

Report on an unannounced full follow-up  
inspection of

**HMP/YOI Feltham  
(Feltham B –young adults)**

18 – 22 March 2013

by HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

### 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 of terms on our website at: [http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps\\_.pdf](http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/hmipris/Glossary-for-web-rps_.pdf)

Crown copyright 2013

Printed and published by:  
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons  
1st Floor, Ashley House  
Monck Street  
London SW1P 2BQ  
England

# Contents

Introduction	5
Fact page	7
Healthy prison summary and main recommendations	9
<b>1</b> Safety	19
<hr/>	
<b>2</b> Respect	31
<hr/>	
<b>3</b> Purposeful activity	45
<hr/>	
<b>4</b> Resettlement	53
<hr/>	
<b>5</b> Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points	61
<hr/>	
<b>6</b> Appendices	
<hr/>	
I Inspection team	69
II Progress on recommendations from the last report	70
III Prison population profile	77
IV Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews	80



# Introduction

HMP/YOI Feltham, situated in West London, has a long history of managing young people in custody. Divided into two parts, the 'Feltham A' side holds male young people under the age of 18. Feltham B, the subject of this report, holds young adult men aged 18 to 21. This inspection was carried out two months after our earlier inspection of Feltham A.

There is no concealing the fact that this report is one of the most concerning we have published recently. Against all our healthy prison tests, we found outcomes experienced by young adult prisoners to be either insufficient or poor. Notwithstanding the complexity of managing two institutions in one, or the obvious challenges faced when holding large numbers of young men in one custodial facility, it was clear that Feltham B had deteriorated significantly and that there was a need for some radical thinking about its future.

In our view, young adults were not safe enough. Feltham received young men from the streets and yet elements on the first night and induction arrangements were not good enough. Work was being done to reduce violence, supported by a very effective security department, but the levels of violence remained high and some incidents were serious. Self-harming behaviour was reducing but, again, remained high. There were good structures to case manage those at risk, but some basic aspects of care were poor.

In the two months between our inspections, there had been some decorative improvements to the segregation unit and some reasonable staff support was evident, but too many young men were segregated (although for short periods), the environment remained limited and the regime poor. Use of disciplinary procedures and use of force were both high, but while most use of force was low level, we were shocked at what seemed to be the unprecedented use of extendable batons by staff. We were told that batons had been drawn 108 times during 2012 and used 25 times. This was beyond anything we have seen in other establishments and suggested use had become normalised to an extent at odds with the Prison Service's own instructions. I have written separately to the Chief Executive of NOMS and drawn this specific concern to his attention.

Cleanliness and environmental standards, both external and in accommodation areas, were poor. Emergency cell bells were not answered quickly, applications were not dealt with sufficiently and too many staff were disengaged. We saw examples where staff were working well, but expectations of young adults generally were low. For a prison with such a diverse population, the promotion of equality and diversity was surprisingly underdeveloped and useful consultation weak. Prisoners were very negative about the quality of food, and at lunchtimes prisoners were served food at their cell door, a practice that we considered disrespectful and something we hardly see elsewhere.

For a prison holding young men, time unlocked was limited and often unpredictable. During the working day we found over 40% of the population locked up and inactive, while the daily routine was subject to frequent delays and cancellations. There was insufficient activity to meet need, with 43% of prisoners recorded as unemployed. The education and work places that were available were too often underused. The vocational training was better than the education on offer, much of which was poorly taught and did not meet need.

The prison had an overarching plan to deliver resettlement services that was based on the needs of young adults, but there was a significant gap between what was planned and what was delivered. Staffing issues and transitional arrangements had seen the effective suspension of offender management and planning in the previous six months. Unsentenced

and short-term prisoners received no assessment, and services for longer termers were inconsistent and limited. Similarly, coordinated pre-release planning had ceased. Work was taking place to deliver the various resettlement pathways, some of it meaningful and effective, but again it was not well coordinated or sufficiently linked to the proper planning of sentences. A specific resettlement unit, Teal, had been established and was an interesting initiative that might develop, but there was a lack of clarity about its purpose and it was not well integrated. The use of temporary release to support resettlement was limited.

Overall this is a troubling report. While we did find pockets of good work, many of the issues we identify were cross-cutting. For example, the reduction of violence and making the prison safer would need an improvement of staff-prisoner relationships and the provision of more meaningful and challenging activity. Little was asked or expected of young men and it was difficult to see why they would have any investment in engaging with the prison and what it had to offer. Our findings caused us to question the viability of part of this institution being set aside for just young adult prisoners.

As with my findings at Feltham A, there need to be interventions in the short-term to tackle the risks we have identified. In the medium- to longer-term, NOMS should think radically about Feltham's role, its purpose and the way young adults are housed within the wider adult population.

**Nick Hardwick**  
HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

**May 2013**

# Fact page

## Task of the establishment

Holds male young adults from the age of 18 to 21.

## Prison status

Public

## Region

Greater London

## Number held

435

## Certified normal accommodation

522

## Operational capacity

522

## Date of last full inspection

11–22 January 2010

## Brief history

The original Feltham was built in 1854 as an industrial school and was taken over in 1910 by the Prison Commissioners as their second Borstal institution. The existing building opened as a remand centre in March 1988. The current HM Prison and Young Offender Institution Feltham was formed by the amalgamation of Ashford Remand Centre and Feltham Borstal in 1990/91.

The establishment is split into Feltham A, which holds young people (aged 15-18), and Feltham B, which holds young adults (aged 18-21); this report relates to Feltham B.

## Short description of residential units

There are currently 10 units for young adults, including Lapwing as the first night and induction unit. Each unit holds 55 young adults, except for Lapwing, which holds 46, Kingfisher, 53, and Teal, 38. All rooms have integral sanitation and TV.

Kingfisher	Normal location
Lapwing	Induction unit / normal location
Mallard	Normal location
Nightingale	Normal location
Osprey	Normal location
Partridge	Normal location
Quail	Normal location
Raven	Normal location
Swallow	Normal location
Teal	Resettlement unit
Wren	Detoxification unit
Ibis	Segregation unit

## Name of governor

Paul Durham (acting governor)

**Escort contractor**

Serco

**Health service commissioner and provider**

Commissioner: NHS Hounslow

Lead provider: Central North West London NHS Trust.

**Learning and skills provider**

A4E

**Independent Monitoring Board chair**

Marion Rider



# Healthy prison summary

## Introduction

---

HP1 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, immigration detention facilities and police, courts and customs custody.

HP2 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.

HP3 All Inspectorate of Prisons reports include a summary of an establishment's performance against the model of a healthy prison. The four criteria of a healthy prison are:

**Safety** prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely

**Respect** prisoners are treated with respect for their human dignity

**Purposeful activity** prisoners are able, and expected, to engage in activity that is likely to benefit them

**Resettlement** prisoners are prepared for their release into the community and helped to reduce the likelihood of reoffending.

HP4 Under each test, we make an assessment of outcomes for prisoners and therefore of the establishment's overall performance against the test. In some cases, this performance will be affected by matters outside the establishment's direct control, which need to be addressed by the National Offender Management Service.

**- outcomes for prisoners are good against this healthy prison test.**

There is no evidence that outcomes for prisoners are being adversely affected in any significant areas.

**- outcomes for prisoners are reasonably good against this healthy prison test.**

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 against this healthy prison test.**

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 against this healthy prison test.**

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.

HP5 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 checked for implementation at future inspections

- **housekeeping points:** achievable within a matter of days, or at most weeks, through the issue of instructions or changing routines

- **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.

HP6 The Inspectorate conducts follow-up inspections to assess progress against recommendations made in the previous full inspection. Follow-up inspections may be announced or unannounced and are proportionate to risk. In full follow-up inspections inspectors conduct a new inspection of the establishment and also assess whether recommendations made at the previous inspection have been achieved. They also investigate areas of serious concern identified in the previous inspection, or matters of concern subsequently drawn to the attention of the Chief Inspector. Inspectors use the findings of prisoner surveys (where available), prisoner focus groups, research analysis of prison data and observation. This enables a reassessment of previous healthy prison assessments held by the Inspectorate on all establishments, and published in reports from 2004 onwards. Full follow-up reports are presented as full inspection reports with a new set of recommendations. Repeated recommendations are, however, indicated within the main report, and a list of recommendations from the previous inspection, and our assessment of whether they have been achieved, is contained in the appendices.

## Safety

---

HP7 The environment in reception and the first night unit offered a poor experience on arrival, but the support by staff was good. Induction did not ensure that prisoners were clear about what to expect. Levels of violence were high but some good work was developing to address this. Self-harm was also high but reducing. Care for the most vulnerable was inconsistent. Security was appropriately focused. Many prisoners did not feel the incentives and earned privileges (IEP) scheme effectively rewarded good behaviour. The number of adjudications and use of segregation were high. The segregation regime was limited, relationships were good, and the special cell was rarely used. Use of force was high, and we were very concerned about the unprecedented frequency with which batons were drawn and used. Substance misuse treatment was good but psychosocial services needed to be developed. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

HP8 At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners at Feltham were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 25 recommendations in the area of safety. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the

recommendations had been achieved, four had been partially achieved, nine had not been achieved and two were no longer relevant.

- HP9 There were some long waits in court cells before prisoners were moved to the prison but most journeys were short. Reception was stark but staff were welcoming and the process swift. In our survey,<sup>1</sup> significantly fewer prisoners than the comparator said they felt safe on their first night. The first night unit was in a poor state of repair and many first night cells were badly prepared, but all new arrivals had a good quality first night risk interview and cell sharing risk assessments were comprehensive. Staff handover arrangements and care during the first night were good. Induction was rushed and many prisoners felt that they had not been given sufficient information about life at the prison. Arrangements for non-English speaking prisoners were appropriate.
- HP10 A casework approach to manage and change violent behaviour through individual support plans had been introduced and early signs were positive, but the number of violent incidents remained very high. Many incidents were serious, and more than we usually see involved a number of assailants on a single prisoner. Although in our survey most prisoners said that they felt safe currently, 42% reported feeling unsafe at some time whilst at the prison. Over a third reported that they had been intimidated by staff and 40% of foreign national prisoners said that they had been intimidated or threatened by other prisoners. Prisoners with disabilities were also more likely to say they had felt unsafe at some time, and victimised.
- HP11 Attendance at safer custody meetings was good and analysis of data to provide information about patterns and trends on violent and self-harming behaviour was well developed. Levels of self-harm had reduced in the last 12 months but remained high. Care planning in some complex cases was good, but we also saw examples of poor planning for others in crisis. Too many prisoners on care and support plans (ACCTs) were locked up for long periods, increasing their feelings of isolation. The number of Listeners (Samaritans-trained prisoners) was low but the scheme was well supported and prisoners had good access to them. Adult safeguarding arrangements had not been developed.
- HP12 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate and not unnecessarily restrictive in the context of the current risks presented. Intelligence was processed efficiently and the security committee set and monitored appropriate objectives to maintain a safe environment. There was an appropriate focus on the challenges presented by gang affiliation. Drug availability was low and testing arrangements were good. Prisoners were generally negative about the IEP scheme as a motivator to encourage good behaviour.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Inspection methodology:** There are five key sources of evidence for inspection: 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, applying both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. All findings and judgements are triangulated, which increases the validity of the data gathered. Survey results show the collective response (in percentages) from prisoners in the establishment being inspected compared with the collective response (in percentages) from respondents in all establishments of that type (the comparator figure). Where references to comparisons between these two sets of figures are made in the report, these relate to statistically significant differences only. Statistical significance is a way of estimating the likelihood that a difference between two samples indicates a real difference between the populations from which the samples are taken, rather than being due to chance. If a result is very unlikely to have arisen by chance, we say it is 'statistically significant'. The significance level is set at 0.05, which means that there is only a 5% chance that the difference in results is due to chance. (Adapted from Towl et al (eds), *Dictionary of Forensic Psychology*.)

- HP13 Use of all disciplinary procedures was higher than in similar prisons and reflected the levels of violence and antisocial behaviour. Impressive data was maintained and analysed across the spectrum of discipline. Adjudication procedures were appropriate. We found areas where inappropriate and unofficial punishments were applied in the absence of proper managerial oversight and authority.
- HP14 Recorded levels of use of force were high compared with similar prisons, but many incidents required minimal or low-level physical coercion. In most cases de-escalation was used appropriately. However, there was an unprecedented high number of incidents where batons were drawn and/or used – some of which demonstrated excessive use of force. Not all were subject to consistent rigorous scrutiny to assure proportionality. The use of the special accommodation had dramatically reduced and staff engaged with residents there positively to encourage an early return to a normal cell.
- HP15 The general environment in the segregation unit had improved recently and was now cleaner with less graffiti. Nevertheless, some cells were cold and lacked mattresses and many toilets were scaled or rusty. Use of segregation for prisoners seeking protection or for good order was commendably low but, despite this, overall numbers segregated were high, although this was slightly offset by generally short stays. The regime was limited and did not occupy residents constructively, but staff engaged professionally with them.
- HP16 The drug and alcohol strategy was out of date and the substance misuse strategy committee had not met for some time. Prisoners dependent on drugs or alcohol received a good level of care, monitoring and support. The purpose of the drug detoxification unit (Wren) was due to change, and there was a need to ensure that substance-dependent prisoners continued to benefit from the supportive environment. Psychosocial support mainly consisted of group work; one-to-one interventions were limited and some casework had not been prioritised appropriately.

## Respect

---

- HP17 Conditions in residential areas were poor. Relationships between prisoners and many staff were distant and sometimes disrespectful, although we saw some that were good. Many staff had too low expectations of prisoners. The prison needed to do more to understand and meet the concerns of diverse groups. Prisoners lacked confidence in the complaints process, and legal services were underdeveloped. Health care provision was in transition but outcomes were reasonable. Prisoners disliked the food, which at lunchtime was served at cell doors. There was no catalogue ordering service. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.
- HP18 At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners at Feltham were good against this healthy prison test. We made 54 recommendations in the area of respect.<sup>2</sup> At this follow-up inspection we found that 20 of the recommendations had been achieved, 10 had been partially achieved, 23 had not been achieved and one was no longer relevant.

<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.

- HP19 Communal areas were grubby, and the fabric was tired and unkempt. Access to cell cleaning materials was inadequate and many cells were dirty, covered in graffiti and poorly equipped. Toilets in single cells were inadequately screened. The protracted time that staff took to answer some cell call bells was concerning and led some prisoners to feel unsafe. Access to showers was good but the condition and cleanliness of some was poor. Most prisoners could wear their own clothes and access to prison clothing was good. The timeliness and response to applications were often poor.
- HP20 Too many staff were disengaged from prisoners, although we also observed some examples of good relationships, particularly in key areas. Many unit staff had low expectations of prisoners and we heard a few negative, disrespectful and unhelpful comments about the prisoners in their care. In our survey, prisoners were less positive than the comparator about approaching staff if they had a problem, as well as regular checks on them by staff and the helpfulness of personal officers. They were also more likely to report being victimised by staff. In contrast, many staff entries in case notes were balanced and regular, although staff use of prisoners' preferred names was not fully embedded. Consultation with prisoners was underdeveloped.
- HP21 There was no local overarching equality strategy. Identification of prisoners from some protected characteristic groups required improvement, and promotion of equality was underdeveloped. Diversity monitoring data (SMART) only looked at race. Several important areas for black and minority ethnic prisoners had been out of range over a significant period, and there needed to be continued work to understand the reasons for this and address disparities. Relatively few discrimination complaints had been submitted but we found many prisoners who had no faith in the system. External quality assurance of discrimination complaints was good.
- HP22 There were no prisoner equality representatives and consultation arrangements were poor. There was some assistance for foreign national prisoners, but some foreign nationals were unaware of the specific support available to them. In our survey, prisoners with disabilities were particularly negative about their treatment across a range of important issues, and we found that their needs were often not met. There was no support available for gay or transgender prisoners.
- HP23 There was provision for all major faiths and a range of services and classes. Most prisoners were positive about their religious beliefs being respected.
- HP24 The number of formal complaints was lower than the comparator, and many prisoners had little confidence in the process. Some responses to complaints required further investigation and were not answered at an appropriate level or promptly. There was no trend pattern analysis to identify issues and take action where appropriate. Legal services were underdeveloped.
- HP25 Despite poor survey results and complaints from prisoners, health services were satisfactory. There were a range of nurse-led clinics and access to the GP was satisfactory. There was low use of the inpatient unit, which provided good support. Pharmacy services were reasonably good. Dental services were good although the wait for follow-up appointments was too high. Mental health care focused appropriately on immediate priorities, but did not provide a full range of services.
- HP26 Most prisoners were negative about the food and we found the quality and quantity variable and that meals were served too early. Lunch was served at cell doors, which

was disrespectful. Consultation arrangements were inadequate. Prisoners complained about the cost of shop items and the lack of a catalogue ordering system.

## Purposeful activity

---

HP27 Time out of cell and access to outside exercise were poor. Management of learning and skills provision was inadequate, and the education curriculum did not meet the needs of the population. There were insufficient activity places, and those available were poorly used. The quality of teaching varied and too much was inadequate. Provision English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) was insufficient and outcomes in the key areas of basic skills were inadequate. The quality of vocational training and achievements for those on a programme were generally good. The library was good but not well used. The gym provided good opportunities for most prisoners. Outcomes for prisoners were poor against this healthy prison test.

HP28 At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners at Feltham were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 17 recommendations in the area of purposeful activity. At this follow-up inspection we found that five of the recommendations had been achieved, and 12 had not been achieved.

HP29 The average time out of cell was too low for employed prisoners and much less for those who did not work. At roll checks during the morning and afternoon of the working day, we found around 40% of the population locked in their cells. There was slippage in the regime and association was often cancelled or curtailed. Access to outside exercise was limited.

HP30 Leadership and management of learning and skills and work were inadequate. The prison had gone through several changes of providers of learning and skills, which had affected delivery. There had been significant delays in remodelling the curriculum and appointing managers. However, there was now a clear strategic plan, based on a needs analysis, to develop a more coherent approach to synchronising learning and skills with the regime and meeting prisoners' needs.

HP31 There were insufficient work places for the population and the places available were not fully used. There were approximately 150 vocational training and work placements but too few were occupied. There were 60 places in education in the morning and afternoon but again only around 70% of places were usually occupied. Far too many prisoners, 43%, were unemployed.

HP32 There was a limited range of accredited vocational training courses. Training and coaching on practical programmes were generally good, and resources ranged from satisfactory to good. The education curriculum did not fully meet the needs of young adults – it was too narrow and many courses were at too low a level. There was insufficient ESOL provision.

HP33 There was too much inadequate teaching, learning and assessment with poor behaviour management in many sessions. The quality of teaching, learning and assessment had declined since the previous inspection. Some good support was provided by the Volunteer Support for Education (VSE) programme and other voluntary agencies, but processes lacked coordination and links with learning and skills were insufficiently developed.

- HP34 Achievements of accredited qualifications were reasonable although mainly at level 1. Some learners achieved units towards qualifications, which were particularly useful for short-stay prisoners.
- HP35 The library was well presented, welcoming and staffed by a knowledgeable librarian. There was a good stock of books to meet diverse needs but too few prisoners used the library. Access to PE was good. Gym facilities were well used, with a wide range of equipment. Promotion of healthy living and personal fitness were good, as were links with health care.

## Resettlement

---

HP36 There was a reducing reoffending strategy based on a needs analysis of the population but resettlement services were in transition, which affected outcomes for prisoners. The quality of offender management work was mixed and there was only minimal contact with offender supervisors. The needs of many prisoners were not systematically identified on arrival or reviewed before their release. There was limited coordination and delivery of some reintegration work, although good support was offered in some but not all of the resettlement pathways. Outcomes for prisoners were not sufficiently good against this healthy prison test.

HP37 At the last inspection in 2010 we found that outcomes for prisoners at Feltham were reasonably good against this healthy prison test. We made 26 recommendations in the area of resettlement. At this follow-up inspection we found that 10 of the recommendations had been achieved, 10 had been partially achieved, and six had not been achieved.

HP38 An up-to-date reducing reoffending policy document outlined the range of provision across the establishment and a reasonably comprehensive action plan. The supporting needs analysis was also up to date. Despite this, reduced staffing levels and recent changes in offender management personnel had resulted in a considerable gap between what was planned and what was in place.

HP39 There was no structured assessment of resettlement needs for prisoners on remand or serving short sentences. As a consequence, many prisoners had no sentence or custody plan and little contact or engagement with offender supervisors. In our survey, the majority of prisoners said that nobody was working with them to achieve their sentence plan targets, and there was a significant backlog in OASys (offender assessment system) assessments. Work with the few life-sentenced prisoners was reasonably good, as were systems for managing prisoners subject to public protection arrangements.

HP40 Structured reintegration planning had been suspended and, as a consequence, there was little integration of pathway work, and many prisoners were unclear about how to access support. The resettlement unit (Teal) was a positive initiative but its function needed greater clarity. Several initiatives to support reintegration planning were available on the unit, but there was still much work to be done.

HP41 There was some generally good support by accommodation workers. There was no pre-release course but a range of agencies provided through-the-gate support for education, training and employment, with good links to employment and training

opportunities. Release on temporary licence was used for only a small number of prisoners. Support for finance, benefit and debt need was limited. There were reasonable links to community substance misuse and health services for prisoners being released.

