%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	41%	40%	41%	32%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	21%	9%	21%	7%
	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?	45%	39%	45%	37%
9.2	The nurse?	57%	48%	57%	38%
9.2	The dentist?	40%	29%	40%	21%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	40%	33%	40%	23%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	63%	53%	63%	46%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	71%	56%	71%	65%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	51%	45%	51%	44%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	52%	40%	52%	38%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	29%	34%	29%	26%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	23%	21%	23%	17%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	51%	43%	51%	45%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	31%	21%	31%	21%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	11%	11%	11%	13%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	4%	9%	4%	8%
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	65%	57%	65%	30%
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	72%	53%	72%	38%
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	64%	73%	64%	81%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>					
Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:					
11.1	A prison job?	24%	34%	24%	16%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	28%	30%	28%	19%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	48%	44%	48%	44%
11.1	Offending behaviour programmes?	15%	18%	15%	9%
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:					
11.2	A prison job?	50%	47%	50%	39%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	6%	8%	6%	8%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	29%	23%	29%	25%
11.2	Offending behaviour programmes?	8%	7%	8%	6%
11.3	Have you had a job while in this prison?	65%	71%	65%	62%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the job will help you on release?	47%	39%	47%	39%
11.3	Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	50%	56%	50%	52%
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?	39%	41%	39%	37%
11.3	Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	66%	67%	66%	67%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the education will help you on release?	41%	48%	41%	49%
11.3	Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	45%	54%	45%	52%
For those who have been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison:					
11.3	Do you feel the offending behaviour programme(s) will help you on release?	30%	39%	30%	36%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	29%	28%	29%	11%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	27%	33%	27%	16%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	31%	24%	31%	10%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	39%	41%	47%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	62%	42%	62%	61%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	15%	8%	15%	5%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>					
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	39%	30%	39%	32%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	44%	48%	44%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	20%	36%	20%	17%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	45%	34%	45%	42%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	Local prisons comparator	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2017	HMP & YOI Doncaster 2015
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>					
For those who are sentenced:					
13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	80%	62%	80%	72%
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	31%	45%	31%	37%
13.2	Contact by letter?	36%	26%	36%	37%
13.2	Contact by phone?	21%	13%	21%	16%
13.2	Contact by visit?	38%	33%	38%	38%
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	58%	31%	58%	46%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	54%	31%	54%	40%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	52%	55%	52%	48%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	40%	49%	40%	51%
13.6	Offender supervisor?	51%	32%	51%	33%
13.6	Offender manager?	36%	24%	36%	23%
13.6	Named/ personal officer?	8%	10%	8%	8%
13.6	Staff from other departments?	13%	18%	13%	8%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	58%	51%	58%	37%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	25%	28%	25%	22%
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	40%	32%	40%	26%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	5%	7%	5%	9%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	16%	11%	16%	9%
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?	44%	25%	44%	28%
13.12	Accommodation?	50%	31%	50%	33%
13.12	Benefits?	51%	33%	51%	36%
13.12	Finances?	42%	21%	42%	22%
13.12	Education?	40%	27%	40%	21%
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	41%	40%	41%	32%
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	51%	44%	51%	50%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity and religion) HMP & YOI Doncaster 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	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>151</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	78%	74%	82%	75%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	16%	8%	17%	8%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	97%	96%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	97%	98%	96%	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.)			83%	8%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	7%	7%	5%	7%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	61%	3%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	28%	35%	35%	34%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	7%	8%	14%	7%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	56%	46%	52%	48%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	61%	68%	54%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	56%	64%	65%	64%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	75%	82%	74%	83%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	63%	74%	54%	74%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	81%	77%	78%	78%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	67%	68%	64%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	60%	66%	55%	66%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	84%	83%	83%	84%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	44%	41%	36%	42%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	66%	56%	64%	56%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	94%	93%	86%	95%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	22%	15%	14%	17%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	28%	45%	27%	43%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	59%	58%	46%	60%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	44%	52%	35%	52%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	59%	43%	70%	42%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	51%	61%	52%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	60%	69%	52%	69%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	55%	52%	52%	52%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	45%	56%	33%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	50%	30%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	13%	14%	30%	11%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	78%	81%	62%	83%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	70%	73%	71%	72%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	35%	28%	23%	29%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	53%	43%	50%	44%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	66%	63%	73%	61%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	34%	29%	35%	29%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	63%	43%	59%	45%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	31%	28%	27%	29%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	16%	4%	14%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	16%	3%	9%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	12%	4%	4%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	9%	2%	4%	3%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better				
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse				
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details				
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference				
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	31%	32%	50%	29%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	6%	10%	9%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	9%	2%	14%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	6%	2%	9%	2%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	0%	3%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	19%	22%	18%	21%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	35%	42%	36%	41%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	44%	66%	46%	66%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	44%	52%	50%	51%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	44%	54%	46%	52%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	41%	52%	42%	50%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	0%	8%	0%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	31%	21%	31%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	7%	8%	16%	7%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	22%	32%	29%	30%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	37%	29%	36%	29%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	48%	39%	48%	41%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	55%	63%	52%	62%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	16%	15%	14%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	40%	45%	33%	46%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	25%	20%	23%	20%

## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability, age over 50 and under 21) HMP & YOI Doncaster 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	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better								
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse								
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details								
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference								
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>116</b>			<b>26</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>151</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	73%	76%			100%	71%	54%	79%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	9%	10%			8%	10%	4%	11%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	97%			96%	97%	100%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	97%			100%	97%	96%	98%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	15%	20%			0%	22%	38%	16%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	9%	6%			4%	8%	16%	6%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	13%	13%			0%	16%	20%	12%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?					31%	34%	28%	34%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	8%	7%			19%	6%	0%	9%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	40%	53%			77%	44%	75%	45%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	68%	67%			89%	64%	56%	69%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	63%	63%			66%	63%	68%	62%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	83%	80%			92%	79%	84%	81%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	64%	75%			89%	68%	64%	72%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	90%	71%			64%	80%	88%	76%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	72%	66%			80%	67%	70%	69%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	59%	68%			85%	61%	60%	65%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	81%	84%			96%	81%	84%	83%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	30%	47%			28%	43%	21%	44%



## Diversity Analysis

### 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	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	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						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	44%	64%	89%	51%	48%	58%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	91%	95%	96%	94%	96%	94%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	11%	20%	23%	16%	9%	19%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	40%	42%	56%	39%	32%	43%
4.6	Does the shop /canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	58%	58%	61%	57%	68%	56%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	45%	53%	42%	51%	44%	51%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	40%	49%	50%	46%	44%	47%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	47%	56%	58%	51%	28%	56%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	58%	71%	69%	67%	64%	68%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	44%	57%	66%	50%	48%	53%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	45%	59%	76%	51%	40%	57%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	44%	52%	58%	47%	35%	51%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	20%	10%	0%	15%	25%	11%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	71%	85%	96%	78%	72%	82%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	62%	77%	92%	68%	48%	76%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (most/all of the time)	20%	33%	27%	28%	29%	28%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	32%	52%	56%	44%	33%	48%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	70%	59%	46%	65%	68%	61%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	33%	27%	16%	31%	33%	28%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	56%	41%	31%	48%	56%	44%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	35%	25%	23%	29%	16%	30%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	9%	5%	0%	7%	12%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	7%	5%	0%	6%	12%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	9%	4%	0%	6%	12%	4%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	9%	0%	0%	4%	0%	4%

## 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	Prisoners under the age of 21	Prisoners aged 21 and over
	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?	44%	25%	8%	35%	32%	30%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	16%	5%	4%	9%	0%	10%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	4%	3%	4%	3%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	1%	4%	0%	4%	0%	4%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	2%	2%	0%	2%	4%	1%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	7%	0%	0%	3%	0%	3%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	13%	26%	35%	20%	16%	23%
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	34%	44%	64%	38%	36%	43%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	82%	52%	81%	60%	40%	67%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	70%	41%	23%	56%	56%	50%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	60%	47%	31%	55%	28%	55%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	33%	58%	61%	48%	21%	56%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	6%	7%	4%	7%	4%	7%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	26%	31%	19%	31%	33%	29%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	10%	4%	9%	0%	10%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	33%	28%	35%	29%	29%	30%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	20%	36%	19%	33%	21%	32%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	41%	41%	31%	43%	50%	39%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	48%	68%	81%	58%	56%	62%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc)	7%	19%	23%	13%	8%	16%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	51%	40%	15%	49%	48%	43%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	30%	15%	0%	24%	20%	20%