- HP42 The visitors' centre was good and there was effective support for families, especially those visiting for the first time. Visits were generally well managed and the environment was reasonable. The 'family man' programme (teaching the importance of communication and supporting others) was a positive initiative, although currently only available for prisoners on the resettlement unit.
- HP43 No accredited offending behaviour programmes were provided, although transfers to other establishments were facilitated for some longer-term prisoners with identified needs. More needed to be done to coordinate work to ensure prisoners being released who needed to do so were targeted for relevant offending behaviour programmes

## Main concerns and recommendations

---

- HP44 Concern: Levels of violence at Feltham were too high, resulting in high levels of adjudications and use of force. Some of the incidents were serious and sometimes involved gangs attacking single prisoners. Many prisoners had felt unsafe at some time and/or victimised. The unprecedented and illegitimate use of batons at Feltham B was emblematic of this problem and the broader weakness of effective relationships between staff and prisoners. This concentration of young people and young adults in a single establishment presented local managers with huge challenges in maintaining a safe environment which they were currently not able to provide.

**Recommendation: NOMS should carry out an urgent review of the viability of Feltham, as it is currently constituted, as a suitable location for large numbers of young adult prisoners. Alternatives for their location, and safer and more constructive management should be considered.**

- HP45 Concern: The high number of times batons were drawn and/or used was unprecedented and significantly out of line with what we would expect to see. Some of the cases we reviewed did not indicate that this was done proportionately. We did not accept the explanation given that use of batons was an appropriate means of de-escalation. The practice also did not meet the criterion in Prison Service Instruction 1600 that batons should only be used in extreme circumstances as a defensive implement.

**Recommendation: Batons should only be drawn and/or used as a last resort, and incidents involving batons should be scrutinised to ensure proportionality.**

- HP46 Concern: Too many staff had distant relationships with prisoners and dismissive attitudes, which reinforced their low expectation of them. Much of the interaction we observed was passive, and not focused on assisting prisoners to improve their behaviour or to address resettlement issues.

**Recommendation: All staff should interact positively with prisoners, build good relationships with them, refer to them by their preferred name, and treat them**



**with respect. The prison should develop a strategy that will deliver these positive outcomes.**

HP47 Concern: Too many prisoners spent far too long locked in cells with nothing purposeful to do. The provision of association was limited and often curtailed, and access to outside exercise was also limited, and these decisions were made at the unregulated and variable discretion of unit staff.

**Recommendation: Prisoners' time out of their cells should be improved and include association every evening and at least an hour exercise outside per day.**

HP48 Concern: There were considerably fewer activity places than needed for the numbers of prisoners held, and those that were offered were poorly used and often not focused on individual needs, including addressing sentence planning and reducing reoffending targets.

**Recommendation: There should be sufficient purposeful activities for the population, places should be appropriately focused on addressing individual needs, and all places should be fully used.**

HP49 Concern: Prisoners' resettlement needs were not adequately assessed on arrival or pre-release to ensure everything possible had been done to address issues contributing to their offending behaviour and risk of harm to others.

**Recommendation: The prison should ensure that the assessment of need, provision of required interventions and review of support before release are in place for all prisoners.**



# Section 1: Safety

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.

## Courts, escorts and transfers

---

**Expected outcomes:**

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

- 1.1 Some prisoners spent an excessive time in court cells before they were taken to the prison. Escort vans were dirty, but escort staff courteous. Disembarkation from vehicles was swift, but reception was not open over lunch. The court video link was well used.
- 1.2 We reviewed several person escort records (PER) and found that some prisoners spent an excessive time in court cells after they were dealt with by the court and before they were moved to the prison. In one case, a prisoner arrived at the establishment nine hours after the court had finished with him.
- 1.3 In our survey, only 38% of respondents said that escort vans were clean, and we found that they were dirty and covered with graffiti. For most prisoners journey times were under two hours. The escort staff we observed were courteous to prisoners, but only 48% of respondents in our survey, against the comparator of 63%, said that escort staff treated them well.
- 1.4 Escort vans entered the establishment quickly and disembarkation was usually swift. However, reception was closed over lunch and prisoners arriving then remained on the vehicles till staff returned from their break. Prisoners were not handcuffed from the vans to reception, which was proportionate to the risk. Late arrivals to the prison were rare.
- 1.5 The court video link court was well used with over 4,000 hours a year recorded.

### Recommendations

---

- 1.6 Prisoners should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods.
- 1.7 Escort vans should be clean and free from graffiti.

## Early days in custody

---

**Expected outcomes:**

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

- 1.8 The separate reception and first night unit for the Feltham young adult site were stark and unwelcoming and some prisoners felt unsafe on their first night, although they received good care. First night risk and cell sharing risk assessments were of a good standard. Induction was compressed into one day and many prisoners did not fully understand its contents. The early days process for non-English speakers was satisfactory.
- 1.9 The reception area for the young adults was large and bright, but was stark and unwelcoming. Holding rooms were large with good sightlines for staff, but they had no information and much of the furniture was damaged. Prisoner toilets were dirty.
- 1.10 The reception process for most prisoners was swift, with court returns spending a minimal time in reception. We observed a new arrival who was processed within 20 minutes of arrival. Reception staff were courteous to all prisoners and built an instant rapport with them. The reception desk where new arrivals had their warrant checked was away from the sight and sound of other prisoners.
- 1.11 All prisoners were strip searched in a dedicated search area away from other prisoners (see recommendation 1.56). In our survey, 71% of respondents, fewer than the comparator of 78%, said that when they were searched, it was carried out in a respectful way, but we observed staff search prisoners sensitively and with respect.
- 1.12 Health care had a private room in reception and a similar room on the first night wing. Both were used depending on the number of receptions and were suitable for purpose.
- 1.13 In our survey, only 68% of respondents, against the comparator of 78%, said that they felt safe on their first night. Lapwing unit was the first night wing, where nearly all prisoners went from reception, and was old and uncared for, with a damaged floor. Some first night cells were dirty, poorly prepared and had large amounts of graffiti. Many prisoners we spoke to said that the environment contributed to their anxieties on their first night at the establishment.
- 1.14 All prisoners had cell sharing risk assessments, which were of a good quality and informed by the prisoner and the pre-sentence report. All new arrivals had a first night risk interview in private, and issues that arose were signposted to the relevant staff.
- 1.15 In our survey, 76% of respondents, against the comparator of 63%, said they received a free telephone call on their first night, but only 14%, against 45%, said they received a shower. Our own observations and check of the first night records concurred with this.
- 1.16 Handover arrangements between day and night staff were sound and worked well, and an officer from the first night team was always on night duty. New arrivals were checked hourly and, although the records suggested little interaction, this was a good initiative to keep new prisoners safe.
- 1.17 Induction started the day after arrival. The one-day programme took place in a suitable venue, with appropriate multimedia, although it was rushed. In our survey, only 40% of respondents who had undertaken an induction said it covered everything they needed to know. There was also a fast-track induction for prisoners who had been in the establishment within the last six months. After completing induction, prisoners spent up to three days with little to do and much time locked in cell. Records indicated that some prisoners had not completed the induction programme.

- 1.18 New arrivals with difficulties speaking English had a first night interview and induction talk through the use of professional interpreting services.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.19 The reception should be refurbished, be more welcoming and contain relevant information for new arrivals.
- 1.20 All new arrivals should be offered a shower on their first night whatever time they arrive. (Repeated recommendation 1.49)
- 1.21 The first night wing should be a welcoming environment in a good state of repair. First night cells should be clean and well prepared.
- 1.22 The induction should enable prisoners to fully understand all aspects of the prison. All prisoners should complete it, and prisoners who have fully completed induction should be moved into the main prison as soon as possible.

## Bullying and violence reduction

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.23 A casework approach to manage and change violent behaviour through individual support plans had recently been introduced, but the level of violence was still too high. Too many incidents were serious, with many involving a number of assailants on a single prisoner. Although most prisoners said that they felt safe, over a third reported that they had been intimidated by staff and 40% of foreign national prisoners said that they had been intimidated or threatened by other prisoners.
- 1.24 A monthly safer custody committee monitored overall progress of both the violence reduction and suicide prevention strategies. Meetings were always well attended. There was a generally good focus on dealing with overall levels of violence, but the over-use of batons had not been identified as a significant issue by managers, who considered it a legitimate means of de-escalation. Information about the number, type and location of violent incidents each month was comprehensive, and there was good analysis of information to identify trends, patterns and problem areas. An important feature of this meeting was that it included senior representatives from Feltham A (holding children and young people under 18) and B (holding the young adults), which meant that lessons learned from both sides could be effectively shared across the prison.
- 1.25 Formal arrangements to deal with bullying and other forms of violence had been reviewed and modified. A casework approach was used to identify, monitor and change antisocial behaviour. Needs were assessed and dealt with through individual support plans (ISPs). Prisoners subject to ISPs were reviewed weekly by an effective multidisciplinary group at well-attended meetings. Work with prisoners with problematic behaviour was organised by a recently formed dedicated antisocial behaviour team. This group consisted of two full-time officers, supported

by a nominated manager who reported directly to a senior manager (the head of safety and equality).

- 1.26 This framework enabled the coordination of a number of interventions, such as one-to-one work, professional counselling, mediation and victim awareness. It mirrored the good approach we found at Feltham A during our inspection in early 2013.
- 1.27 The security department was effective at identifying young adults who needed to be separated from each other, usually as a result of external gang activity. The 'known conflict' list developed to manage prisoners with known gang affiliations was accessible to all relevant staff and could be updated quickly.
- 1.28 An officer from the antisocial behaviour team interviewed new arrivals identified by security intelligence as engaging in gang or other custodial violence in order to allow safe allocation to one of the residential units. They also saw prisoners referred to them by induction staff following initial safety assessments if there were particular concerns.
- 1.29 However, there was a general over-reliance on the two antisocial behaviour officers to manage the ISP system day-to-day. Many officers said that they were unsure about all processes involved with violence reduction work. Information about progress of prisoners was kept in too many different places, such as wing files, observation books, individual unlock plans and safe systems of work plans.
- 1.30 The number of violent incidents was high, with about 215 fights and assaults in the previous six months. Many were serious, and more than we usually see involved a number of assailants on a single prisoner (see main recommendation HP44).
- 1.31 Assaults on staff were particularly high at an average of about seven a month. This was a rate of about 9.5 per 100 over the last six months, which was significantly higher than we have seen in similar establishments inspected.
- 1.32 In our survey, most prisoners reported that they did not feel unsafe currently but 42%, against the comparator of 36%, said that they had felt unsafe at some stage, and 37%, against 26%, said that had been intimidated or threatened by staff. The responses from foreign national prisoners were worse – for example, 40% said that they had been intimidated by other prisoners and 21% that they had been victimised by staff due to their race or ethnic origin (see also paragraph 2.37). Prisoners with disabilities were also more likely to say they had felt unsafe at some time, and victimised by staff and prisoners.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.33 The prison should explore and address prisoner perceptions about their safety, particularly concerning their treatment by staff.

## Self-harm and suicide

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.34 Attendance at safer custody meetings was good and analysis of data for patterns and trends of self-harming behaviour was well developed. Self-harm had reduced in the last 12 months but remained high. Although some care planning was good, there was poor planning for others in crisis, who were often locked up for long periods. Too many prisoners on self-harm monitoring documents were locked up for long periods without meaningful distraction, which increased their feelings of isolation.
- 1.35 There was a policy document based on an examination of local practices, with a particular focus on the needs of a local prison. Staff and prisoners were aware of its content. Its procedures and protocols were managed directly by a designated manager. She was accountable for ensuring that procedures to manage prisoners at risk from self-harm were properly implemented, and was also a central point for advice and guidance for staff.
- 1.36 The safer custody committee (see paragraph 1.24) monitored the implementation of the strategy across the prison site. It used a wide range of information to identify trends and patterns of behaviour in terms of location, type, age, timing and peripheral circumstances of individual incidents.
- 1.37 The Listener scheme (prisoners trained by the Samaritans to support those at risk of self-harm) was well established and prisoners had 24-hour access to them. The scheme was explained during the induction programme and also publicised around the prison on information notices. At the time of our inspection there were seven Listeners, including one located on the induction unit. This number was low but had recently increased, and the prison was trying to recruit more. A Listener, as well as a Samaritans representative, attended all safer custody meetings, and gave a report of their work. Those we met said that they felt supported, particularly by senior staff, and that officers valued their work. There was also a free direct line telephone number for prisoners to contact the Samaritans during the day.
- 1.38 The number of prisoners on assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) self-harm monitoring documents was high at about 24 new cases a month, but this was a year-on-year reduction since the previous inspection, when there had been about 32 a month. The number of self-harming incidents was also high at about 10 a month, but this was also a reduction of about 40% since 2010.
- 1.39 We noted that just a few prisoners accounted for a disproportionate number of incidents. For example, one prisoner was responsible for over 35% of the total incidents in the previous three months. There was also a disproportionate number of foreign national prisoners who self-harmed.
- 1.40 At the time of inspection, there were 14 prisoners on open ACCTs. Reviews were usually well attended and there were good formal links with the mental health in-reach team, who attended most meetings. However, the quality of entries in documents was mixed. Some entries from officers indicated reasonable standards of day-to-day care, but there were also examples of entries that were mainly observational and gave little indication of supportive relationships.
- 1.41 Although care planning was generally good, we saw prisoners on open ACCT documents who had been left locked in their cells for long periods with nothing to occupy their time. Prisoners said that the lack of a predictable regime, and distant staff-prisoner relationships, also contributed to their feelings of isolation and alienation. Our observations supported this view (see also paragraphs 2.19 and 3.2).

## Recommendations

---

- 1.42 Managers should ensure a consistently high standard of documentation for assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews. (Repeated recommendation 3.49)
- 1.43 Plans for prisoners in crisis should include purposeful activity and time out of cell, and managers should ensure that officers are fully engaged in supporting such prisoners.

## 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>

- 1.44 There was no adequate structure to inform a specific policy to deal with adults in need of care services because of disability or illness.
- 1.45 No specific policy to deal with adults in need of community care services by reason of mental or other disability or illness had been developed. However, there was very good vulnerability screening and assessment of risk for new arrivals, including cell sharing risk assessments, and health care interviews. Prisoners with vulnerabilities were discussed at safer custody meetings.
- 1.46 Protocols on action to be taken in the event of information indicating that an adult at risk may have been abused or injured while in custody were not clear. Staff said they were not aware of formal protocols, but generally knew their personal responsibility to protect those at risk. Awareness training for staff had not been planned.
- 1.47 There were no formal links between the prison and the local authority safeguarding board to review current practices and identify the threshold at which formal adult protection protocols would be brought in.

## Recommendation

---

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

## 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.

---

<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).



- 1.49 Security arrangements were broadly proportionate. Intelligence was processed efficiently, security objectives were appropriate and there was a measured focus on gang affiliations. Drug availability was low and testing well managed. Closed visits were used too frequently for issues not directly related to visits.
- 1.50 The well-resourced security team worked across both sites at Feltham. It managed a considerable amount of security information well, although at about 1,250 security information reports (SIRs) processed in the previous six months, this was significantly fewer from the young adult side. Resulting security arrangements focused properly on the risks posed at the prison, such as gang affiliations, which were less pronounced among young adults than the young people. Proportionate measures included maintaining a 'known conflict' list to try and keep prisoners safe. All prisoner movements around the prison were escorted. This was reasonable but needed to be kept under constant review to ensure proportionality.
- 1.51 Information was shared appropriately and the security team had well-established relationships with other departments and the police. The security committee met monthly and set and monitored appropriate security objectives.
- 1.52 The availability of illegal drugs was relatively low, and in our survey fewer prisoners than the comparator said it was easy to get drugs or alcohol. The random mandatory drug testing (MDT) positive rate for young adults averaged 4.7% in the previous six months against a target of 5%. During this time there were 30 suspicion tests, resulting in a 16.6% positive rate. The MDT programme was appropriately resourced, strip searches were rare and intelligence-led, and supply reduction was discussed at monthly security meetings. Drug finds and test results involved small amounts of cannabis.
- 1.53 Closed visits had been applied 16 times in the previous six months, and too often inappropriately for incidents not relating directly to the trafficking of unauthorised items through visits.
- 1.54 There were good records on strip searching, which mostly took place only when there was intelligence to support it, including prior to MDT and on entry to the segregation unit. It therefore appeared incongruous that all prisoners, including those transferred from other prisons, were stripped on reception and 5% routinely after visits, often in the absence of supporting intelligence.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.55 Closed visits should only be applied where there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits.
- 1.56 Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion.

## Incentives and earned privileges<sup>4</sup>

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.57 There was evidence that the rewards and sanction scheme was used to encourage responsible behaviour but prisoners had poor perceptions about its fairness. There was insufficient difference between the levels, and little to show that it was linked to sentence planning.
- 1.58 The rewards and sanction scheme had been reviewed and a policy document published in April 2012. It described how the system worked, how young adults could progress through the levels, and the standard of behaviour expected of them.
- 1.59 The document described the usual three incentive levels: basic, standard and enhanced (gold). New arrivals were placed on standard unless they had earned enhanced status at a previous establishment. At the time of inspection, 21% of young adults were on the gold level and about 5% on basic.
- 1.60 Differences between standard and enhanced were less than we usually see. Although they included extra spending allowances and an extra visit, the more popular incentives we see at other prisons, such as computer games, were not permitted.
- 1.61 The scheme was used to support overarching behaviour management protocols. Prisoners were considered for immediate demotion to basic for single acts of violence or alleged bullying following an investigation. Weekly behaviour targets were set through individualised behaviour improvement plans (ISPs, see also paragraph 1.25) and following successful completion they could gain extra periods of association or other rewards quickly. However there was little to link the scheme with sentence planning.
- 1.62 Although the basic regime was austere, including curtailment of time out of cell, prisoners could attend work activities and had at least one period of association every day.
- 1.63 Many prisoners were negative about their experience of the scheme. In our survey, only 40% said they had been treated fairly by the scheme, against the comparator of 47%, and only 46%, against 54%, said that it encouraged them to change their behaviour.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.64 There should be greater differences between the incentive levels in the rewards and sanction scheme to encourage responsible behaviour.
- 1.65 There should be formal links between IEP processes and sentence planning. (Repeated recommendation 7.44)

---

<sup>4</sup> In reports up to 2012, incentives and earned privileges were covered under the healthy prison area of respect. In our updated *Expectations* (Version 4, 2012) they now appear under the healthy prison area of safety.

# 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.

1.66 Use of all aspects of discipline was high, and this was directly related to high levels of violence and antisocial behaviour. An impressive amount of data on all forms of discipline were collated and analysed. Adjudications were well managed but the use of unofficial punishments was inappropriate. Use of force was high and incidents where batons were drawn and/or used was far higher than we have seen elsewhere. The number of young adults segregated was high and, although their average length of stay was short, the regime for most was poor.

## Disciplinary procedures

---

- 1.67 Between September 2012 and February 2013, there had been 687 adjudications, which was higher than in similar prisons, and many resulted from high levels of violence and other antisocial behaviour. Prisoners on hearings had sufficient time to prepare their case and sought legal advice where requested. The records of hearings we sampled were generally of a good standard and showed appropriate exploration before a finding of guilt. Good data on adjudications were collated and used to identify trends and patterns.
- 1.68 We found significant evidence of the application of unofficial punishments, including the loss of gymnasium, association or in-cell power, without proper managerial authority or oversight.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.69 Prisoners should only be subject to properly authorised punishments.

## The use of force

---

- 1.70 The number of incidents involving the use of force was high at 321 in the previous six months, and reflected the high number of violent and other antisocial incidents. However, many of the incidents required only low-level or minimal physical coercion, but we were concerned by the unprecedented frequency of incidents where batons were drawn and/or used (108 and 25 respectively in 2012), both of which were much higher than our findings in any other prison. We were given little assurance that this was always as a last resort, proportionate to the risk posed or subject to appropriate subsequent managerial scrutiny. In the CCTV footage we watched, we saw baton use that constituted an excessive use of force and referred this to the management team for investigation. This picture also conflicted with the relevant Prison Service Instruction 1600, which stated that batons should only be used by officers in extreme circumstances as a defensive mechanism. We did not accept the explanation offered by managers that the drawing of batons was a de-escalation technique (see main recommendation HP45).
- 1.71 The use of force documentation we sampled was completed to a good standard and, apart from the use of batons, generally reflected efforts to de-escalate. Use of handcuffs and relocation to the segregation unit were not routine. Planned interventions were mostly recorded

but were not routinely reviewed. Those we watched showed that incidents were well managed with an appropriate focus on de-escalation.

- 1.72 Good levels of data were collated and use of force was discussed at a joint meeting with the young people's side of the prison. Systems and safeguards applied to young people were not always replicated with young adults, where managerial attention was less focused, particularly around the use of batons.
- 1.73 Use of special accommodation had dramatically reduced since our previous inspection. It had not been used in 2013 to date, and the three uses in 2012 were properly authorised, appeared appropriate and for the minimum time, and the documentation indicated clear efforts to engage with and remove the prisoners at the earliest opportunity.

## Segregation

---

- 1.74 The segregation unit (Ibis) was used to accommodate both young people and young adult prisoners. There had been a throughput of 262 young adults in the previous six months, which was both higher than at the last inspection and in similar prisons. This again was directly linked to high levels of violence and antisocial behaviour in the prison. Segregation was used mainly for prisoners awaiting adjudication or as a result of an adjudication punishment of cellular confinement, and was commendably low for those seeking refuge and for reasons of good order. At the time of the inspection, four of the seven residents were young adults serving punishments of cellular confinement. The average length of stay was under four days. Impressive data on segregated young adults were collated and used to identify trends and patterns.
- 1.75 Living conditions appeared marginally better than when we inspected the unit in January 2013. It was cleaner and had no graffiti, except for that etched into windows and furniture. However, some cells were cold, lacked mattresses and had dirty, scaled or rusty toilets. Strip searching on entry to the unit was subject to risk assessment and was not routine.
- 1.76 The regime for most residents was poor. The basic daily regime included access to showers, telephones and only a 30-minute period of outside exercise. We were told that, subject to risk assessment, prisoners could attend off-unit activities, including the gym and religious services, but we found only limited evidence of attendance at the gym. Education staff attended the unit to engage with young people but had little or no interaction with young adults unless the prisoner requested it. Other than a book, the young adults we spoke to had nothing to occupy them constructively. Battery operated radios were available on the unit but none of the prisoners we spoke to had one, and staff said there were no batteries.
- 1.77 Reviews of segregated prisoners were multidisciplinary and included meaningful targets that challenged the initial reasons for segregation. Care and reintegration planning were not evident, although most residents returned to normal location in Feltham.
- 1.78 In our survey and focus groups, many prisoners felt that segregation unit staff treated them poorly. The interactions we observed were professional and staff were reasonably knowledgeable about prisoners in their care, but their entries in daily history sheets and electronic case notes did not reflect this. Managers, the chaplaincy, health care staff and the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) visited the unit at required frequencies. However, we observed a manager conduct a routine visit by speaking to some residents through their door, which was very poor.

## Recommendation

---

- 1.79 The regime and environment for young adults in segregation should be improved to include greater opportunity for purposeful activity and structured input to address problematic behaviour.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 1.80 Routine visits by managers to prisoners in the segregation unit should be conducted face to face.

## Substance misuse

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 1.81 Young adults with substance misuse needs received good clinical care, but psychosocial support was limited to mainly group work interventions. The drug and alcohol strategy policy was out of date and the committee had not met for some time.
- 1.82 Young adults were screened on arrival and those with a high level of drug or alcohol use were immediately assessed by the clinical substance misuse team. There was appropriate first night treatment provision. The majority of prisoners who needed provision (46 in the last 11 months) required alcohol detoxification, and 26 were prescribed opiate substitute treatment or symptomatic relief. Prescribing regimes were flexible and reviewed regularly.
- 1.83 Substance-dependent young people were located on a designated unit, Wren, where they received a high level of monitoring and care. During the previous 11 months, 79 had been admitted to Wren, but occupancy levels were decreasing with only 10 admissions in the first two months of 2013. The purpose of the unit was due to change, and the prison needed to ensure that young adults with drug and alcohol problems continued to benefit from the supportive environment it offered.
- 1.84 The clinical substance misuse team also provided structured interventions on an outpatient basis to young adults with complex needs. They linked in well with mental health services and used the weekly multi-agency meeting to coordinate care. Although joint work with the Journey to Recovery (J2R) team (previously the CARAT service) had improved, the teams were not fully integrated and did not consistently plan and review care plans jointly.
- 1.85 Primary care and substance misuse nurses were trained to deliver smoking cessation advice, and young adults could access nicotine replacement therapy on their first day after a follow-up health screen. Smoking cessation clinics ran daily and an average of 20-25 young adults a month accessed this service.
- 1.86 The drug and alcohol strategy document was out of date, not appropriate and had not been reviewed since the comprehensive needs analysis in 2012. The substance misuse strategy committee had not met in the previous seven months.

- 1.87 Since April 2012, Journey to Recovery had offered psychosocial interventions. Feedback from service users was mixed, and in our survey only 69% of respondents found the support useful, against the comparator of 83%. All new arrivals were seen during induction and services were advertised on the units, but workers did not complete all assessments within five days. At the time of the inspection, 85 prisoners actively engaged with the service and 11 files were suspended. There was evidence that young adults were not prioritised appropriately for substance misuse support according to their level of need, and case files confirmed that one-to-one contact was too infrequent.
- 1.88 Drug and alcohol awareness modules ran regularly, and there was a popular six-week 'mind body and goals' course facilitated jointly with gym staff, but service user consultation was still insufficient.

## Recommendations

---

- 1.89 The drug and alcohol strategy should be updated and action plans should be informed by the most recent needs analysis.
- 1.90 Clinical substance misuse and Journey to Recovery services should improve joint work and provide fully integrated care. (Repeated recommendation 3.97)
- 1.91 The Journey to Recovery service should assess young adults without delay and prioritise work according to individual need. Service users should be actively involved in future service development.

## Section 2: Respect

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.

### 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 Communal areas and cells were dirty. Many cells were poorly equipped and had a lot of graffiti. Cell call bells took too long to answer. The in-cell electricity isolation system was applied inconsistently. Access to showers was good but many were in a poor state of repair. Prisoners could wear their own clothes and prison clothing was exchanged daily. Applications took too long to answer.
- 2.2 Communal areas were grubby and uncared for, the fabric was old and unkempt, and the prison was overrun with rodents. Cell doors were poorly painted and notice boards were sparse. The outside environment was poorly maintained and windows were dirty. There was plenty of association equipment but much of it was in a poor state of repair.
- 2.3 Access to cell cleaning materials was poor, and the one weekly designated cell cleaning period was often cancelled. Cells were particularly grimy and too many were covered in graffiti, much of which looked like it had been there for a long time. Toilets were adequately screened in double cells but not in single cells. Many cells had insufficient or broken furniture, including broken lockable cupboards in many double cells.
- 2.4 The prison policy was that staff could isolate and turn off the electricity to the in-cell television and kettle because of a prisoner's attitude to the regime and attendance at work. We found many examples where staff had breached the policy, and understanding of the policy differed between staff. In any case, this constituted an unofficial punishment without sufficient due process or managerial oversight.
- 2.5 Some staff took a long time to answer cell call bells. In our survey, only 34% of respondents, against the comparator of 41%, said that their cell call bell was answered within five minutes. Our observations concurred with this. An asthmatic prisoner told us that staff took a long time to answer his cell call bell when he was in discomfort.
- 2.6 Access to a daily shower was good, and in our survey 87% of respondents said they could shower daily, against the comparator of 68%. Shower cubicles had some privacy. Although there had been some refurbishment, too many showers were in a poor state of repair with flaking paint, and many were dirty with strewn clothes.
- 2.7 All prisoners could wear their own clothes, and prisoners who chose to wear prison clothing could have a full kit change daily during association. Bedding exchange took place each weekend and all prisoners had a duvet in their cells.

- 2.8 In our survey, only 49% of respondents said that general applications were dealt with fairly, against the comparator of 61%, and only 29%, against 47%, said they were dealt with quickly. Prisoners in our groups and individually complained about the applications system, and some staff told us that some departments took too long to answer them. Although only 24% of respondents in our survey, against the comparator of 35%, said they could access their stored property if they needed to, we found no backlog of applications in reception and a good system to deal with access to stored property.
- 2.9 The offensive display policy was generally adhered to by prisoners and wing rules were displayed on each residential wing. There were an adequate number of telephones on each residential unit and no problems with incoming and outgoing mail.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.10 Communal areas on wings should be maintained to an acceptable standard. Showers should be kept clean and in a good state of repair. Accommodation must be free from rodents, and association equipment should be in a good condition.
- 2.11 Cell cleaning materials should be offered regularly and cells should be free of graffiti, clean and contain furniture maintained to an acceptable standard, including lockable cupboards in all double cells.
- 2.12 All single cells should have adequate toilet privacy screens.
- 2.13 Staff should answer cell call bells within five minutes. (Repeated recommendation 2.22)
- 2.14 Prisoners should receive a timely and fair response to general applications.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.15 Staff should understand the in-cell electricity isolation policy and apply it consistently.

## 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.

- 2.16 Too many staff were disengaged from prisoners and we observed some negative interactions. Staff use of prisoners' preferred names was not well embedded and the work of the personal officers was perfunctory, although case history notes were balanced. Prisoner consultation was underdeveloped.
- 2.17 In our survey, while the majority of prisoners said that most staff treated them with respect, they were negative across a range of other staff-prisoner relationship indicators. In particular, 37% said they had been victimised by staff, against the comparator of 26%. We observed too many staff who were disinterested in building a positive relationship with prisoners, and many staff had low expectations of the young adults in their care. We conducted several more in-



depth interviews with prisoners which supported the view that relationships were very mixed, and often at best distant and at worst dismissive (see main recommendation HP46).

- 2.18 We saw several examples of staff displaying negative and disrespectful attitudes towards prisoners. During association, we observed staff who were distant from prisoners with little or no engagement or interaction with them. In our survey, only 65% of respondents, against the comparator of 71%, said there was a member of staff they could turn to if they had a problem. We did observe a few pockets of positive and caring staff, specifically during prisoners' early days in custody.
- 2.19 Staff use of preferred names to address prisoners was not well embedded and we heard them often use surnames only. However, some documentation had good examples where prisoners were referred to by their preferred name.
- 2.20 In our survey, only 46% of respondents, against the comparator of 74%, said that they had a personal officer, of whom only 51% said that their personal officer was helpful. Case history notes we reviewed were usually balanced and had regular entries by all staff. However, many personal officer entries were observational and did not indicate meaningful interactions with prisoners or involvement with other departments. Targets set by personal officers for their prisoners were mainly behavioural.
- 2.21 There were no prisoner consultation meetings, but there had been a few ad hoc focus groups during 2012.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.22 **Managers should ensure that personal officers work with all departments involved with the young adults allocated to them, and that targets set by personal officers are specific to the needs of young adults, as well as their behaviour.** (Repeated recommendations 2.48 and 2.46)
- 2.23 There should be regular monthly consultation meetings involving prisoners and staff.

## 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>5</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.

- 2.24 There was no diversity policy, the needs of the population had not been assessed and positive promotion of diversity was underdeveloped. The data collected were restricted to race, and some outcomes were poor with no effective action taken. Consultation arrangements with minority groups were also poor. Complaints about discrimination were well managed. Black and minority ethnic prisoners had similar perceptions about their treatment as white prisoners.

---

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

Services for foreign national prisoners needed to improve. Prisoners with disabilities were negative about their treatment. No gay or bisexual prisoners had identified themselves, and in any case no positive support was offered.

## Strategic management

---

- 2.25 There was no local equality and diversity policy based on a needs analysis of the population to identify the support needed. The equality action team (EAT) was chaired by the governor and met monthly. The EAT considered SMART (systematic monitoring and analysis of race equality treatment) monitoring data on race but not the other protected characteristics. The data identified that black and minority ethnic prisoners had experienced poorer outcomes against a range of indicators for a significant period of time - for example, use of force, segregation and IEP. There had been equality impact assessments to understand why this was the case, but it was not clear whether there had been any actual changes to address the discrepancies. Equality impact assessments had been carried out in several other areas but again had not taken account of all protected characteristics.
- 2.26 There were no prisoner equality representatives. Consultation with prisoners from protected characteristic groups was poor and most had no formal forum to raise issues. The chaplaincy did hold specific groups with Gypsy, Romany and Traveller and Eastern European prisoners, and the equality team attended some of these. However, where issues were raised subsequent actions were not always completed or a response given.
- 2.27 Apart from black history month, promotion of diversity was underdeveloped. There were few displays promoting equality and diversity throughout the prison.
- 2.28 Twenty discrimination information reporting forms (DIRFs) had been submitted in the previous six months. Over half were submitted by staff about prisoners. There had been a reduction in the number submitted from 84 in 2011 to 71 in 2012. Many prisoners told us that they were unaware of the process or had no faith in the system. Incidents were investigated reasonably well and responses were polite and timely. The governor and an independent charity, the Zahid Mubarek Trust, scrutinised the investigations separately, and their checks were good. The prison maintained a list of prisoners who had been identified as racist, but there was no programme to challenge racists.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.29 **An equality and diversity policy should be developed to ensure that the needs of all groups within the establishment are identified and addressed, and the prison should promote all aspects of equality and diversity.**
- 2.30 **Equality data should be gathered on all protected characteristics and where problems are consistently identified these should be fully explored to understand the reasons and take action to address them.**
- 2.31 **Prisoner equality representatives should be appointed and there should be regular consultation meetings with them. The prison should investigate the negative perceptions of foreign national and disabled prisoners and address these concerns.**
- 2.32 **The establishment should develop and implement a programme to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour at Feltham. (Repeated recommendation 4.33)**

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.33 Prisoners should be made aware of discrimination incident reporting procedures.

## Protected characteristics

---

- 2.34 Support for the protected characteristic groups was underdeveloped and the lack of a needs analysis meant that neither the equality team nor managers were clear about the needs of all diverse groups held. Nevertheless, black and minority ethnic prisoners accounted for around 65% of the population and their responses to our survey were comparable with those of white prisoners across a range of indicators. These prisoners expressed similar views in our focus groups. However, no specific black and minority ethnic consultation meetings were held.
- 2.35 A third of the population were Muslim prisoners. In our survey, only 52% of Muslim prisoners said they were treated respectfully by staff, compared with 69% of non-Muslims, and again there was no forum where they could highlight concerns collectively.
- 2.36 There were 94 foreign national prisoners, making up 22% of the population. They included 13 detainees held beyond the end of their sentence, the longest for 10 months. A member of the equality team saw all new foreign national arrivals to ascertain their needs. A UK Border Agency representative attended weekly, and foreign nationals could make applications to access them and the prison referred some prisoners to Detention Advice Service. There was good use of professional interpreting services when needed. Staff who spoke foreign languages could be called on to interpret.
- 2.37 Foreign nationals who did not receive visits could apply for a free five-minute telephone call to their country of origin. However, some told us they were unaware of this entitlement and prison records reviewed indicated that some prisoners were not accessing this support. Many foreign national prisoners said they were unaware of any specific support for them. There was very little information displayed in foreign languages around the prison, and although there was a folder in each unit office containing information to assist foreign national prisoners, many staff were unaware of this. In our survey, foreign national prisoners were more negative than British prisoners across a range of respect indicators (see recommendation 2.30).
- 2.38 The prison had identified 60 prisoners as having a disability and there was some good work by health care and education departments to assess needs. This information was passed to the equality team but personal emergency evacuation plans (PEEPs) for prisoners with disabilities were not comprehensive and were missing for some prisoners who required one. Multidisciplinary care plans for prisoners requiring one were not developed and there was no paid carer or buddy scheme. In our survey, respondents with disabilities were more negative about outcomes in a wide range of areas, including important aspects of safety and respect. Many prisoners with disabilities we spoke to felt unsupported by staff. For example, a prisoner who required hearing aids said that staff often forgot to follow up requests for batteries, which left him unable to hear.
- 2.39 Our survey indicated that approximately 4% of the population were from a Gypsy, Romany or Traveller background, although the prison had identified just two. The weekly support group held by the chaplaincy was appreciated by those we spoke to.
- 2.40 No gay or bisexual prisoners had identified themselves to the equality team. Gay and bisexual prisoners did not have access to community support agencies, and there were no displays

promoting positive images of gay people, which the prison felt might offend other prisoners. We considered this to be an inappropriate response.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.41 The prison should improve systems to identify prisoners from minority groups, and meet their needs.
- 2.42 Prisoners with a disability who have additional needs should have a care plan and, if appropriate, a personal emergency evacuation plan. Those who require day-to-day support should be offered a paid carer or buddy.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.43 Positive gay and bisexual images should be displayed across the establishment, as well as information about sources of support and help. (Recommendation 4.66 repeated as housekeeping point)

## 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.

2.44 Faith and religious activity provision was good, and most prisoners felt their religious beliefs were respected.

2.45 The chaplaincy was active, highly visible and well integrated in the prison, delivering good provision for all faiths. In our survey, 64% of respondents, against the comparator of 50%, said that their religious beliefs were respected, and in our groups, prisoners spoke positively of the opportunity to practise their faith.

2.46 Prisoners had to apply to attend corporate worship but this was proportionate to the security of the establishment. Facilities for worship were good and well used. There was an excellent range of courses, groups and support, which included counselling, Sycamore Tree (victim awareness course), drama and Islamic studies. The chaplaincy ran support groups for some foreign nationals and Travellers (see paragraph 2.26).

## 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.

2.47 Prisoners were negative about the formal complaints system. Responses to complaints required improvement, and data analysis was poor.

2.48 In our survey, 47% of respondents said it was easy to make a formal complaint against the comparator of 71%. Only 25%, against 34%, said complaints had been dealt with fairly, and only 19%, against 42%, said they had been handled quickly. The most common subjects for complaint were staff and property. Prisoners in groups were negative about their complaints making any difference and the time it took for some replies. One prisoner commented in his survey: 'Need to be able to complain about staff members without the forms going missing.' In the previous six months, there had been 381 formal complaints, which was lower than similar prisons.

2.49 The responses to formal complaints we examined were polite and generally answered the issue. However, not all were answered on time, at the appropriate level or with enough investigation. Regular quality assurance of 10% of complaints highlighted poor practice, and we saw some evidence of improvements as a result, but more consistency was required.

2.50 Complaint forms were freely available on the wings and locked boxes were emptied daily. Forms were available in 20 languages in a folder in each unit office, but most staff and prisoners were unaware of this. We saw two complaint forms where responses had been translated. The senior management team did not analyse trend data.

## Recommendations

---

2.51 The prison should investigate and address negative perceptions about the formal complaints system.

2.52 There should be a robust quality assurance scheme for complaints, which ensures promised action is taken and patterns or trends identified for remedial action. (Repeated recommendation HP53)

## 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.

2.53 The legal services provision for young adults was poor but access to legal visits was good.

2.54 Legal information and bail information services were inadequate. The only support that was available was provided by offender supervisors who could supply telephone numbers for solicitors, although even this was poorly publicised. Access to legal visits was good and there was a range of appropriate legal materials in the library.

## Recommendation

---

2.55 The legal services provision for young adults should be improved.

# 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.

2.56 The overall quality of health services was comparable with the findings of the inspection of the young people's site in January 2013 and remained satisfactory, although several senior staff had left and there was uncertainty about future delivery of services. Partnership and clinical governance arrangements were good, although changes in NHS commissioning meant that partnership arrangements were in flux. Levels of care were generally good and well man clinics were well established but many prisoners were negative about key outcomes. There was evidence of useful health promotion. Pharmacy services were reasonably good. Initial access to dental services was adequate but the wait for follow-up appointments had increased. Mental health services were prioritised effectively, but full provision was not available due to staffing shortages. The mental health in-patient unit was good but about to be merged with the local drug unit.

## Governance arrangements

---

- 2.57 Health services were commissioned by NHS Hounslow. Primary care and mental health services were provided by Central North West London Primary Care Trust, which subcontracted mental health services to West London Mental Health Trust. Medical services were provided by Medacs, which also provided the out-of-hours services. These were effective but occasionally slow to respond. Governance and monitoring arrangements were good. There was a good range of clinical audit and action plans to improve services. Services were being transferred to Care UK and Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust from April 2013. In our survey, only 35% of respondents rated the overall quality of health care as good, which was worse than the comparator of 55%.
- 2.58 We noted that arrangements to ensure the continuity of health services from the end of March 2013 were being planned and monitored, although during the inspection staff expressed concern about the uncertainty of future services. Several senior staff had left or were about to leave, which would limit leadership during an important transition.
- 2.59 We observed some respectful interactions by health care staff with prisoners, although one health care professional was discussing a sexual health appointment with a young adult loudly on the wing and could be overheard by us and other staff and prisoners. Complaints were well managed and monitored.
- 2.60 An infection control audit had been undertaken and there had been action to improve the cleanliness of the areas. Some areas still required refurbishment to comply with expected standards. The health needs assessment had been updated in December 2012 and was specific to young adults. We saw relevant policies and procedures that reflected the requirements of the organisation. Clinical supervision was available. There was a good programme of training, although some had not been progressed as a result of organisational change.

- 2.61 Emergency resuscitation equipment, including oxygen and automated external defibrillators (AEDs) were available in the health care areas, and were checked daily. Not enough officers were up to date with first aid training, there was limited first aid equipment on the wings, and not all officers knew where the nearest emergency equipment (including defibrillators) were kept. There was no defibrillator in the gym.
- 2.62 There was some health promotion literature available and there had been some useful events. We observed some good health promotion, although this was not in a variety of media to enhance learning by the young adults.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.63 All clinical areas and equipment should comply with infection control guidance.
- 2.64 There should be mechanisms to monitor the delivery of health services once new providers are in place.
- 2.65 There should be sufficient officers trained to respond to emergencies, sufficient emergency equipment around the site, and all staff should know how to access equipment.
- 2.66 Health promotion information should be available in a variety of media.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.67 First aid boxes should be checked regularly and stock should be replaced when used.

## Delivery of care (physical health)

---

- 2.68 SystmOne, the electronic clinical record system, was used. Young adults were screened on arrival and seen in a well man clinic the next day. Record keeping was generally adequate although there were some gaps in information from some records. There was good use of templates but the quality of record keeping did not always reflect the care delivered.
- 2.69 In our survey, only 20% young adults said it was easy to see the doctor, compared with the comparator of 44% and the response of 29% at the previous inspection. We also received complaints from the prisoner groups about the difficulty seeing a doctor or nurse. We saw that waiting lists were short and there were opportunities for emergency appointments if required. We were told that escort staff were not always available at weekends to take young adults to the primary care centre, and the non-attendance rate was high, which might have contributed to the perception of poor access to health services. We noted that the views of young people had been sought but there were no regular meetings.
- 2.70 Nurse triage was available every morning and nurses had expertise in asthma, smoking cessation and immunisations. In our survey young adults were also negative about getting to see a nurse, with only 35% considering this easy against the comparator of 63%. There was very good access to a sexual health clinic and a speech and language therapist. There was a programme of immunisations. Chlamydia screening was available for all young adults, barrier protection was available and there was very good access to a sexual health clinic. There was good access to a speech and language therapist. The waiting list for the optician had reduced.