## Prisoner survey responses HMP & YOI Doncaster 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

	Houseblock 1	Houseblocks 2 and 3
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better		
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>		
1.2 Are you under 21 years of age?	9%	19%
1.3 Are you sentenced?	85%	65%
1.3 Are you on recall?	5%	6%
1.4 Is your sentence less than 12 months?	5%	18%
1.4 Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	3%	0%
1.5 Are you a foreign national?	6%	12%
1.6 Do you understand spoken English?	97%	97%
1.7 Do you understand written English?	97%	98%
1.8 Are you from a minority ethnic group? (Including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories.)	14%	22%
1.9 Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/ Romany/ Traveller?	8%	6%
1.1 Are you Muslim?	11%	15%
1.11 Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	9%	2%
1.12 Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	30%	35%
1.13 Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	14%	2%
1.14 Is this your first time in prison?	72%	32%
1.15 Do you have any children under the age of 18?	47%	60%
<b>SECTION 2: Transfers and escorts</b>		
On your most recent journey here:		
2.1 Did you spend more than 2 hours in the van?	32%	22%
2.5 Did you feel safe?	72%	68%
2.6 Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	76%	64%
2.7 Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	52%	72%
2.8 When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	74%	68%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Houseblock 1</b>	<b>Houseblocks 2 and 3</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction</b>			
3.1	Were you in reception for less than 2 hours?	<b>36%</b>	<b>30%</b>
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	<b>83%</b>	<b>81%</b>
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	<b>76%</b>	<b>68%</b>
	When you first arrived:		
3.4	Did you have any problems?	<b>79%</b>	<b>75%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	<b>18%</b>	<b>19%</b>
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	<b>6%</b>	<b>27%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	<b>0%</b>	<b>3%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	<b>23%</b>	<b>25%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems ensuring dependants were being looked after?	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
3.4	Did you have any money worries?	<b>12%</b>	<b>30%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	<b>30%</b>	<b>33%</b>
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	<b>15%</b>	<b>20%</b>
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	<b>26%</b>	<b>6%</b>
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	<b>15%</b>	<b>25%</b>
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:		
3.6	Tobacco?	<b>80%</b>	<b>91%</b>
3.6	A shower?	<b>41%</b>	<b>60%</b>
3.6	A free telephone call?	<b>77%</b>	<b>78%</b>
3.6	Something to eat?	<b>71%</b>	<b>82%</b>
3.6	PIN phone credit?	<b>39%</b>	<b>52%</b>
3.6	Toiletries/ basic items?	<b>79%</b>	<b>79%</b>

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblock 1	Houseblocks 2 and 3
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 3: Reception, first night and induction continued</b>			
	When you first arrived here did you have access to the following people:		
3.7	The chaplain or a religious leader?	45%	39%
3.7	Someone from health services?	73%	65%
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	30%	30%
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	34%	40%
	When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:		
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	44%	40%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	43%	41%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	41%	34%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	36%	37%
3.8	Health services?	54%	47%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	43%	32%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	65%	66%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	91%	79%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	88%	72%
<b>SECTION 4: Legal rights and respectful custody</b>			
	In terms of your legal rights, is it easy/very easy to:		
4.1	Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	40%	40%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	50%	53%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%	17%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	31%	36%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	39%	27%
	For the wing/unit you are currently on:		
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	60%	52%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	95%	93%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	92%	83%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	44%	42%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	13%	17%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	31%	46%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	21%	21%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	45%	36%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	62%	54%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time, if you want to?	49%	49%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	46%	44%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	51%	49%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	46%	38%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Houseblock 1</b>	<b>Houseblocks 2 and 3</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 5: Applications and complaints</b>			
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	79%	57%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	62%	44%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	26%	18%
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	19%	16%
<b>SECTION 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme</b>			
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	62%	47%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	48%	48%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	10%	16%
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>			
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	86%	75%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	76%	67%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	42%	36%
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	23%	29%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	64%	31%

**Key to tables**

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Houseblock 1</b>	<b>Houseblocks 2 and 3</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety</b>			
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	74%	53%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	28%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	60%	34%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:		
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	29%	13%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	26%	19%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	2%	4%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	37%	21%
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	14%	14%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	0%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	2%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	6%	8%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	3%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	0%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	5%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	1%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	8%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	26%	6%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	9%	11%

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Houseblock 1</b>	<b>Houseblocks 2 and 3</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 8: Safety continued</b>			
8.6	Have you been victimised by staff here?	34%	29%
	Since you have been here, have staff:		
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	12%	14%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	5%	8%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	2%	1%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	8%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	2%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a traveller community?	2%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	0%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	2%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	0%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	5%	4%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	14%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	2%	2%
<b>SECTION 9: Health services</b>			
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	22%	18%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	42%	38%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	23%	16%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	71%	53%
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	45%	54%
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>			
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	22%	37%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	12%	32%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	46%	56%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	19%	40%
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	11%	10%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	0%	7%



### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Houseblock 1	Houseblocks 2 and 3
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>SECTION 11: Activities</b>			
	Is it very easy/ easy to get into the following activities:		
11.1	A prison job?	18%	26%
11.1	Vocational or skills training?	30%	27%
11.1	Education (including basic skills)?	49%	48%
11.1	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	11%	18%
	Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:		
11.2	A prison job?	53%	49%
11.2	Vocational or skills training?	8%	6%
11.2	Education (including basic skills)?	34%	28%
11.2	Offending Behaviour Programmes?	3%	12%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	34%	24%
11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	22%	26%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	40%	27%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	40%	40%
11.8	Do you go on association more than five times each week?	66%	56%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	16%	16%
<b>SECTION 12: Friends and family</b>			
12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with family/friends while in this prison?	37%	38%
12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	48%	44%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	17%	23%
12.4	Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	48%	43%
<b>SECTION 13: Preparation for release</b>			
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	71%	46%
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	0%	9%
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	21%	11%