- 2.71 At the time of the inspection, there were three young adults on the mental health inpatient wing (Albatross), while prisoners with physical health problems could be admitted to the substance misuse inpatient unit (Wren). There had been 10 young adult admissions during the past year. These wings were due to be amalgamated to form one unit and the prison needed to ensure that both categories of prisoners continued to receive appropriate support (see paragraph 1.83). There was an admission procedure to Albatross. Although all nurses were registered mental health nurses (RMNs), there was no clear training plan that identified their training needs. However, there was a good range of triage algorithms.
- 2.72 The administrator managed outside hospital appointments. No appointments had been cancelled due to insufficient escort opportunities, although there was a tendency to avoid external escorts on Mondays and Fridays.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.73 There should be an ongoing audit to enhance the quality of record keeping.
- 2.74 The views of prisoners on health care should be further investigated and the high number of 'did not attends' should be reduced.
- 2.75 There should be a training needs analysis to identify the skills and training required for nursing staff.

## Pharmacy

---

- 2.76 Central North West London NHS Trust held the contract to provide pharmacy services, and medication was dispensed and supplied by a local pharmacy. The provider was due to change in April 2013.
- 2.77 A full-time pharmacist and technician were available to give advice. Prisoners could request medicines advice on the health care application forms available on the units. The pharmacist assisted with asthma advice and undertook medication use reviews.
- 2.78 Stock medication was stored in a treatment room in primary care and distributed from there to be administered on the units. Only insulin and vaccines were regularly administered directly from the primary care treatment room. Medication trolleys kept in this room were used to transport and administer medication to young adults, except for those on the Albatross and Wren units where treatment rooms were used. There was 24-hour nursing care and patients could access medication out of hours; supplies were appropriately recorded and monitored.
- 2.79 The level of prescribing was low and appropriate to the population. A formulary was available. Over half the prescribed medication was supplied as in possession and covered by a policy, currently under review. The doctor carried out risk assessments on a point-score system, patients signed an agreement and these were recorded on SystmOne. Prescriptions identified whether medication was to be held in possession. A list of medication not permitted in possession included basic analgesia, insulin and nicotine replacement therapy, which were considered high risk in this population.
- 2.80 There was an agreed stock list, although use of stock was not strictly audited. Stock was occasionally supplied as split packs and bore labels. Ongoing supplies of medicines could be provided on discharge or transfer if held in possession or when there was sufficient notice.



Prisoners on administered medications attending court were given morning doses but did not receive doses for later that day or ongoing supplies if released.

- 2.81 Patient medication records for dispensed medicines were held by the pharmacy supplier and could not be accessed. There was no facility to label medication. Review and analysis of prescribing data could not be done electronically.
- 2.82 Controlled drugs were held and administered from Albatross and Wren units. Ordering and record keeping at both locations was good, although registers did not comply with the current legislation.
- 2.83 Only soluble paracetamol for analgesia, Mucogel for indigestion and a sunscreen could be provided by nursing staff as special sick. Records of these supplies were recorded on the charts. Prisoners could buy a limited range of over-the-counter remedies for external use from the prison shop. There were patient group directions (PGDs), authorising appropriate health care professionals to supply and administer prescription-only medicine, for sexual health and substance misuse. A PGD for nurse supply of an asthma inhaler was due to be agreed by the medicines management group. In practice, most basic medication had to be prescribed by a doctor.
- 2.84 There were comprehensive pharmacy-related procedures for staff to adhere to, although there was no evidence that staff signed these. The medicines management group met approximately every two months and was attended by all the relevant stakeholders.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.85 **SystemOne should be used to record prescribing and administration of medicines and enable more effective audit and analysis of medicines used.**
- 2.86 **Patients should be supplied with an appropriate quantity of their medication for any court appearances.**
- 2.87 **A wider range of patient group directions should be introduced to enable more potent medication to be supplied by the pharmacist or nurse, and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor.**

## Housekeeping points

---

- 2.88 Wholesale stock should be supplied as complete packs and should not be labelled.
- 2.89 Staff should read and sign the agreed pharmacy procedures and policies.
- 2.90 Controlled drugs registers should be compliant with the current legislation.

## Dentistry

---

- 2.91 The dentist and dental nurse were available for three sessions a week. Access to the dentist for a first treatment had reduced to two weeks but there was a 13-week wait for ongoing treatment. The dentist or dental nurse attended the wings regularly to triage prisoners.

- 2.92 Dental equipment was maintained and worked satisfactorily. Infection control was generally satisfactory and the newly installed decontamination area had been rectified since the January 2013 inspection of the Feltham young people's site.
- 2.93 In our survey, only 9% of young adults thought it was easy to see the dentist, against the comparator of 19%, but 33% considered the quality of the service was good compared with 23% at the previous inspection. Oral health information was provided one-to-one.

## Delivery of care (mental health)

---

- 2.94 Delivery of mental health services was prioritised effectively, but staffing vacancies and sick leave had affected the provision of primary care and in-reach services. At the time of the inspection, prisoners had no access to anger management courses. There was no mental health awareness training for staff.
- 2.95 Prisoners had good access to psychiatrists. There was integrated working between the in-reach team and primary care mental health worker. There were weekly team meetings to discuss referrals, inpatients and prisoners with complex mental health needs. Prisoners who needed inpatient treatment were moved to the Albatross unit (see paragraph 2.71)

## Recommendations

---

- 2.96 An anger management training programme should be introduced for prisoners.
- 2.97 Mental health awareness training, including learning disabilities and personality disorders, should be available to all staff.

## 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.**

- 2.98 Prisoners were negative about the quality and quantity of food, although there was a varied menu. Meals were served too early and lunch was served at cell doors which was unnecessary and disrespectful. Storage and preparation of halal food were inadequate, as were consultation arrangements.
- 2.99 In our survey, only 11% of respondents said the food was good against the already low comparator of 25%, and this was worse than at our last inspection. In our groups, prisoners complained about the quality and quantity of food. We found that the meals varied, with particularly small portions at lunch. Meals were served too early, with lunch at 11.30am and the evening meal at 4.30pm. The lunch, which consisted of a baguette or pasta, was issued at the cell door, which was unnecessary and disrespectful. There was no opportunity for prisoners to dine in association. Breakfast packs issued in the morning were inadequate.
- 2.100 The menu operated over a four-week cycle and was varied and broadly met the needs of the population, including vegetarians, vegans, religious and medical diets.

- 2.101 Wing serveries and food trolleys were clean. The kitchen was an adequate size and equipment was well maintained. Halal food was cooked separately from non-halal food, but there was no separate storage or preparation area. Prisoners working in the kitchens could gain a range of qualifications up to national vocational qualification (NVC) level 2.
- 2.102 Consultation arrangements were inadequate. There was a food survey every six months but the return rate on the most recent survey was very low. Kitchen workers were the only group asked for their opinions about food. There were no food comments books on the units, and prisoners who wanted to raise an issue were told to make a formal complaint.

## Recommendations

---

- 2.103 The food provided should be of an adequate quality and quantity, and offer a balanced diet, and prisoners should be regularly consulted about these issues.
- 2.104 Lunch should not be served before noon and dinner not before 5pm. (Repeated recommendation 8.10)
- 2.105 All meals should be issued at the servery.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 2.106 Halal food should be stored and prepared in a separate area.

## Purchases

---

### Expected outcomes:

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

- 2.107 Prisoners were dissatisfied with the shop and some new arrivals had significant delays in receiving their first order. Consultation was responsive, but there was no catalogue ordering service.
- 2.108 In our survey, prisoners were less satisfied than the comparator with the range of items in the prison shop, and in focus groups complained of high prices. Packs for smokers and non-smokers were available on reception and more could be bought, subject to available funds, if there was a delay in ordering from the main shop list. Depending on their day of arrival, prisoners could wait up to 13 days to receive their first orders from the shop, which could lead to debt and bullying.
- 2.109 The shop list was also available in pictorial format for those who could not read and included a reasonable range of products. Quarterly consultation resulted in publicised changes to the list. Although prisoners could have items handed in by their family or friends, they could not order from catalogues, which was a significant gap.

## Recommendation

---

2.110 Prisoners should be able to order from catalogues.

## Section 3: Purposeful activity

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.

### 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 Prisoners spent too much time locked in their cells with nothing meaningful to do.
- 3.2 The published core day indicated that a fully employed prisoner could achieve about 9.5 hours unlocked on weekdays and about 7.5 hours at weekends. In reality, we calculated that the average time out of cell was nearer to 4.5 hours a day for employed prisoners and as little as an hour or two for the 43% who did not work. We found a daily slippage in the regime, and observed that prisoners were often unlocked late. 'Full' association in reality did not mean everyone on a unit was unlocked, and often this was further curtailed with even fewer prisoners being facilitated. These decisions were made by unit staff using unregulated discretion, which varied from unit to unit (see main recommendation HP47).
- 3.3 At a roll check during mornings and afternoons in the middle of the day, when prisoners should have been unlocked and at activity, we found 40% to 45% of the population locked in their cells.
- 3.4 Most prisoners could have a period of association during the day but it was often cancelled or curtailed in evenings. Exercise periods were limited to 30 minutes a day and exercise yards were too small. Full association on all residential units was limited to a maximum of 28 prisoners out of cell at a time, although we saw this being limited to half this number. This meant that many prisoners were locked up routinely and unnecessarily during evening association (see main recommendation HP47).

### Recommendation

---

- 3.5 Exercise yards in the young adult units should be large enough for the number of people using them and be furnished with adequate seating. (Repeated recommendation 6.85)

### 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

---

<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.

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 There were too few activity places, but even these were underused. A high proportion of young adults (43%) were classified as unemployed and locked in their cells during the core day. Only 150 activity places were available, including part-time education and vocational training. The range of work was small and most jobs were in wing work, kitchens, laundry and gardens. The variety and range of education programmes was narrow, inflexible and offered insufficient progression. The management of learning and skills and work was inadequate, and the provider had not made sufficient progress in appointing managers and remodelling the curriculum. Achievements were generally good for vocational programmes but required improvement in some English and mathematics provision. English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) provision was poor and did not meet needs. Library resources were good but too few young people accessed them.

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

Outcomes for prisoners engaged in learning and skills and work activities:

Quality of learning and skills and work activities, including the quality of teaching, training, learning and assessment):	Requires improvement
Effectiveness of leadership and management of learning and skills and work activities:	Inadequate
	Inadequate

## Management of learning and skills and work

---

3.8 The prison management of learning and skills was inadequate. A new contractor, A4e, had been appointed in November 2012. Communications between prison managers and A4e were good, but although the prison had raised significant concerns there had been little progress to bring about required changes to management and the curriculum. There had been no education manager in post since November 2012. Some A4e staff had been given additional responsibilities to manage the provision, but this had not been successful or effective. A new education manager had been recruited.

3.9 The education curriculum was linked to the residential units and not based on the individual needs of young adults. The prison and A4e had recognised the need to change this but there had been significant delays and no progress. However, the prison had clear strategies to synchronise learning and skills with regimes. These were based on a detailed and accurate needs analysis, and shared with and supported by all prison and learning and skills staff.

3.10 The prison was not effective in maximising attendance in education and training. Education sessions were often only 70% occupied. Attendance in vocational training sessions was poor – frequently only between 30% and 50% – and required significant improvement. Relationships with the provider for the young people’s side, CFBT, were unproductive, and in shared sessions there were missed opportunities to fill spaces. Increased participation had been a key recommendation at the previous inspection but there had been no discernible improvement.

---

<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>.

- 3.11 Prisoners' induction to learning and skills was sufficient and initial assessment was effective in providing clear indications of support needs. Allocation to activities had improved and was quick and fair. However, wing jobs were allocated by senior wing staff and there was no formal system to ensure this was fair and equitable.
- 3.12 Prison-wide self-assessment had been established with the previous provider but had not yet been fully integrated with A4e. Structures for the observation of teaching, training and learning had been introduced into the A4e provision but had yet to go through formal moderation. The prison had not yet introduced a system to observe and develop staff responsible for prison-led areas.
- 3.13 The prison did not sufficiently assess and differentiate participation and achievement of different groups to identify and support any areas for improvement.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.14 All young adults requiring learning and skills support should attend education and training classes, and attendance and participation in education and training sessions should be improved. (Repeated recommendation 6.30)
- 3.15 Arrangements to maximise the use of vocational training places shared with the young people's side should be improved.
- 3.16 The establishment should make better use of initial screening information to ensure learners are allocated to programmes meeting their needs. (Repeated recommendation 6.32)
- 3.17 There should be a prison-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work that includes and evaluates all activities, and fully informs action planning for improvement.
- 3.18 The session observation scheme across all learning and skills activities should be developed to improve the quality of teaching and learning and assessment.
- 3.19 The analysis and use of data to assess participation and achievement of different groups of young adults should be improved to ensure all learners' needs are identified and met.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.20 The allocation of young adults to wing work should be fair and be monitored to ensure equality of opportunity.

## Provision of activities

---

- 3.21 There were insufficient work places with only approximately 150 available for the population of about 445 young adults held (potentially up to 522). Fifty work places offered mostly wing work, recycling and the laundry. This work was not accredited and young adults' employability skills were not recognised or recorded. A high proportion of young adults (43%) were classified as unemployed. In our survey, the majority of young adults did not find it easy to access work, education or vocational training (see main recommendation HP48).

- 3.22 The variety and range of education provision were inadequate. There were 60 part-time places in education in the morning and afternoon. Most young adults followed a fixed programme of English and mathematics, information and computer technology (ICT) at level 1, and a business and employability course. Others followed single subject programmes in art or cookery. These programmes were not focused on meeting individual needs. The prison had not yet extended the social and life skills provision recommended at the previous inspection. Provision for those needing to learn English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) was poor and relied on additional support tutors in other classes. Workers for the Volunteer Support for Education (VSE) programme provided effective literacy and numeracy support for a few young adults in the workplace or in the VSE offices. Some staff were qualified to support young adults with dyslexia and worked independently of the education provider. Links between VSE and the education provider were underdeveloped.
- 3.23 The prison provided 46 vocational training places but often only between 30% and 50% were occupied. The range of vocational training was reasonable and good in PE. Opportunities included horticulture, motor vehicle, painting and decorating, brickwork, exploring music, and ICT in the Prisons Information Communication Technology Academy (PICTA) workshop. Most were at level 1 with no opportunities to progress upwards. The vocational training shared with that for the young people's site was not well managed and places were not maximised.
- 3.24 Industrial cleaning had not been available in the prison for seven months. Many prisoners were not in Feltham long enough to complete full qualifications but could achieve units of qualifications, which helped those on short stays. NVQs in catering were available to young adults working in the kitchen and staff mess. Short courses in manual handling, food hygiene and first aid were provided successfully.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.25 **The establishment should continue to develop social and life skills programmes, especially those that help to improve young adults' personal effectiveness by addressing negative attitudes and self-control.** (Repeated recommendation 6.36)
- 3.26 **All work and training opportunities should be formally accredited to national standards, and skills not formally accredited should be recognised and recorded to support prisoners' employment needs.**

## Quality of provision

---

- 3.27 Induction into education and initial assessment were satisfactory. English and mathematics were assessed using a computer-based assessment tool and provided a clear picture of individual support needs. Foreign national young adults with limited English completed a simple assessment to identify the level of ESOL provision they needed. The prison did not have a suitable test that accurately assessed the mathematics skills of those with limited English or any screening to identify young adults with dyslexia. Prospects, the contractor for the National Careers Service, gave a presentation on careers, information and guidance at induction but did not routinely see young adults unless they requested an interview. Interviews were not held in sufficient privacy to discuss sensitive or personal matters.
- 3.28 Teaching, learning and assessment were inadequate. Our previous recommendation to improve standards had not been achieved and standards had declined. There was a minority of good teaching sessions, but too many were inadequate and failed to meet individual needs. In the better sessions, tutors motivated and interested young adults through well-chosen topics



and activities, and they generally behaved well and made good progress. In the weakest sessions, tutors lacked good teaching skills and used mundane activities that did not relate to personal experience or interests. Too many prisoners became rowdy and disruptive, or simply did not participate.

- 3.29 Training and coaching in workshops, kitchens and PE were generally good; sessions were well planned, and health and safety were thoroughly reinforced. The standard of work produced by some young adults in vocational training areas was good. Practical sessions were interesting and stimulating, and young adults were enthusiastic and clearly enjoyed the sessions. Resources were adequate in most workshops but particularly good in the music workshops, with a wide range of instruments and sound recording equipment. Numeracy support was also available for those in the bricks workshop.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.30 **The quality of teaching and learning should be improved, and the behaviour of young adults in learning sessions should be managed better.** (Repeated recommendation 6.31)
- 3.31 **There should be systematic provision in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) for young adults needing support, and appropriate ESOL qualifications should be offered.**

## Education and vocational achievements

---

- 3.32 Too few prisoners achieved qualifications in English and mathematics. In the three and a half months since the new contract, 400 prisoners had started courses in English and mathematics, but only around 25% achieved a qualification. In some practical classes prisoners made good progress towards challenging learning goals.
- 3.33 Pass rates on physical education programmes were good. Most learners (70%) who started the gym instructor course gained the full qualification. Ninety per cent of young adults who started on the 'football changing lives' course completed the entire programme. Those identified for these programmes were held in the prison to allow them to finish. Young adults working in the kitchen and staff mess completed an NVO at level 1. Many young adults on PICTA training programmes gained at least one unit, but 34% gained the full Microsoft Office Software (MOS) qualification.
- 3.34 Young adults in vocational training workshops completed units of accredited qualifications primarily at level 1, for example, motor vehicle, gardening, brick work, and painting and decorating. These qualifications offered a stepping stone to a higher level work-related qualification at other prisons or in the community. In the exploring music workshop, most learners completed individual units of qualifications.

## Recommendation

---

- 3.35 **Achievement of learners' learning and skills outcomes, particularly in English and mathematics, should be improved.**

## Library

---

- 3.36 The library was a welcoming environment with attractively displayed books. There was a range of fiction and non-fiction to meet young adults' interests and needs, as well as easy readers. The collection of resources in 22 languages was reasonable. The stock was well managed but stock loss was high at 20%, and the outdated computerised library management system needed replacing. The library was well managed by an experienced and knowledgeable librarian. There was a small range of newspapers in English and other languages and a good selection of magazines and periodicals.
- 3.37 Prisoners did not have enough access to the library and in our survey fewer than half the respondents said that they could go there at least once a week. It was difficult for young adults in vocational training to attend, and wing visits by library staff were often cancelled. There was very limited access to library services outside the core working day. Over the past 12 months, approximately 40% of prisoners were regular users, with an additional 6% receiving outreach from library staff.
- 3.38 There were few resources apart from books. DVDs or CDs had been discontinued because they were often stolen or damaged. Computers in the library were out of date and due to be removed.

## Recommendations

---

- 3.39 Access to the library should be improved, and it should be available in the evenings and at weekends.
- 3.40 The library should keep its computers, which should be upgraded.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 3.41 The computerised library management system should be updated.

## 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.

- 3.42 The promotion of healthy living and physical training was very good. Young adults had access to a very wide range of activities and physical education facilities. The range of programmes was very good and achievement rates on vocational qualifications were high.
- 3.43 The physical education provision was well managed and promoted, with a range of recreational and structured physical training programmes. Accredited programmes included gymnasium instructor courses at level 1, football and rugby coaching. The community sport leader award was used effectively to identify those who would complete the gym instructor training.

- 3.44 All young adults completed an appropriate induction to the gymnasium that included an introduction to the equipment, the importance of healthy training, diet and nutrition, manual handling and first aid training. They also completed a pre-activity readiness questionnaire and appropriate referrals were made to health care. There was thorough monitoring of gym users, which was used to inform specific sessions.
- 3.45 PE resources were excellent and well promoted. Facilities were well used, clean and welcoming, with standard modern equipment. Two large sports halls were well used for games and coaching activities, and a cardiovascular suite with modular and weight training facilities provided most of the recreational activity. However, there was no plan for the maintenance and replacement of the expensive equipment provided. Full-size, grass football and rugby pitches were well used for major team sports and coaching, with occasional matches against local colleges and clubs.
- 3.46 All PE staff were enthusiastic, suitably qualified and promoted the benefits of general fitness, health and well-being. Partnership working with local organisations was particularly strong. Links with premiership rugby and football clubs provided opportunities for learners to work with top coaches and gain employment on release. Tackling drugs through sport programmes ran frequently in conjunction with Journey to Recovery (J2R).

## Recommendation

---

- 3.47 The prison should implement a budgeted plan for the replacement of cardiovascular and modular weight training equipment.



## Section 4: Resettlement

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.

### 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 general strategic approach of the prison to offender management and resettlement was appropriate, but development had been affected by recent staffing issues and the service was going through transition. There was still a considerable gap between the work planned and what was actually in place for prisoners.
- 4.2 The reducing reoffending policy document was up to date and covered all aspects of offender management and resettlement. There had been a needs analysis in July 2012, based on information collected through the London initial screening, referral and resettlement tool (LISARRT), which was used to inform the strategic direction of both offender management and resettlement work.
- 4.3 Development objectives for each resettlement pathway, along with offender management, were clear and generally appropriate, with progress monitored through the monthly reducing reoffending meeting. The meeting was appropriately constituted and attended by representatives from across the establishment. A further bimonthly interventions and services meeting supported agencies delivering resettlement pathway provision. While the broad strategy underpinning resettlement and offender management was sound, progress had been slow as the whole service was going through a period of transition (see paragraph 4.8). Due to low staffing levels and the management of new staff into the offender management unit (OMU), much of the core offender management work needed in a busy local prison had not been undertaken for about six months. An offender management procedure manual had been developed to support new staff and was generally comprehensive but, despite this, many prisoners were not assessed on their arrival or their needs reviewed before release (see main recommendation HP49).
- 4.4 Links with community services across London were reasonable and included the development of support through the integrated offender management services of the top 10 boroughs from where the prison's population was mainly drawn. However, further work was required to ensure the effectiveness of this initiative.
- 4.5 The prison anticipated that new staff would be in place by the beginning of May 2013 and able to undertake necessary assessments of need along with pre-release assessments. However, at the time of the inspection, there remained a significant gap for many prisoners between what was planned and what was actually in place.

# Offender management and planning

---

## Expected outcomes:

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

- 4.6 Unsented prisoners and those with less than a month left to serve did not receive any assessment of their resettlement needs. Those serving longer sentences were not consistently assessed for OASys (offender assessment system), and those that were completed varied in quality. Quality assurance of the work of offender supervisors was also variable. The Teal resettlement unit was a positive initiative but there needed to be greater clarity about its purpose and function. Work with life-sentenced prisoners was reasonably good, as was public protection.
- 4.7 Unsented prisoners (195) and those who were sentenced but with less than a month to serve (116) did not have any formal assessment of need due to the suspension of the LISARRT for the previous six months. St Mungo's (homelessness charity) saw all prisoners during induction about their housing needs (see paragraph 4.26), but this information was not formally shared with OMU to inform sentence planning and there was no coordination of these needs. Of the remaining sentenced population, approximately 50 were in scope for offender management (high or very high risk of harm) and managed by community-based offender managers. Only 17 of the remaining cases had completed up-to-date OASys assessments, with around 60 either incomplete or partially completed.
- 4.8 The OMU was undergoing a period of transition with most staff being replaced with new offender supervisors. Only seven of the resourced 11 staff were in post, of whom only three had completed OASys training. Some were very new to the role and undertaking only limited work with prisoners. Only 31% of prisoners in our survey, against the comparator of 85%, said that they had an offender supervisor, and only 27%, against 65%, said that they had a sentence plan.
- 4.9 We reviewed the OASys assessments and sentence plans that had been completed and found that most were of a reasonable standard, although they needed to be more focused on issues of risk. In most cases, sentence planning meetings involved only the offender supervisor and prisoner, without direct involvement from other departments. In many cases, written information was provided from specialist departments, such as Prospects and J2R (substance misuse), but the OASys assessments did not always refer to this.
- 4.10 Each OASys report was checked before it was signed off, with 10% of those completed reviewed further. Beyond this, checks were limited. We were told that case files had been checked randomly until about six months previously, and this would restart once all new staff were in post.
- 4.11 Offender supervisors had minimal contact with prisoners beyond sentence planning. The electronic case notes we looked at often indicated no contact while the prisoner had been at Feltham. The role of personal officers in the process was unclear – some we spoke to had little or no idea of the resettlement needs or sentence plan targets of the prisoners they were responsible for (see section on staff-prisoner relations). In our survey, only 14% of prisoners, against the comparator of 50%, said that their offender supervisor was working with them to

achieve sentence plan targets, and 57%, against 34%, said that no one was working with them.

- 4.12 In October 2012, the Teal unit had opened as a resettlement unit for up to 38 prisoners. This was potentially a positive initiative for prisoners with at least 12 months left to serve, and aimed to deliver a range of modules oriented to resettlement. But these aims had yet to be achieved; while some courses had been run, including 'family man' (teaching the importance of communication and supporting others), a money management course and a workshop about disclosure on release, they were sporadic. There was little or no involvement by offender supervisors, and some prisoners on the unit did not have an OASys assessment. There had been no profile of the needs of the prisoners on the unit to ensure that what was available or planned was being developed.
- 4.13 Home detention curfew arrangements were reasonable. Out of 66 applications received in the previous six months, 27 (41%) had been granted and a further 24 prisoners (36%) had been either transferred or their application halted for a variety of reasons. The rest had been refused.
- 4.14 Release on temporary licence (ROTL) remained low. Ten prisoners had successfully completed periods of release in the previous six months for a total of 40 days. This had included attendance on the Duke of Edinburgh's award scheme as well as various work experiences and college interviews. Although in theory prisoners could apply for and achieve ROTL from anywhere in the prison, in reality they had to be on Teal unit to be successful, which limited opportunities.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.15 **Sentence planning meetings and OASys (offender assessment system) assessments should include contributions from all departments involved with the prisoner.**
- 4.16 **The prison should introduce a quality assurance model that extends beyond OASys work and which ensures that offender supervisors are sufficiently skilled and trained to meet prisoner needs.**
- 4.17 **The prison should clarify the role of the Teal unit and ensure that it meets the resettlement needs of its prisoners.**
- 4.18 **Release on temporary licence should be extended to meet the needs of prisoners preparing for release.**

## Public protection

---

- 4.19 Public protection arrangements were broadly appropriate. All new arrivals were screened to identify those with current or previous convictions relating to child protection (five at the time of the inspection) and/or harassment (13) along with multi-agency public protection arrangements (MAPPAs) cases. Although there were no level three cases at the time of the inspection, when there were, they and the MAPPAs level twos (six during the inspection) were reviewed regularly and appropriately through the monthly inter-departmental risk management team (IDRMT) meeting. Although all prisoners subject to MAPPAs were reviewed by the IDRMT before their release, despite determined efforts by the public protection manager, the MAPPAs level of some prisoners was not identified by the responsible probation trust before their release.

- 4.20 Offender supervisors did not consistently play an active role in public protection meetings. They did not attend routinely and the reports requested in the last six months of a prisoner's custody, while forwarded to offender managers, were completed by the public protection manager with some help and advice from offender supervisors.

## Categorisation

---

- 4.21 In 2012 there had been 1,820 transfers from Feltham with an average of around 35 a week. Although we saw some examples where prisoners had been transferred to other establishments to meet sentence planning objectives, this was not a primary consideration and tended to happen only when an offender supervisor or offender manager specifically advocated for this.

## Indeterminate sentenced prisoners

---

- 4.22 Work with the small number of life-sentenced prisoners was reasonably good. Information leaflets had been developed for remand prisoners likely to receive such a sentence, as well as those already convicted. One offender supervisor was responsible for the eight lifers held at the prison and had regular contact with them. Multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel (MALRAP) meetings were undertaken quickly following sentence and were generally well supported by appropriate agencies, although there were some problems with consistent attendance from community-based offender managers.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.23 There should be greater efforts to secure probation input into multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel (MALRAP) meetings. (Repeated recommendation 9.59)

## 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 With the suspension of LISARRT, systematic pre-release planning for all had ceased. Ad hoc assessments in some of the resettlement pathways were still undertaken but only if a need had already been identified. There was little connection between resettlement intervention work and the OMU. Other than for accommodation, few prisoners knew who to speak to about support before release. There were insufficient links between education, training and employment agencies and other departments. Community links for prisoners with drug and/or alcohol-related problems were limited. There was reasonable family support overall, although only limited family visits for a few prisoners. The range of offending behaviour programmes was limited.

- 4.25 An average of 25 young adults a month were released from Feltham. Up until about six months previously, all prisoners were assessed before their release drawing on information available from LISARRT. With the suspension of LISARRT, pre-release planning had also ceased.



Where need had already been identified (housing, substance misuse etc), individual prisoners were seen before release by the respective pathway providers, but there was relatively little connection with offender supervisors to ensure that such information was passed to offender managers responsible for community licence supervision. In our survey, responses were significantly worse than the comparators concerning knowledge of who to speak to at the prison about resettlement provision and support before release. The exception was accommodation. Cases we reviewed of prisoners due to be released in the next week included some who had never been seen by an offender supervisor at Feltham, and those seen before release were only to ensure they understood their licence conditions (see main recommendation HP49).

## Accommodation

---

- 4.26 All prisoners were seen by St Mungo's (a specialist housing support charity for ex-prisoners and offenders) during their induction about their accommodation need. In most cases, they were seen in a group with individual contact if requested. In the previous three months, around 250 prisoners had been seen by the service and approximately half had received some help.
- 4.27 The service had developed good links with accommodation providers across London, and data provided by the prison after the inspection indicated around 96% of prisoners were released to settled accommodation. Despite this, around 5% of the population were released with no fixed accommodation, which for the age group was higher than at similar establishments.
- 4.28 In our survey significantly more prisoners than the comparator (48% against 37%) said they knew who to speak to about accommodation at the prison, but only those already identified through induction or other referral were seen before release to assess their accommodation.
- 4.29 We were told that a few foreign national prisoners were regularly released each month with no access to public funds and often no accommodation. The extent of this issue was not monitored to ensure the needs of this particularly vulnerable group were met.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.30 The prison should work with statutory and community groups to ensure that all prisoners needing housing on release are offered stable and suitable accommodation.
- 4.31 The prison should monitor the accommodation needs of foreign national prisoners released with no access to public funds, and work with other community agencies to ensure their needs are met.

## Education, training and employment

---

- 4.32 The range of vocational training provided was reasonable and based on a thorough and informed needs analysis, but too few prisoners accessed it. Most programmes were only offered at level 1 with no opportunity to progress, but did provide a stepping stone to further education and training in other prisons and on release into the community. Units of full qualifications were particularly useful for those on short stays in the establishment, but again too few were achieving them. Some good employment-related qualifications were provided in catering and PE.

- 4.33 ROTL had been used successfully and there were good links with local employers and the community to provide further opportunities. Links between the PE department and local football clubs had been successful in providing opportunities for work experience.
- 4.34 Local charities and training providers worked well together in the prison to provide young adults with a range of support and signposts to further employment, education and training opportunities in the community. Some staff took young adults to employers, colleges and training providers when released and provided free clothes for interviews. In the previous year, prison records indicated that 25% of the 400 young adults released had entered employment and 30% entered education or training. However, in our survey a significantly higher number than the comparator said that they did not know who to talk to in the prison to get information about education and training. There were insufficient links between the partner agencies working in the prison and relevant prison staff to ensure a coordinated approach to resettlement work was adopted.
- 4.35 The prison did not provide a structured pre-release or business start-up course, and there was an over-reliance on Prospects and other agencies to provide activities such as job search, CV writing and dealing with disclosure.

## Recommendations

---

- 4.36 **Links between partner agencies working in the resettlement pathways, prison managers and the education department should be more structured and information better shared to maximise the effectiveness of work to resettle prisoners.**
- 4.37 **The prison should offer a pre-release and business start-up course for prisoners due for release.**

## Health care

---

- 4.38 Health care discharge arrangements were reasonably good. There were satisfactory links with local secure services for prisoners with complex mental health needs, and records indicated that successful transfers to secure mental health services took between two and four weeks.

## Drugs and alcohol

---

- 4.39 The J2R (Journey to Recovery) team was based in the interventions office, which facilitated liaison with housing and employment agencies. Workers contributed to sentence plans when invited. Pre-release plans described young adults' work with the service, but harm reduction and overdose prevention advice was not sufficiently evidenced.
- 4.40 The team dealt with a large number of drug intervention programme (DIP) teams, but these often prioritised class A drug users and offered only a signposting service to young adults with alcohol or cannabis problems. A designated recovery/reintegration worker had been appointed who was focusing on developing family work and strengthening community links.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.41 **The J2R service should develop and implement a harm reduction checklist for clients before their release.**

## Finance, benefit and debt

---

- 4.42 With the absence of LISARRT, the level of prisoners' finance, benefit and debt need was not clear. In the needs analysis of July 2012, around 80 prisoners a month were referred for support, but this included both young adults and young people. The support provided was limited. There was currently no specific debt management support, although St Mungo's could support prisoners with housing-specific debt.
- 4.43 A money management programme was provided through the education department and Barclays Bank had piloted a money management programme on the Teal unit, anticipated to be extended across the prison, which included help in opening bank accounts before release.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.44 The finance needs of prisoners, especially in relation to debt, should be evaluated, and appropriate and necessary support provided.

## Children, families and contact with the outside world

---

- 4.45 The visitors' centre was run by the Spurgeons charity, which offered a range of support and help to families visiting prisoners. Information, including a visitors' booklet, was appropriately detailed and staff aimed to see those visiting the prison for the first time. It also supported the children's play area in the visits hall, although not every session was covered.
- 4.46 A reasonable level of family support was provided, although for most prisoners there were only two family visits a year. Similar visits were also provided through programmes such as Sycamore Tree victim awareness, rugby and football academies, and 'family man' (improving communication skills and understanding of the importance of relationships). In our survey, only 25% of prisoners, compared with the 44% comparator, said that staff had helped them maintain contact with their family. The 'family man' programme had been run on the Teal unit with positive feedback and it was hoped to be available more widely across the prison.
- 4.47 The visits hall was generally well managed and could accommodate up to 36 prisoners and their visitors at a time. 'Keep apart' arrangements were appropriate and the general environment reasonably conducive to visiting. However, the refreshment bar had been replaced by vending machines that offered only limited options.
- 4.48 Access to visits was reasonable with two sessions an afternoon. Although there were sometimes delays in visitors and/or prisoners getting into the visits hall, sessions were usually extended where necessary to ensure a minimum of one hour, and many could last up to 80 minutes.

## Recommendation

---

- 4.49 The number of family visits should be extended and available to all prisoners.

## Attitudes, thinking and behaviour

---

- 4.50 At the time of the inspection the prison provided no accredited offending behaviour programmes. Where identified as a need, prisoners could transfer to other establishments to

complete these, but with the current shortfall in OASys assessments the level of need for offending behaviour work was unknown. Although we saw some examples of OASys targets to complete offending behaviour programmes in the community while on post-release licence, these were not routinely agreed with offender managers to ensure that proper arrangements and referrals were made in advance.

- 4.51 The Sycamore Tree victim awareness programme was undertaking its first course for some years, and prisoners who were part of the programme were positive about it. Two further courses were scheduled for 2013. Some initial work had begun in developing restorative justice work, in particular on the Teal unit, but this was still in its early stages.

## Housekeeping point

---

- 4.52 Where post-release offending behaviour programmes are set as targets, these should be agreed and negotiated in advance with the responsible offender manager.

# Section 5: Summary of recommendations and housekeeping points

The following is a listing of repeated and new recommendations, housekeeping points 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, or in the previous report where recommendations have been repeated.

---

<b>Main recommendation</b>	<b>To NOMS</b>
----------------------------	----------------

---

- 5.1 NOMS should carry out an urgent review of the viability of Feltham, as it is currently constituted, as a suitable location for large numbers of young adult prisoners. Alternatives for their location, and safer and more constructive management should be considered. (HP44)

---

<b>Main recommendations</b>	<b>To the governor</b>
-----------------------------	------------------------

---

- 5.2 Batons should only be drawn and/or used as a last resort, and incidents involving batons should be scrutinised to ensure proportionality. (HP45)
- 5.3 All staff should interact positively with prisoners, build good relationships with them, refer to them by their preferred name, and treat them with respect. The prison should develop a strategy that will deliver these positive outcomes. (HP46)
- 5.4 Prisoners' time out of their cells should be improved and include association every evening and at least an hour exercise outside per day. (HP47)
- 5.5 There should be sufficient purposeful activities for the population, places should be appropriately focused on addressing individual needs, and all places should be fully used. (HP48)
- 5.6 The prison should ensure that the assessment of need, provision of required interventions and review of support before release are in place for all prisoners. (HP49)

---

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To NOMS</b>
-----------------------	----------------

---

- 5.7 NOMS should work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that foreign national detainees are held at Feltham only when it is appropriate to do so and for the minimum time possible. (2.42)

---

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To Prison Escort and Custody Services</b>
------------------------	--

---

- 5.8 Prisoners should not be held in court cells for unnecessarily long periods. (1.6)
- 5.9 Escort vans should be clean and free from graffiti. (1.7)

### **Early days in custody**

---

- 5.10 The reception should be refurbished, be more welcoming and contain relevant information for new arrivals. (1.19)
- 5.11 All new arrivals should be offered a shower on their first night whatever time they arrive. (1.20, repeated recommendation 1.49)
- 5.12 The first night wing should be a welcoming environment in a good state of repair. First night cells should be clean and well prepared. (1.21)
- 5.13 The induction should enable prisoners to fully understand all aspects of the prison. All prisoners should complete it, and prisoners who have fully completed induction should be moved into the main prison as soon as possible. (1.22)

### **Bullying and violence reduction**

---

- 5.14 The prison should explore and address prisoner perceptions about their safety, particularly concerning their treatment by staff. (1.33)

### **Self-harm and suicide**

---

- 5.15 Managers should ensure a consistently high standard of documentation for assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews. (1.42, Repeated recommendation 3.49)
- 5.16 Plans for prisoners in crisis should include purposeful activity and time out of cell, and managers should ensure that officers are fully engaged in supporting such prisoners. (1.43)

### **Safeguarding**

---

- 5.17 The governor should initiate contact with the local director of adult social services (DASS) and the local safeguarding adults board (LSAB) to develop local safeguarding processes. (1.48)

### **Security**

---

- 5.18 Closed visits should only be applied where there is evidence of illicit activity relating to visits. (1.55)
- 5.19 Prisoners should only be strip searched on the basis of intelligence or specific suspicion. (1.56)

### **Incentives and earned privileges**

---

- 5.20 There should be greater differences between the incentive levels in the rewards and sanction scheme to encourage responsible behaviour. (1.64)

- 5.21 There should be formal links between IEP processes and sentence planning. (1.65, repeated recommendation 7.44)

### **Discipline**

---

- 5.22 The regime and environment for young adults in segregation should be improved to include greater opportunity for purposeful activity and structured input to address problematic behaviour. (1.79)

### **Substance misuse**

---

- 5.23 The drug and alcohol strategy should be updated and action plans should be informed by the most recent needs analysis. (1.89)
- 5.24 Clinical substance misuse and Journey to Recovery services should improve joint work and provide fully integrated care. (1.90, repeated recommendation 3.97)
- 5.25 The Journey to Recovery service should assess young adults without delay and prioritise work according to individual need. Service users should be actively involved in future service development. (1.91)

### **Residential units**

---

- 5.26 Communal areas on wings should be maintained to an acceptable standard. Showers should be kept clean and in a good state of repair. Accommodation must be free from rodents, and association equipment should be in a good condition. (2.10)
- 5.27 Cell cleaning materials should be offered regularly and cells should be free of graffiti, clean and contain furniture maintained to an acceptable standard, including lockable cupboards in all double cells. (2.11)
- 5.28 All single cells should have adequate toilet privacy screens. (2.12)
- 5.29 Staff should answer cell call bells within five minutes. (2.13, repeated recommendation 2.22)
- 5.30 Prisoners should receive a timely and fair response to general applications. (2.14)

### **Staff-prisoner relationships**

---

- 5.31 Managers should ensure that personal officers work with all departments involved with the young adults allocated to them, and that targets set by personal officers are specific to the needs of young adults, as well as their behaviour. (2.22, repeated recommendations 2.48 and 2.46)
- 5.32 There should be regular monthly consultation meetings involving prisoners and staff. (2.23)

## **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.33 An equality and diversity policy should be developed to ensure that the needs of all groups within the establishment are identified and addressed, and the prison should promote all aspects of equality and diversity. (2.29)
- 5.34 Equality data should be gathered on all protected characteristics and where problems are consistently identified these should be fully explored to understand the reasons and take action to address them. (2.30)
- 5.35 Prisoner equality representatives should be appointed and there should be regular consultation meetings with them. The prison should investigate the negative perceptions of foreign national and disabled prisoners and address these concerns. (2.31)
- 5.36 The establishment should develop and implement a programme to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour at Feltham. (2.32, repeated recommendation 4.33)
- 5.37 The prison should improve systems to identify prisoners from minority groups, and meet their needs. (2.41)
- 5.38 Prisoners with a disability who have additional needs should have a care plan and, if appropriate, a personal emergency evacuation plan. Those who require day-to-day support should be offered a paid carer or buddy. (2.42)

## **Complaints**

---

- 5.39 The prison should investigate and address negative perceptions about the formal complaints system. (2.51)
- 5.40 There should be a robust quality assurance scheme for complaints, which ensures promised action is taken and patterns or trends identified for remedial action. (2.52, repeated recommendation HP53)

## **Legal rights**

---

- 5.41 The legal services provision for young adults should be improved. (2.55)

## **Health services**

---

- 5.42 All clinical areas and equipment should comply with infection control guidance. (2.63)
- 5.43 There should be mechanisms to monitor the delivery of health services once new providers are in place. (2.64)
- 5.44 There should be sufficient officers trained to respond to emergencies, sufficient emergency equipment around the site, and all staff should know how to access equipment. (2.65)
- 5.45 Health promotion information should be available in a variety of media. (2.66)
- 5.46 There should be an ongoing audit to enhance the quality of record keeping. (2.73)



- 5.47 The views of prisoners on health care should be further investigated and the high number of 'did not attends' should be reduced. (2.74)
- 5.48 There should be a training needs analysis to identify the skills and training required for nursing staff. (2.75)
- 5.49 SystmOne should be used to record prescribing and administration of medicines and enable more effective audit and analysis of medicines used. (2.85)
- 5.50 Patients should be supplied with an appropriate quantity of their medication for any court appearances. (2.86)
- 5.51 A wider range of patient group directions should be introduced to enable more potent medication to be supplied by the pharmacist or nurse, and to avoid unnecessary consultations with the doctor. (2.87)
- 5.52 An anger management training programme should be introduced for prisoners. (2.96)
- 5.53 Mental health awareness training, including learning disabilities and personality disorders, should be available to all staff. (2.97)

### **Catering**

---

- 5.54 The food provided should be of an adequate quality and quantity, and offer a balanced diet, and prisoners should be regularly consulted about these issues. (2.103)
- 5.55 Lunch should not be served before noon and dinner not before 5pm. (2.104, Repeated recommendation 8.10)
- 5.56 All meals should be issued at the servery. (2.105)

### **Purchases**

---

- 5.57 Prisoners should be able to order from catalogues. (2.110)

### **Time out of cell**

---

- 5.58 Exercise yards in the young adult units should be large enough for the number of people using them and be furnished with adequate seating. (3.5, repeated recommendation 6.85)

### **Learning and skills and work activities**

---

- 5.59 All young adults requiring learning and skills support should attend education and training classes, and attendance and participation in education and training sessions should be improved. (3.14, repeated recommendation 6.30)
- 5.60 Arrangements to maximise the use of vocational training places shared with the young people's side should be improved. (3.15)
- 5.61 The establishment should make better use of initial screening information to ensure learners are allocated to programmes meeting their needs. (3.16, repeated recommendation 6.32)

- 5.62 There should be a prison-wide self-assessment of learning and skills and work that includes and evaluates all activities, and fully informs action planning for improvement. (3.17)
- 5.63 The session observation scheme across all learning and skills activities should be developed to improve the quality of teaching and learning and assessment. (3.18)
- 5.64 The analysis and use of data to assess participation and achievement of different groups of young adults should be improved to ensure all learners' needs are identified and met. (3.19)
- 5.65 The establishment should continue to develop social and life skills programmes, especially those that help to improve young adults' personal effectiveness by addressing negative attitudes and self-control. (3.25, repeated recommendation 6.36)
- 5.66 All work and training opportunities should be formally accredited to national standards, and skills not formally accredited should be recognised and recorded to support prisoners' employment needs. (3.26)
- 5.67 The quality of teaching and learning should be improved, and the behaviour of young adults in learning sessions should be managed better. (3.30, repeated recommendation 6.31)
- 5.68 There should be systematic provision in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) for young adults needing support, and appropriate ESOL qualifications should be offered. (3.31)
- 5.69 Achievement of learners' learning and skills outcomes, particularly in English and mathematics, should be improved. (3.35)
- 5.70 Access to the library should be improved, and it should be available in the evenings and at weekends. (3.39)
- 5.71 The library should keep its computers, which should be upgraded. (3.40)

### **Physical education and healthy living**

---

- 5.72 The prison should implement a budgeted plan for the replacement of cardiovascular and modular weight training equipment. (3.47)

### **Offender management and planning**

---

- 5.73 Sentence planning meetings and OASys (offender assessment system) assessments should include contributions from all departments involved with the prisoner. (4.15)
- 5.74 The prison should introduce a quality assurance model that extends beyond OASys work and which ensures that offender supervisors are sufficiently skilled and trained to meet prisoner needs. (4.16)
- 5.75 The prison should clarify the role of the Teal unit and ensure that it meets the resettlement needs of its prisoners. (4.17)
- 5.76 Release on temporary licence should be extended to meet the needs of prisoners preparing for release. (4.18)

- 5.77 There should be greater efforts to secure probation input into multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel (MALRAP) meetings. (4.23, repeated recommendation 9.59)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.78 The prison should work with statutory and community groups to ensure that all prisoners needing housing on release are offered stable and suitable accommodation. (4.30)
- 5.79 The prison should monitor the accommodation needs of foreign national prisoners released with no access to public funds, and work with other community agencies to ensure their needs are met. (4.31)
- 5.80 Links between partner agencies working in the resettlement pathways, prison managers and the education department should be more structured and information better shared to maximise the effectiveness of work to resettle prisoners. (4.36)
- 5.81 The prison should offer a pre-release and business start-up course for prisoners due for release. (4.37)
- 5.82 The J2R service should develop and implement a harm reduction checklist for clients before their release. (4.41)
- 5.83 The finance needs of prisoners, especially in relation to debt, should be evaluated, and appropriate and necessary support provided. (4.44)
- 5.84 The number of family visits should be extended and available to all prisoners. (4.49)

## **Housekeeping points**

---

### **Discipline**

---

- 5.85 Routine visits by managers to prisoners in the segregation unit should be conducted face to face. (1.80)

### **Residential units**

---

- 5.86 Staff should understand the in-cell electricity isolation policy and apply it consistently. (2.15)

### **Equality and diversity**

---

- 5.87 Prisoners should be made aware of discrimination incident reporting procedures. (2.33)
- 5.88 Positive gay and bisexual images should be displayed across the establishment, as well as information about sources of support and help. (2.43, recommendation 4.66 repeated as housekeeping point)

### **Health services**

---

- 5.89 First aid boxes should be checked regularly and stock should be replaced when used. (2.67)

- 5.90 Wholesale stock should be supplied as complete packs and should not be labelled. (2.88)
- 5.91 Staff should read and sign the agreed pharmacy procedures and policies. (2.89)
- 5.92 Controlled drugs registers should be compliant with the current legislation. (2.90)

### **Catering**

---

- 5.93 Halal food should be stored and prepared in a separate area. (2.106)

### **Learning and skills and work activities**

---

- 5.94 The allocation of young adults to wing work should be fair and be monitored to ensure equality of opportunity. (3.20)
- 5.95 The computerised library management system should be updated. (3.41)

### **Reintegration planning**

---

- 5.96 Where post-release offending behaviour programmes are set as targets, these should be agreed and negotiated in advance with the responsible offender manager. (4.52)

## Appendix I: Inspection team

---

Martin Lomas	Deputy Chief Inspector
Sean Sullivan	Team leader
Andrew Lund	Inspector
Keith McInnis	Inspector
Kevin Parkinson	Inspector
Kellie Reeve	Inspector
Annie Crowley	Research officer
Olayinka Macauley	Research officer
Rebecca Webb	Research trainee

### **Specialist inspectors**

Sigrid Engelen	Substance misuse inspector
Helen Carter	Health services inspector
Eileen Robson	Pharmacist
Bob Cowdrey	Ofsted team leader
Alistair Pearson	Ofsted inspector
Martin Hughes	Ofsted inspector

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

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

<b>Safety</b>	
Prisoners, particularly the most vulnerable, are held safely.	
<p>At the last inspection, in 2010, the separate reception, first night and induction procedures for juveniles and young adults were reasonably thorough, with an appropriate focus on risk. Safeguarding and child protection procedures were sound, but there was insufficient independent scrutiny. Violence reduction and anti-bullying arrangements were comprehensive and well managed. Managers had a good understanding of the nature and extent of violence in the establishment, but the number of incidents remained high. Self-harm prevention measures were generally satisfactory, with very good attention to high risk cases. Young people said they felt relatively safe at Feltham. Use of segregation was high, although stays in the unit were usually brief and there was a reasonable regime. Use of force was high across the establishment, and disproportionately so for juveniles. The special cell was used too often and paperwork was inadequate. Clinical interventions for young people abusing drugs were good and illicit drug use was relatively low. On both the juvenile and young adult sides of Feltham, we assessed that outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.</p>	
<b>Main recommendations</b>	
Young adults should have ready access to Listeners and/or peer supporters in reception or on the first night centre on their day of arrival. (HP49)	Achieved
Force should only be used as a last resort where meaningful attempts at de-escalation have failed. (HP50)	Not achieved
Special accommodation should be used only in extreme circumstances, and its use should always be properly authorised and monitored. (HP51)	Achieved
<b>Recommendations</b>	
The establishment should continue to promote the use of the video links with courts. (1.14)	Achieved
All interviews with new arrivals should take place in private. (1.47)	Achieved
All new arrivals should be offered a shower on their first night whatever time they arrive. (1.49)	Not achieved, (Rec repeated, 1.20)
Cells on Kingfisher unit should be clean and free from graffiti. (1.51)	Not achieved
Managers should ensure records of initial custodial interviews always demonstrate engagement with the young adult, and clearly record any referrals made. (1.52)	Achieved
All first night staff should undergo mental health awareness training. (1.53)	Not achieved

Young adults should be kept fully occupied during the induction programme, particularly on Mallard unit. (1.54)	Not achieved
Post-induction interviews should always be completed before young adults move from Mallard unit. (1.55)	No longer relevant
Young adults should not be transferred until all aspects of the induction programme have been completed. (1.56)	Partially achieved
Peer supporters should be easily identifiable and accessible during the day. (1.58)	No longer relevant
There should be greater use of formal interventions to deal with individuals who bully and to support victims. (3.11)	Partially achieved
Anti-bullying coordinators should have sufficient time to carry out their duties. (3.12)	Achieved
Regular bullying surveys should be conducted and the results should help inform policy development. (3.13)	Not achieved
Managers should ensure a consistently high standard of documentation for assessment, care in custody and teamwork (ACCT) reviews. (3.49)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 1.42)
There should be multidisciplinary attendance at ACCT reviews. (3.50)	Partially achieved
Young adults should have easy access to Listeners. (3.51)	Achieved
An appropriate number of safer cells should be installed across the establishment. (3.52)	Achieved
Minor infringements of prison rules and childish behaviour should be dealt with using less formal procedures. (7.31)	Achieved
There should be a strategy to reduce incidents where use of force is required. (7.33)	Not achieved
The number of young people segregated should be reduced. (7.34)	Not achieved
All segregation cells should be clean, well ventilated, and free from graffiti. (7.35)	Achieved
Clinical substance misuse and CARAT services should improve joint work and provide fully integrated care. (3.97)	Partially achieved (Rec repeated, 1.90)

## Respect

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

At the last inspection, in 2010, environmental standards were generally satisfactory, and marginally better on the juvenile side. Despite some negative findings in our juvenile survey and some complaints from young adults, the quality of staff-prisoner relationships appeared reasonable and staff had a good knowledge of young people. There had been some progress in the development of personal officer work. The provision of food was adequate, although juveniles had better access to fresh fruit and some could dine in association. Work to promote diversity was reasonably good for disability, race and foreign nationals, and survey results from minority groups were encouraging. Young people had little confidence in the application and complaints procedures. The high profile and active chaplaincy was appreciated by young people. Health services were very good, although young people had some negative perceptions. We concluded that outcomes for young people at Feltham were good against this healthy prison test.

### Main recommendations

There should be a robust quality assurance scheme for complaints, which ensures promised action is taken and patterns or trends identified for remedial action. (HP53)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.52)
--	-----------------------------------

<b>Recommendations</b>	
Cell furniture should be maintained to an acceptable standard, and broken items should be replaced. (2.19)	Not achieved
All double cells should have adequate toilet privacy screens. (2.20)	Achieved
Double cells should have lockable cupboards. (2.21)	Partially achieved
Staff should answer cell call bells within five minutes. (2.22)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.13)
Young adults should have access to tea/coffee making facilities and radios/music systems in their cells during the day. (2.23)	Partially achieved
There should be at least one telephone for every 20 prisoners. (2.24)	Achieved
The showers on the young adult units should be upgraded to ensure that they are fit for purpose. (2.26)	Partially achieved
Managers should ensure that staff consistently engage positively with young adults during periods of association. (2.35)	Not achieved
Managers should ensure that staff address young adults by their preferred names. (2.36)	Partially achieved
Managers should ensure that targets set by personal officers are specific to the needs of young adults, as well as their behaviour. (2.46)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.22)
Managers should ensure that personal officer entries in files are made weekly and reflect some interaction with the young adult prisoner. (2.47)	Achieved
Managers should ensure that personal officers work with all departments involved with the young adults allocated to them. (2.48)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.22)
There should be formal links between IEP processes and sentence planning. (7.44)	Not achieved (Rec repeated 1.65)
Each strand of diversity should be covered by an up-to-date policy. (4.12)	Not achieved
There should be a full-time race equality officer. (4.13)	Achieved
The role of prisoner representatives should be clearly defined, and their work monitored by the diversity team. (4.14)	Not achieved
Equality impact assessments should be carried out for all areas of diversity. (4.15)	Not achieved
Feltham should ensure that any areas of disparity identified in ethnic monitoring are investigated, and that necessary remedial action taken is monitored through the race equality action team. (4.29)	Not achieved
SMART (systematic monitoring and analysing of race equality treatment) ethnic monitoring data should include information over the previous 12 months to ensure that patterns can be easily identified. (4.30)	Achieved
The establishment should ensure a consistent model of quality assurance for racist incident report forms. (4.31)	Achieved
An analysis of patterns and trends in racist incident reports should be provided to the race equality action team. (4.32)	Achieved
The establishment should develop and implement a programme to challenge racist and discriminatory prisoner behaviour at Feltham as soon as possible. (4.33)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.32)
All foreign national new arrivals should have their specific needs identified, and there should be support systems to meet these needs. This information should be used to develop a needs analysis of foreign nationals and appropriate services to meet these. (4.48)	Not achieved
Foreign national representatives should be identified, and there should be specific forums to ensure the needs of these young people are effectively represented and pursued by the establishment. (4.49)	Not achieved



NOMS should work with the UK Border Agency to ensure that foreign national detainees are not held at Feltham. (4.50)	Not achieved
Positive gay and bisexual images should be displayed across the establishment, as well as information about sources of support and help. (4.66)	Not achieved (Rec repeated as housekeeping point, 2.43)
Adequate staff should be trained in legal and bail information. (3.68)	Not achieved
Young people should be able to make free telephone calls to their legal representatives.	Partially achieved
A pre-release interview should be introduced. (3.70)	Not achieved
The health needs assessment should distinguish between the needs of juveniles and young adults. (5.64)	Achieved
The inpatient association area should be cleaned, decorated and made more welcoming and age-appropriate. (5.65)	No longer relevant
The disabled-access facilities in the inpatient unit should not be used for de-escalation. (5.66)	Achieved
Clinical governance reporting arrangements should be consistent across providers. (5.67)	Achieved
There should be an overarching, collective record of health services staff training and continual professional development. (5.68)	Partially achieved
All staff should have annual resuscitation training. (5.70)	Achieved
There should be formal arrangements for the loan of occupational therapy equipment and specialist advice as required. (5.72)	Achieved
All complaints about health services should be answered in an age-appropriate and understandable manner, and addressed to the complainant. (5.73)	Achieved
All health services staff should be easily identifiable by an easy-to-read name badge. (5.74)	Partially achieved
Primary care nurses should wear their uniform correctly at all times. (5.75)	Achieved
Health services staff should provide a range of basic remedies. (5.76)	Partially achieved
The medicines management committee should review the procedures for monitoring and recording the supply of prescribed medicines out of hours and for ordering repeatable medications to avoid a duplication of supply and wastage. (5.78)	Achieved
Records of medication supplied to patients from stock should be added to the patient medication records (PMR) at the pharmacy. (5.79)	Not achieved
An up-to-date controlled drugs register should be put in place, in accordance with current legislative requirements. (5.81)	Not achieved
A written, signed and dated medical history questionnaire should be completed for all dental patients. (5.82)	Achieved
A protocol should be developed for dental out-of-hours cover. (5.83)	Achieved
The full range of NHS dental treatments should be available. (5.84)	Achieved
The Ministry of Justice should expedite all warrants for transfers to mental health secure beds to avoid unnecessary delays to patients. (5.86)	Achieved
Lunch should not be served before noon and dinner not before 5pm. (8.10)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 2.104)
All wing serveries should be kept clean. (8.11)	Achieved
The food consultation arrangements should be strengthened. (8.13)	Not achieved
All new arrivals should be able to buy items from the establishment shop within their first 24 hours. (8.21)	Not achieved
Young people should be formally consulted about items on the shop list.	Partially achieved
The method of reviewing the range of shop items available should be made explicit and the procedure followed. (8.23)	Partially achieved

## Purposeful activity

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

At the last inspection, in 2010, the provision of education and vocational training for both juveniles and young adults was good. The breadth of curriculum and access to practical learning was varied and met the needs of both populations, although attendance was better for juveniles. The quality of teaching varied but standards of learning and achievements were good, particularly for juveniles. All juveniles and most young adults were engaged in some form of activity. The library was well promoted but access was limited. PE was well planned and inclusive, with a range of recreational and accredited work. Facilities were excellent and access, in particular for juveniles, was good. Access to time out of cell was good for juveniles and reasonably predictable for young adults. Most young adults were able to associate at some stage each day. We found relatively few young people locked in cell during the core day. We concluded that on the young adult side of Feltham, outcomes for young adults were reasonably good against this healthy prison test, and on the juvenile side they were good.

### Recommendations

The daily time out of cell for unemployed young adults should be increased. (6.81)	Not achieved
Young adults should be guaranteed a period of evening association at least twice a week. (6.82)	Achieved
Officer-led groups should be built into the regime to provide consistency. (6.83)	Not achieved
There should be more than one exercise period a day so that it is available to all young adults. (6.84)	Not achieved
Exercise yards in the young adult units should be large enough for the number of people using them and be furnished with adequate seating. (6.85)	Not achieved. (Rec repeated, 3.5)
Waterproof clothing should be available on all units for young adults who wish to go out on exercise during bad weather. (6.86)	Not achieved
All young adults requiring learning and skills support should attend education and training classes, and attendance and participation in education and training sessions should be improved. (6.30)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 3.14)
The quality of teaching and learning should be improved, and the behaviour of young adults in learning sessions should be managed better. (6.31)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 3.30)
The establishment should make better use of initial screening information to ensure learners are allocated to programmes meeting their needs. (6.32)	Not achieved (Re repeated, 3.16)
Recording on young adults' individual learning plans should be improved to include individual learning targets to guide learning plans. (6.33)	Achieved
The establishment should improve the collection and use of achievement data in education as part of its quality improvement strategies. (6.34)	Not achieved
The establishment should introduce procedures to improve the attendance of learners. (6.35)	Not achieved
The establishment should continue to develop social and life skills programmes, especially those that help to improve young adults' personal effectiveness by addressing negative attitudes and self-control. (6.36)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 3.25)
There should be more resources to enable careers information and advice support to be available to all young adults who need it. (6.37)	Achieved
Access to the library should be available in the evenings and at weekends. (6.38)	Not achieved

The proportion of the population who access the gymnasium should be monitored more effectively. (6.69)	Achieved
All young adults should be able to access a minimum of two PE sessions a week. (6.70)	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 2010, there was an up-to-date reducing reoffending strategy but it lacked an overarching needs analysis and separate action plans for each resettlement pathway. Sentence planning for young adults required better engagement from service providers. The offender management unit provided a service to all young people, who were all allocated an offender supervisor, and remand management plans were in place. Only a few young adults were in scope for formal offender management and their cases were managed well. Training planning processes for juveniles were reasonably good but needed to be more multidisciplinary. Public protection procedures were better for juveniles than for young adults. Indeterminate-sentenced young people were well managed. Sentenced young people were allocated and transferred expeditiously. There was a reasonable amount of activity under each pathway, with good outcomes for young people across a number . We concluded that outcomes for young people were reasonably good against this healthy prison test.

### Main recommendations

The reducing reoffending strategy should be based on a needs analysis of the population and should have separate action plans for each resettlement pathway. (HP54)	Achieved
---	----------

### Recommendations

There should be individual action plans for each resettlement pathway. (9.8)	Achieved
The reducing reoffending committee should meet as described in the terms of reference. (9.9)	Partially achieved
The offender management unit should establish stronger working links with the London Probation Area to facilitate routine offender management processes and support the professional development of offender supervisors. (9.10)	Partially achieved
Details of all contact and communication relating to an individual case should be recorded in a single contact log. (9.43)	Achieved
Prolific or priority offender (PPO) cases should be identified on arrival, and consideration should be given to relocating them close to home before release. (9.44)	Partially achieved
Sentence planning processes should be improved. Relevant departments should contribute to the process and meetings should take place in appropriate settings. (9.45)	Not achieved
Sentence plans should contain outcome-focused objectives that are measurable, with a specific timescale for their achievement. (9.46)	Partially achieved
Young adults should be encouraged to play an active role in sentence planning. (9.47)	Achieved
Staff from the security department should routinely attend public protection meetings. (9.51)	Achieved

Offender supervisors should be invited to attend public protection meetings. (9.52)	Achieved
Offender managers should receive notes of public protection meetings when their cases are reviewed. (9.53)	Achieved
Offender management unit staff should receive training in the supervision and management of high risk offenders, including those convicted of sexual offences. (9.54)	Partially achieved
Offender supervisors should receive appropriate training to enable them to carry out their roles effectively. (9.55)	Partially achieved
Risk management plans should accurately describe how the objectives of the sentence plan and other activities address the risk of harm and protect actual and potential victims. (9.56)	Partially achieved
Offender assessment system (OASys) assessments, including sentence plans, should be completed for all young adults, to a sufficient quality and in line with the national standards timescale. (9.57)	Not achieved
The National Offender Management Service should ensure that all offender managers are involved in all applicable custodial cases, in line with the offender management model. (9.58)	Partially achieved
There should be greater efforts to secure probation input into multi-agency lifer risk assessment panel (MALRAP) meetings. (9.59)	Not achieved (Rec repeated, 4.23)
Health services staff should be represented at the reducing reoffending committee. (9.84)	Achieved
The CARAT service should raise its profile and improve service uptake. Young adults should be consulted as part of this process. (9.106)	Partially achieved
The drug and alcohol strategy document should contain detailed action plans and performance measures. (9.105)	Not achieved:
Up-to-date information on the financial and benefits advice services should be displayed in residential units. (9.88)	Not achieved
The toilets in the visitors' waiting room should always be available, clean and properly equipped. (9.127)	Achieved
Children's activity areas should be supervised by trained staff during all visits. (9.128)	Partially achieved
Families should be given sufficient notice of when family days are due to take place, and there should be written information about what happens at them. (9.130)	Achieved
The establishment should conduct a regular needs analysis of the population and commission appropriate interventions. (9.136)	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 yr olds	21 and over & other	%
Sentenced	204	16	50.6
Recall	9	3	2.8
Convicted unsentenced	61	2	14.5
Remand	124	2	29
Civil prisoners	1	0	0.2
Detainees	7	2	2.1
Other	4	0	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>

Sentence	18-20 yr olds	21 and over & other	%
Unsentenced	195	6	46.2
Less than 6 months	39	1	9.4
6 months to less than 12 months	29	0	5.3
12 months to less than 2 years	59	4	14
2 years to less than 4 years	56	8	12.9
4 years to less than 10 years	29	5	7.8
10 years and over (not life)	3	0	0.7
Life	8	1	2.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>

Age	Number of prisoners	%
Under 21 years	410	94.3
21 years to 29 years	25	5.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>100</b>

Nationality	18-20 yr olds	21 and over & other	%
British	314	21	77
Foreign nationals	91	3	21.6
Not stated	5	1	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>

Security category	18-20 yr olds	21 and over & other	%
Uncategorised unsentenced	19	0	4
Uncategorised sentenced	189	13	46.4
Unsentenced	63	2	14.9
YOI closed	139	10	34.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>

Ethnicity	18-20 yr olds	21 and over & other	%
<i>White</i>			
British	99	6	24.1
Irish	6	1	1.6
Other white	37	1	8.7
<i>Mixed</i>			
White and black Caribbean	25	0	5.7
White and black African	12	0	2.8

White and Asian	1	0	0.2
Other mixed	16	0	3.7
<i>Asian or Asian British</i>	2	0	0
Indian	6	1	1.6
Pakistani	7	1	1.8
Bangladeshi	9	0	2.1
Other Asian	25	1	6
<i>Black or black British</i>			
Caribbean	59	5	14.7
African	59	5	14.7
Other black	17	2	4.4
<i>Chinese or other ethnic group</i>		0	
Chinese	2	0	0.5
Arab	2	0	0.5
Other ethnic group	7	1	1.8
Not stated	18	1	4.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>

Religion	18-20 yr olds	21 and over & other	%
Church of England	27	4	7.1
Roman Catholic	92	5	22.3
Other Christian denominations	79	3	18.9
Muslim	150	8	36.3
Sikh	1	1	0.5
Hindu	6	0	1.4
Buddhist	2	0	0.5
No religion	49	4	12.2
Not stated	4	0	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9</b>

Other demographics	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Gypsy/Romany/Traveller	2	0	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.4</b>

#### Sentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18-20 yr olds		21 and over & other	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	50	11.5	1	0.2
1 month to 3 months	72	16.6	4	0.9
3 months to 6 months	43	9.9	5	1.1
6 months to 1 year	41	9.4	9	2.1
1 year to 2 years	9	2.1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4.4</b>

#### Sentenced prisoners only

	18-20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Foreign nationals detained post-sentence expiry	13	0	2.8
Public protection cases	10		
<b>Total</b>			

Unsentenced prisoners only

Length of stay	18–20 yr olds		21 and over & other	
	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 1 month	57	13.1	1	0.2
1 month to 3 months	65	14.9	2	0.5
3 months to 6 months	56	12.9	1	0.2
6 months to 1 year	16	3.7	2	0.5
1 year to 2 years	1	0.2	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.4</b>

Main offence	18–20 yr olds	21 and over	%
Violence against the person	73	12	19.55
Sexual offences	10		2.29
Burglary	43	5	11.04
Robbery	80	5	19.54
Theft and handling	36		8.27
Fraud and forgery	1		0.23
Drugs offences	29	2	7.12
Other offences	46	1	10.81
Civil offences	1		0.23
Offence not recorded/holding warrant	91		20.92
<b>Total</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>

# Appendix IV: Summary of prisoner questionnaires and interviews

---

## Prisoner survey methodology

---

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

### Choosing the sample size

---

The baseline for the sample size was calculated using a robust statistical formula provided by a government department statistician. Essentially, the formula indicates the sample size that is required and the extent to which the findings from a sample of that size reflect the experiences of the whole population.

At the time of the survey on 12 March 2013, the young adult population at HMYOI Feltham was 438. The sample size was 185. Overall, this represented 42% of the young adult population.

### Selecting the sample

---

Respondents were randomly selected from a P-NOMIS young adult population printout using a stratified systematic sampling method. This basically means every second person is selected from a P-NOMIS list, which is printed in location order, if 50% of the population is to be sampled.

Completion of the questionnaire was voluntary. Refusals were noted and no attempts were made to replace them. Nine respondents refused to complete a questionnaire.

Interviews were carried out with any respondents with literacy difficulties. Two respondents were interviewed.

## Methodology

---

Every attempt was made to distribute the questionnaires to each respondent on an individual basis. This gave researchers an opportunity to explain the independence of the Inspectorate and the purpose of the questionnaire, as well as to answer questions.

All completed questionnaires were confidential – only members of the Inspectorate saw them. In order to ensure confidentiality, respondents were asked to do one of the following:

- have their questionnaire ready to hand back to a member of the research team at a specified time;
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and hand it to a member of staff, if they were agreeable; or
- seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and leave it in their room for collection.



Respondents were not asked to put their names on their questionnaire.

## **Response rates**

---

In total, 165 respondents completed and returned their questionnaires. This represented 38% of the young adult population. The response rate was 89%. In addition to the nine respondents who refused to complete a questionnaire, six questionnaires were not returned and five were returned blank.

## **Comparisons**

---

The following documents detail the results from the survey. Data from each establishment have been weighted, in order to mimic a consistent percentage sampled in each establishment.

Some questions have been filtered according to the response to a previous question. Filtered questions are clearly indented and preceded by an explanation as to which respondents are included in the filtered questions. Otherwise, percentages provided refer to the entire sample. All missing responses are excluded from the analysis.

The following analyses have been conducted:

- The current survey responses in 2013 against comparator figures for all young adults surveyed in young offender institutions. This comparator is based on all responses from young adult surveys carried out in 12 young offender institutions since April 2008.
- The current survey responses in 2013 against the responses of young adults surveyed at HMYOI Feltham in 2009.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of white young adults and those from a black and minority ethnic group.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of young adults who are British nationals and those who are foreign nationals.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of Muslim young adults and non-Muslim young adults.
- A comparison within the 2013 survey between the responses of young adults who consider themselves to have a disability and those who do not consider themselves to have a disability.

In all the above documents, statistical significance is used to indicate whether there is a real difference between the figures, i.e. the difference is not due to chance alone. Results that are significantly better are indicated by green shading, results that are significantly worse are indicated by blue shading and where there is no significant difference, there is no shading. Orange shading has been used to show a significant difference in young adults' background details.

It should be noted that, in order for statistical comparisons to be made between the most recent survey data and those of the previous survey, both sets of data have been coded in the same way. This may result in changes to percentages from previously published surveys. However, all percentages are true of the populations they were taken from, and the statistical significance is correct.

## Summary

---

In addition, a summary of the survey results is attached. This shows a breakdown of responses for each question. Percentages have been rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.

No questions have been filtered within the summary so all percentages refer to responses from the entire sample. The percentages for certain responses within the summary, for example 'not sentenced' options across questions, may differ slightly. This is due to different response rates across questions, meaning that the percentages have been calculated out of different totals (all missing data are excluded). The actual numbers will match up as the data are cleaned to be consistent.

Percentages shown in the summary may differ by 1% or 2% from those shown in the comparison data as the comparator data have been weighted for comparison purposes.

# Survey summary

## Section 1: About you

Q1.2	<b>How old are you?</b>		
	<i>Under 21</i> .....	153 (93%)	
	<i>21 - 29</i> .....	11 (7%)	
	<i>30 - 39</i> .....	0 (0%)	
	<i>40 - 49</i> .....	0 (0%)	
	<i>50 - 59</i> .....	0 (0%)	
	<i>60 - 69</i> .....	0 (0%)	
	<i>70 and over</i> .....	0 (0%)	
Q1.3	<b>Are you sentenced?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	75 (46%)	
	<i>Yes - on recall</i> .....	11 (7%)	
	<i>No - awaiting trial</i> .....	40 (25%)	
	<i>No - awaiting sentence</i> .....	35 (21%)	
	<i>No - awaiting deportation</i> .....	2 (1%)	
Q1.4	<b>How long is your sentence?</b>		
	<b><i>Not sentenced</i></b> .....	77 (48%)	
	<i>Less than 6 months</i> .....	21 (13%)	
	<i>6 months to less than 1 year</i> .....	9 (6%)	
	<i>1 year to less than 2 years</i> .....	19 (12%)	
	<i>2 years to less than 4 years</i> .....	21 (13%)	
	<i>4 years to less than 10 years</i> .....	8 (5%)	
	<i>10 years or more</i> .....	1 (1%)	
	<i>IPP (indeterminate sentence for public protection)</i> .....	1 (1%)	
	<i>Life</i> .....	2 (1%)	
Q1.5	<b>Are you a foreign national? (i.e. do not have UK citizenship)</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	36 (23%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	124 (78%)	
Q1.6	<b>Do you understand spoken English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	157 (98%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	4 (2%)	
Q1.7	<b>Do you understand written English?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....	155 (96%)	
	<i>No</i> .....	6 (4%)	
Q1.8	<b>What is your ethnic origin?</b>		
	<i>White - British (English/Welsh/Scottish/ Northern Irish)</i> .....	31 (19%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>White - Irish</i> .....	5 (3%)	<i>Asian or Asian British - other</i> ..... 9 (6%)
	<i>White - other</i> .....	13 (8%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black Caribbean</i> 12 (7%)
	<i>Black or black British - Caribbean</i> .....	23 (14%)	<i>Mixed race - white and black African</i> .... 9 (6%)
	<i>Black or black British - African</i> .....	36 (22%)	<i>Mixed race - white and Asian</i> .....
	<i>Black or black British - other</i> .....	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Indian</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Mixed race - other</i> ..... 5 (3%)
	<i>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</i> .....	1 (1%)	<i>Arab</i> ..... 5 (3%)
			<i>Other ethnic group</i> ..... 8 (5%)

*Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi*..... 2 (1%)

Q1.9	<b>Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		6 (4%)
	<i>No</i> .....		152 (96%)
Q1.10	<b>What is your religion?</b>		
	<i>None</i> .....	19 (12%)	<i>Hindu</i> ..... 4 (3%)
	<i>Church of England</i> .....	32 (20%)	<i>Jewish</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>Catholic</i> .....	31 (19%)	<i>Muslim</i> ..... 60 (38%)
	<i>Protestant</i> .....	0 (0%)	<i>Sikh</i> ..... 1 (1%)
	<i>Other Christian denomination</i> .....	12 (8%)	<i>Other</i> ..... 0 (0%)
	<i>Buddhist</i> .....	1 (1%)	
Q1.11	<b>How would you describe your sexual orientation?</b>		
	<i>Heterosexual/straight</i> .....		158 (100%)
	<i>Homosexual/gay</i> .....		0 (0%)
	<i>Bisexual</i> .....		0 (0%)
Q1.12	<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>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		21 (13%)
	<i>No</i> .....		141 (87%)
Q1.13	<b>Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		5 (3%)
	<i>No</i> .....		157 (97%)
Q1.14	<b>Is this your first time in prison?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		78 (48%)
	<i>No</i> .....		86 (52%)
Q1.15	<b>Do you have children under the age of 18?</b>		
	<i>Yes</i> .....		31 (19%)
	<i>No</i> .....		132 (81%)

## Section 2: Courts, transfers and escorts

Q2.1	<b>On your most recent journey here, how long did you spend in the van?</b>		
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....		89 (54%)
	<i>2 hours or longer</i> .....		60 (37%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....		15 (9%)
Q2.2	<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> .....		89 (55%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....		15 (9%)
	<i>No</i> .....		52 (32%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....		6 (4%)
Q2.3	<b>On your most recent journey here, were you offered a toilet break?</b>		
	<i>My journey was less than two hours</i> .....		89 (55%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....		4 (2%)
	<i>No</i> .....		64 (40%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....		5 (3%)

Q2.4	On your most recent journey here, was the van clean?	
	Yes.....	63 (38%)
	No.....	84 (51%)
	Don't remember.....	17 (10%)
Q2.5	On your most recent journey here, did you feel safe?	
	Yes.....	112 (70%)
	No.....	47 (29%)
	Don't remember.....	2 (1%)
Q2.6	On your most recent journey here, how were you treated by the escort staff?	
	Very well.....	19 (12%)
	Well.....	59 (36%)
	Neither.....	57 (35%)
	Badly.....	6 (4%)
	Very badly .....	15 (9%)
	Don't remember.....	7 (4%)
Q2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	
	Yes.....	120 (74%)
	No.....	32 (20%)
	Don't remember.....	11 (7%)

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

Q3.1	How long were you in reception?	
	Less than 2 hours.....	136 (83%)
	2 hours or longer.....	17 (10%)
	Don't remember.....	10 (6%)
Q3.2	When you were searched, was this carried out in a respectful way?	
	Yes.....	110 (71%)
	No .....	37 (24%)
	Don't remember.....	9 (6%)
Q3.3	Overall, how were you treated in reception?	
	Very well.....	20 (12%)
	Well.....	71 (44%)
	Neither.....	52 (32%)
	Badly.....	7 (4%)
	Very badly.....	7 (4%)
	Don't remember.....	6 (4%)
Q3.4	Did you have any of the following problems when you first arrived here? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	Loss of property .....	34 (21%)
	Housing problems .....	37 (23%)
	Contacting employers .....	6 (4%)
	Contacting family.....	42 (26%)
	Childcare.....	1 (1%)
	Money worries.....	45 (28%)
	Feeling depressed or suicidal.....	20 (12%)
	Physical health .....	11 (7%)
	Mental health.....	10 (6%)
	Needing protection from other prisoners .....	7 (4%)
	Getting phone numbers.....	62 (38%)
	Other .....	9 (6%)
	<b>Did not have any problems.....</b>	<b>44 (27%)</b>
Q3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems when you first arrived here?	
	Yes.....	27 (17%)
	No.....	85 (54%)

	<i>Did not have any problems</i> .....	44 (28%)
Q3.6	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Tobacco</i> .....	128 (79%)
	<i>A shower</i> .....	23 (14%)
	<i>A free telephone call</i> .....	123 (75%)
	<i>Something to eat</i> .....	99 (61%)
	<i>PIN phone credit</i> .....	52 (32%)
	<i>Toiletries/basic items</i> .....	77 (47%)
	<i>Did not receive anything</i> .....	7 (4%)
Q3.7	<b>When you first arrived here, did you have access to the following people or services? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>Chaplain</i> .....	74 (47%)
	<i>Someone from health services</i> .....	93 (58%)
	<i>A Listener/Samaritans</i> .....	41 (26%)
	<i>Prison shop/canteen</i> .....	34 (21%)
	<i>Did not have access to any of these</i> .....	34 (21%)
Q3.8	<b>When you first arrived here, were you offered information on the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)</b>	
	<i>What was going to happen to you</i> .....	46 (30%)
	<i>What support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal</i> .....	48 (31%)
	<i>How to make routine requests (applications)</i> .....	31 (20%)
	<i>Your entitlement to visits</i> .....	44 (28%)
	<i>Health services</i> .....	65 (42%)
	<i>Chaplaincy</i> .....	57 (37%)
	<i>Not offered any information</i> .....	51 (33%)
Q3.9	<b>Did you feel safe on your first night here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	110 (68%)
	<i>No</i> .....	41 (25%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	10 (6%)
Q3.10	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you go on an induction course?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	39 (24%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	81 (51%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	19 (12%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	21 (13%)
Q3.11	<b>Did the induction course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?</b>	
	<i>Have not been on an induction course</i> .....	39 (25%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	47 (30%)
	<i>No</i> .....	49 (31%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	23 (15%)
Q3.12	<b>How soon after you arrived here did you receive an education ('skills for life') assessment?</b>	
	<i>Did not receive an assessment</i> .....	57 (36%)
	<i>Within the first week</i> .....	22 (14%)
	<i>More than a week</i> .....	53 (33%)
	<i>Don't remember</i> .....	28 (18%)

## Section 4: Legal rights and respectful custody

Q4.1	How easy is it to:						
		<i>Very easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>	<i>Very difficult</i>	<i>N/A</i>
	<i>Communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?</i>	7 (4%)	46 (29%)	28 (18%)	39 (24%)	28 (18%)	12 (8%)
	<i>Attend legal visits?</i>	26 (17%)	61 (41%)	23 (15%)	19 (13%)	9(6%)	12 (8%)
	<i>Get bail information?</i>	4 (3%)	14 (9%)	34 (23%)	26 (17%)	36 (24%)	36 (24%)
Q4.2	Have staff here ever opened letters from your solicitor or your legal representative when you were not with them?						
	<i>Not had any letters</i> .....						19 (12%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....						53 (33%)
	<i>No</i> .....						87 (55%)
Q4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						56 (35%)
	<i>No</i> .....						19 (12%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....						85 (53%)
Q4.4	Please answer the following questions about the wing/unit you are currently living on:						
			<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>		
	<i>Do you normally have enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?</i>		105 (66%)	50 (31%)	4 (3%)		
	<i>Are you normally able to have a shower every day?</i>		137 (87%)	19 (12%)	1 (1%)		
	<i>Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?</i>		105 (67%)	47 (30%)	5 (3%)		
	<i>Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?</i>		88 (56%)	66 (42%)	4 (3%)		
	<i>Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?</i>		53 (34%)	87 (56%)	14 (9%)		
	<i>Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?</i>		82 (52%)	74 (47%)	3 (2%)		
	<i>If you need to, can you normally get your stored property?</i>		38 (24%)	75 (48%)	44 (28%)		
Q4.5	What is the food like here?						
	<i>Very good</i> .....						0 (0%)
	<i>Good</i> .....						18 (11%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....						35 (22%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....						53 (33%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....						55 (34%)
Q4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?						
	<i>Have not bought anything yet/ don't know</i> .....						9 (6%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....						44 (28%)
	<i>No</i> .....						107 (67%)
Q4.7	Can you speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						63 (39%)
	<i>No</i> .....						35 (22%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....						62 (39%)
Q4.8	Are your religious beliefs respected?						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						103 (64%)
	<i>No</i> .....						28 (17%)
	<i>Don't know/N/A</i> .....						30 (19%)
Q4.9	Are you able to speak to a chaplain of your faith in private if you want to?						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						98 (60%)

No..... 15 (9%)  
 Don't know/N/A..... 49 (30%)

Q4.10 How easy or difficult is it for you to attend religious services?  
*I don't want to attend*..... 16 (10%)  
 Very easy..... 37 (23%)  
 Easy..... 63 (39%)  
 Neither..... 18 (11%)  
 Difficult..... 9 (6%)  
 Very difficult..... 9 (6%)  
 Don't know..... 10 (6%)

## Section 5: Applications and complaints

Q5.1 Is it easy to make an application?  
 Yes..... 94 (59%)  
 No..... 49 (31%)  
 Don't know..... 17 (11%)

Q5.2 Please answer the following questions about applications:  
 (If you have not made an application please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	<i>Not made one</i>	Yes	No
Are <i>applications</i> dealt with fairly?	43 (28%)	54 (35%)	56 (37%)
Are <i>applications</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	43 (28%)	32 (21%)	77 (51%)

Q5.3 Is it easy to make a complaint?  
 Yes..... 72 (47%)  
 No..... 32 (21%)  
 Don't know..... 50 (32%)

Q5.4 Please answer the following questions about complaints:  
 (If you have not made a complaint please tick the 'not made one' option.)

	<i>Not made one</i>	Yes	No
Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with fairly?	85 (56%)	17 (11%)	51 (33%)
Are <i>complaints</i> dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	85 (56%)	13 (8%)	55 (36%)

Q5.5 Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?  
 Yes..... 30 (20%)  
 No..... 122 (80%)

Q5.6 How easy or difficult is it for you to see the Independent Monitoring Board (IMB)?  
*Don't know who they are*..... 83 (52%)  
 Very easy..... 7 (4%)  
 Easy..... 12 (8%)  
 Neither..... 22 (14%)  
 Difficult..... 19 (12%)  
 Very difficult..... 16 (10%)

## Section 6: Incentive and earned privileges scheme

Q6.1 Have you been treated fairly in your experience of the incentive and earned privileges (IEP) scheme? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)  
*Don't know what the IEP scheme is*..... 22 (14%)



	Yes .....	63 (40%)
	No .....	66 (42%)
	Don't know .....	8 (5%)
Q6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour? (This refers to enhanced, standard and basic levels.)	
	<i>Don't know what the IEP scheme is</i> .....	22 (14%)
	Yes.....	72 (46%)
	No.....	55 (35%)
	Don't know .....	8 (5%)
Q6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	
	Yes.....	35 (22%)
	No.....	122 (78%)
Q6.4	If you have spent a night in the segregation/care and separation unit in the last six months, how were you treated by staff?	
	<i>I have not been to segregation in the last 6 months</i> .....	97 (61%)
	Very well.....	8 (5%)
	Well.....	10 (6%)
	Neither.....	17 (11%)
	Badly.....	15 (9%)
	Very badly.....	11 (7%)

## Section 7: Relationships with staff

Q7.1	Do most staff treat you with respect?	
	Yes.....	98 (63%)
	No.....	58 (37%)
Q7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	
	Yes.....	105 (65%)
	No.....	56 (35%)
Q7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you are getting on?	
	Yes.....	40 (25%)
	No.....	119 (75%)
Q7.4	How often do staff normally speak to you during association?	
	<i>Do not go on association</i> .....	8 (5%)
	Never.....	26 (16%)
	Rarely.....	50 (31%)
	Some of the time.....	40 (25%)
	Most of the time.....	18 (11%)
	All of the time .....	18 (11%)
Q7.5	When did you first meet your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>I have not met him/her</i> .....	86 (54%)
	In the first week.....	25 (16%)
	More than a week.....	35 (22%)
	Don't remember.....	14 (9%)
Q7.6	How helpful is your personal (named) officer?	
	<i>Do not have a personal officer/I have not met him/her</i> .....	86 (54%)
	Very helpful.....	18 (11%)

<i>Helpful</i> .....	19 (12%)
<i>Neither</i> .....	13 (8%)
<i>Not very helpful</i> .....	6 (4%)
<i>Not at all helpful</i> .....	17 (11%)

## Section 8: Safety

<b>Q8.1</b>	<b>Have you ever felt unsafe here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	66 (42%)
	<i>No</i> .....	93 (58%)
<b>Q8.2</b>	<b>Do you feel unsafe now?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	20 (13%)
	<i>No</i> .....	134 (87%)
<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> .....	93 (61%)
	<i>Everywhere</i> .....	17 (11%)
	<i>Segregation unit</i> .....	14 (9%)
	<i>Association areas</i> .....	15 (10%)
	<i>Reception area</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>At the gym</i> .....	10 (7%)
	<i>In an exercise yard</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>At work</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>During movement</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>At education</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>At meal times</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>At health services</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Visits area</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>In wing showers</i> .....	16 (11%)
	<i>In gym showers</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>In corridors/stairwells</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>On your landing/wing</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>In your cell</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>At religious services</i> .....	7 (5%)
<b>Q8.4</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	39 (25%)
	<i>No</i> .....	119 (75%)
<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> .....	17 (11%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	10 (6%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	19 (12%)
	<i>Having your canteen/property taken</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	13 (8%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	11 (7%)
	<i>Your offence/ crime</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	15 (10%)
<b>Q8.6</b>	<b>Have you been victimised by staff here?</b>	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	57 (37%)
	<i>No</i> .....	97 (63%)

Q8.7	<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> .....	31 (20%)
	<i>Physical abuse (being hit, kicked or assaulted)</i> .....	13 (8%)
	<i>Sexual abuse</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Feeling threatened or intimidated</i> .....	19 (12%)
	<i>Medication</i> .....	1 (1%)
	<i>Debt</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Drugs</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Your race or ethnic origin</i> .....	16 (10%)
	<i>Your religion/religious beliefs</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>Your nationality</i> .....	10 (7%)
	<i>You are from a different part of the country than others</i> .....	7 (5%)
	<i>You are from a traveller community</i> .....	2 (1%)
	<i>Your sexual orientation</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Your age</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>You have a disability</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>You were new here</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>Your offence/crime</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>Gang related issues</i> .....	9 (6%)
Q8.8	<b>If you have been victimised by prisoners or staff, did you report it?</b>	
	<i>Not been victimised</i> .....	97 (66%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	22 (15%)
	<i>No</i> .....	29 (20%)

### Section 9: Health services

Q9.1	<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	14 (9%)	9 (6%)	22 (14%)	24 (15%)	50 (32%)	38 (24%)
	The nurse	16 (10%)	16 (10%)	38 (25%)	20 (13%)	36 (24%)	27 (18%)
	The dentist	31 (20%)	4 (3%)	10 (7%)	17 (11%)	31 (20%)	60 (39%)
Q9.2	<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	27 (17%)	12 (8%)	43 (27%)	36 (23%)	17 (11%)	22 (14%)
	The nurse	22 (15%)	11 (7%)	34 (23%)	32 (21%)	22 (15%)	28 (19%)
	The dentist	52 (34%)	7 (5%)	26 (17%)	26 (17%)	18 (12%)	22 (15%)
Q9.3	<b>What do you think of the overall quality of the health services here?</b>						
	<i>Not been</i> .....						13 (9%)
	<i>Very good</i> .....						6 (4%)
	<i>Good</i> .....						42 (28%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....						41 (27%)
	<i>Bad</i> .....						24 (16%)
	<i>Very bad</i> .....						25 (17%)
Q9.4	<b>Are you currently taking medication?</b>						
	<i>Yes</i> .....						32 (20%)
	<i>No</i> .....						127 (80%)
Q9.5	<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> .....						127 (80%)
	<i>Yes, all my meds</i> .....						12 (8%)

Yes, some of my meds..... 5 (3%)  
 No..... 14 (9%)

Q9.6 Do you have any emotional or mental health problems?  
 Yes..... 37 (24%)  
 No..... 118 (76%)

Q9.7 Are you being helped/ supported by anyone in this prison (e.g. a psychologist, psychiatrist, nurse, mental health worker, counsellor or any other member of staff)?  
*Do not have any emotional or mental health problems*..... 118 (77%)  
 Yes..... 13 (8%)  
 No..... 23 (15%)

### Section 10: Drugs and alcohol

Q10.1 Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?  
 Yes..... 37 (24%)  
 No..... 120 (76%)

Q10.2 Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?  
 Yes..... 27 (17%)  
 No..... 130 (83%)

Q10.3 Is it easy or difficult to get illegal drugs in this prison?  
 Very easy..... 14 (9%)  
 Easy..... 5 (3%)  
 Neither..... 11 (7%)  
 Difficult..... 4 (3%)  
 Very difficult..... 23 (15%)  
 Don't know..... 95 (63%)

Q10.4 Is it easy or difficult to get alcohol in this prison?  
 Very easy..... 11 (7%)  
 Easy..... 2 (1%)  
 Neither..... 4 (3%)  
 Difficult..... 4 (3%)  
 Very difficult..... 26 (17%)  
 Don't know..... 107 (69%)

Q10.5 Have you developed a problem with illegal drugs since you have been in this prison?  
 Yes..... 11 (7%)  
 No..... 145 (93%)

Q10.6 Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?  
 Yes..... 7 (5%)  
 No..... 147 (95%)

Q10.7 Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your drug problem, while in this prison?  
*Did not/do not have a drug problem*..... 112 (74%)  
 Yes..... 33 (22%)  
 No..... 6 (4%)

Q10.8	Have you received any support or help (for example substance misuse teams) for your alcohol problem, while in this prison?	
	<i>Did not/do not have an alcohol problem</i> .....	130 (83%)
	Yes.....	21 (13%)
	No.....	5 (3%)
Q10.9	Was the support or help you received, whilst in this prison, helpful?	
	<i>Did not have a problem/ did not receive help</i> .....	114 (73%)
	Yes.....	29 (19%)
	No.....	13 (8%)

### Section 11: Activities

Q11.1	How easy or difficult is it to get into the following activities, in this prison?					
		<i>Don't know</i>	<i>Very Easy</i>	<i>Easy</i>	<i>Neither</i>	<i>Difficult</i>
						<i>Very difficult</i>
	Prison job	21 (14%)	7 (5%)	20 (13%)	19 (12%)	55 (35%)
	Vocational or skills training	41 (27%)	7 (5%)	23 (15%)	21 (14%)	33 (22%)
	Education (including basic skills)	29 (19%)	20 (13%)	35 (23%)	20 (13%)	26 (17%)
	Offending behaviour programmes	68 (45%)	4 (3%)	14 (9%)	22 (14%)	30 (20%)
Q11.2	Are you currently involved in the following? (Please tick all that apply to you.)					
	<i>Not involved in any of these</i> .....					71 (46%)
	Prison job .....					42 (27%)
	Vocational or skills training.....					16 (10%)
	Education (including basic skills).....					39 (25%)
	Offending behaviour programmes.....					5 (3%)
Q11.3	If you have been involved in any of the following, while in this prison, do you think they will help you on release?					
		<i>Not been involved</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Don't know</i>	
	Prison job	52 (37%)	38 (27%)	33 (23%)	19 (13%)	
	Vocational or skills training	62 (50%)	26 (21%)	20 (16%)	15 (12%)	
	Education (including basic skills)	48 (35%)	39 (28%)	36 (26%)	16 (12%)	
	Offending behaviour programmes	65 (53%)	18 (15%)	22 (18%)	17 (14%)	
Q11.4	How often do you usually go to the library?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....					8 (5%)
	<i>Never</i> .....					53 (35%)
	<i>Less than once a week</i> .....					51 (34%)
	<i>About once a week</i> .....					34 (23%)
	<i>More than once a week</i> .....					5 (3%)
Q11.5	Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?					
	<i>Don't use it</i> .....					38 (25%)
	Yes.....					65 (43%)
	No.....					48 (32%)
Q11.6	How many times do you usually go to the gym each week?					
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....					8 (5%)
	0.....					25 (16%)
	1 to 2.....					104 (68%)
	3 to 5.....					15 (10%)
	More than 5.....					0 (0%)

Q11.7	How many times do you usually go outside for exercise each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	13 (9%)
	<i>0</i> .....	28 (19%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	75 (50%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	30 (20%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	5 (3%)
Q11.8	How many times do you usually have association each week?	
	<i>Don't want to go</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>0</i> .....	9 (6%)
	<i>1 to 2</i> .....	17 (11%)
	<i>3 to 5</i> .....	44 (29%)
	<i>More than 5</i> .....	78 (52%)
Q11.9	How many hours do you usually spend out of your cell on a weekday? (Please include hours at education, at work etc.)	
	<i>Less than 2 hours</i> .....	64 (43%)
	<i>2 to less than 4 hours</i> .....	29 (19%)
	<i>4 to less than 6 hours</i> .....	23 (15%)
	<i>6 to less than 8 hours</i> .....	15 (10%)
	<i>8 to less than 10 hours</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>10 hours or more</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	12 (8%)

## Section 12: Contact with family and friends

Q12.1	Have staff supported you and helped you to maintain contact with your family/friends while in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	38 (25%)
	<i>No</i> .....	114 (75%)
Q12.2	Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail (letters or parcels)?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	66 (43%)
	<i>No</i> .....	87 (57%)
Q12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	47 (31%)
	<i>No</i> .....	107 (69%)
Q12.4	How easy or difficult is it for your family and friends to get here?	
	<i>I don't get visits</i> .....	18 (12%)
	<i>Very easy</i> .....	10 (6%)
	<i>Easy</i> .....	35 (23%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	26 (17%)
	<i>Difficult</i> .....	31 (20%)
	<i>Very difficult</i> .....	23 (15%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	11 (7%)

## Section 13: Preparation for release

Q13.1	Do you have a named offender manager (home probation officer) in the probation service?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	77 (51%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	50 (33%)
	<i>No</i> .....	25 (16%)

Q13.2	What type of contact have you had with your offender manager since being in prison? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Not sentenced/N/A</i> .....	102 (67%)
	<i>No contact</i> .....	25 (16%)
	<i>Letter</i> .....	10 (7%)
	<i>Phone</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Visit</i> .....	16 (10%)
Q13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	46 (31%)
	<i>No</i> .....	102 (69%)
Q13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	
	<i>Not sentenced</i> .....	77 (51%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	20 (13%)
	<i>No</i> .....	55 (36%)
Q13.5	How involved were you in the development of your sentence plan?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	132 (86%)
	<i>Very involved</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Involved</i> .....	6 (4%)
	<i>Neither</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Not very involved</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Not at all involved</i> .....	2 (1%)
Q13.6	Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets? (Please tick all that apply to you.)	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	132 (86%)
	<i>Nobody</i> .....	12 (8%)
	<i>Offender supervisor</i> .....	3 (2%)
	<i>Offender manager</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Named/ personal officer</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Staff from other departments</i> .....	3 (2%)
Q13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	132 (85%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	12 (8%)
	<i>No</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	7 (5%)
Q13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in another prison?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	132 (85%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	4 (3%)
	<i>No</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	14 (9%)
Q13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your sentence plan targets in the community?	
	<i>Do not have a sentence plan/not sentenced</i> .....	132 (85%)
	<i>Yes</i> .....	8 (5%)
	<i>No</i> .....	5 (3%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	11 (7%)
Q13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	
	<i>Yes</i> .....	20 (13%)
	<i>No</i> .....	55 (37%)
	<i>Don't know</i> .....	74 (50%)

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	21 (14%)	45 (30%)	82 (55%)
Accommodation	21 (15%)	58 (41%)	63 (44%)
Benefits	21 (15%)	27 (20%)	89 (65%)
Finances	19 (15%)	16 (12%)	95 (73%)
Education	24 (18%)	33 (25%)	77 (57%)
Drugs and alcohol	37 (28%)	41 (31%)	55 (41%)

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> .....	77 (50%)
<i>Yes</i> .....	39 (25%)
<i>No</i> .....	37 (24%)



Main comparator and comparator to last time



Prisoner survey responses HMYOI Feltham (young adults) 2013

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

		HMYOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2013	HMYOI Feltham 2009
	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>165</b>	<b>1779</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>SECTION 1: General information</b>					
1.2	Are you under 21 years of age?	93%	82%	93%	98%
1.3	Are you sentenced?	53%	90%	53%	33%
1.3	Are you on recall?	7%	6%	7%	2%
1.4	Is your sentence less than 12 months?	19%	33%	19%	12%
1.4	Are you here under an indeterminate sentence for public protection (IPP prisoner)?	1%	8%	1%	4%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	22%	11%	22%	22%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	97%	99%	97%	
1.7	Do you understand written English?	96%	99%	96%	
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	70%	35%	70%	66%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	4%	4%	4%	8%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	38%	17%	38%	32%
1.11	Are you homosexual/gay or bisexual?	0%	2%	0%	0%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	13%	10%	13%	14%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	4%	3%	
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	48%	44%	48%	35%
1.15	Do you have any children under the age of 18?	19%	23%	19%	21%
<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?	37%	37%	37%	27%
For those who spent two or more hours in the escort van:					
2.2	Were you offered anything to eat or drink?	21%	61%	21%	
2.3	Were you offered a toilet break?	6%	9%	6%	
2.4	Was the van clean?	38%	62%	38%	
2.5	Did you feel safe?	70%	85%	70%	
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	48%	63%	48%	57%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	68%	83%	68%	
2.7	Before you arrived here did you receive any written information about coming here?	4%	3%	4%	
2.8	When you first arrived here did your property arrive at the same time as you?	74%	89%	74%	55%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HM/YOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HM/YOI Feltham 2013	HM/YOI Feltham 2009
	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?	83%	84%	83%	
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	71%	78%	71%	63%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	56%	60%	56%	44%
	When you first arrived:				
3.4	Did you have any problems?	73%	59%	73%	76%
3.4	Did you have any problems with loss of property?	21%	14%	21%	21%
3.4	Did you have any housing problems?	23%	17%	23%	31%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting employers?	4%	5%	4%	8%
3.4	Did you have any problems contacting family?	26%	24%	26%	29%
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?	28%	19%	28%	25%
3.4	Did you have any problems with feeling depressed or suicidal?	12%	12%	12%	14%
3.4	Did you have any physical health problems?	7%	1%	7%	
3.4	Did you have any mental health problems?	6%	3%	6%	
3.4	Did you have any problems with needing protection from other prisoners?	4%	8%	4%	10%
3.4	Did you have problems accessing phone numbers?	38%	19%	38%	23%
	For those with problems:				
3.5	Did you receive any help/support from staff in dealing with these problems?	24%	30%	24%	
	When you first arrived here, were you offered any of the following:				
3.6	Tobacco?	79%	91%	79%	83%
3.6	A shower?	14%	45%	14%	18%
3.6	A free telephone call?	76%	63%	76%	79%
3.6	Something to eat?	61%	74%	61%	84%
3.6	PIN phone credit?	32%	50%	32%	
3.6	Toiletries/basic items?	47%	34%	47%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Key to tables		HMYOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2013	HMYOI Feltham 2009
	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?	47%	59%	47%	
3.7	Someone from health services?	58%	75%	58%	
3.7	A Listener/Samaritans?	26%	26%	26%	
3.7	Prison shop/ canteen?	21%	11%	21%	8%
When you first arrived here were you offered information about any of the following:					
3.8	What was going to happen to you?	30%	50%	30%	45%
3.8	Support was available for people feeling depressed or suicidal?	31%	49%	31%	52%
3.8	How to make routine requests?	20%	41%	20%	38%
3.8	Your entitlement to visits?	29%	52%	29%	56%
3.8	Health services?	42%	61%	42%	59%
3.8	The chaplaincy?	37%	52%	37%	60%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	68%	78%	68%	71%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	76%	90%	76%	89%
For those who have been on an induction course:					
3.11	Did the course cover everything you needed to know about the prison?	40%	57%	40%	53%
3.12	Did you receive an education (skills for life) assessment?	64%	67%	64%	
<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?	33%	39%	33%	32%
4.1	Attend legal visits?	58%	48%	58%	59%
4.1	Get bail information?	12%	20%	12%	22%
4.2	Have staff ever opened letters from your solicitor or legal representative when you were not with them?	33%	38%	33%	40%
4.3	Can you get legal books in the library?	35%	35%	35%	
For the wing/unit you are currently on:					
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	66%	52%	66%	58%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	87%	68%	87%	90%
4.4	Do you normally receive clean sheets every week?	67%	76%	67%	63%
4.4	Do you normally get cell cleaning materials every week?	56%	58%	56%	58%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	34%	41%	34%	38%
4.4	Is it normally quiet enough for you to be able to relax or sleep in your cell at night time?	52%	57%	52%	53%
4.4	Can you normally get your stored property, if you need to?	24%	35%	24%	35%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	11%	25%	11%	14%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	28%	41%	28%	36%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	39%	43%	39%	42%
4.8	Are your religious beliefs are respected?	64%	50%	64%	66%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	61%	56%	61%	77%
4.10	Is it easy/very easy to attend religious services?	62%	60%	62%	

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HM/YOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HM/YOI Feltham 2013	HM/YOI Feltham 2009
	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?	59%	83%	59%	
	For those who have made an application:				
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with fairly?	49%	61%	49%	35%
5.2	Do you feel applications are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	29%	47%	29%	29%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	47%	71%	47%	
	For those who have made a complaint:				
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with fairly?	25%	34%	25%	19%
5.4	Do you feel complaints are dealt with quickly (within seven days)?	19%	42%	19%	30%
5.5	Have you ever been prevented from making a complaint when you wanted to?	20%	14%	20%	
5.6	Is it easy/very easy to see the Independent Monitoring Board?	12%	25%	12%	22%
<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?	40%	47%	40%	43%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	46%	54%	46%	62%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	22%	16%	22%	18%
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?	30%	55%	30%	
<b>SECTION 7: Relationships with staff</b>					
7.1	Do most staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	63%	66%	63%	67%
7.2	Is there a member of staff, in this prison, that you can turn to for help if you have a problem?	65%	71%	65%	66%
7.3	Has a member of staff checked on you personally in the last week to see how you were getting on?	25%	33%	25%	
7.4	Do staff normally speak to you most of the time/all of the time during association?	22%	21%	22%	25%
7.5	Do you have a personal officer?	46%	74%	46%	66%
	For those with a personal officer:				
7.6	Do you think your personal officer is helpful/very helpful?	51%	59%	51%	58%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2013	HMYOI Feltham 2009
	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?	42%	36%	42%	35%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	15%	13%	13%
8.4	Have you been victimised by other prisoners here?	25%	21%	25%	24%
	Since you have been here, have other prisoners:				
8.5	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	11%	11%	11%	13%
8.5	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	6%	7%	6%	12%
8.5	Sexually abused you?	3%	2%	3%	1%
8.5	Threatened or intimidated you?	12%	8%	12%	
8.5	Taken your canteen/property?	3%	6%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because of medication?	3%	3%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of debt?	3%	3%	3%	
8.5	Victimised you because of drugs?	1%	1%	1%	3%
8.5	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	6%	3%	6%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	3%	2%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because of your nationality?	8%	2%	8%	
8.5	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	3%	6%	3%	5%
8.5	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.5	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	0%
8.5	Victimised you because of your age?	3%	1%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	1%	3%	4%
8.5	Victimised you because you were new here?	7%	7%	7%	7%
8.5	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	4%	5%	4%	2%
8.5	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	10%	5%	10%	9%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2013	HMYOI Feltham 2009
	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?	37%	26%	37%	36%
	Since you have been here, have staff:				
8.7	Made insulting remarks about you, your family or friends?	22%	12%	22%	19%
8.7	Hit, kicked or assaulted you?	9%	5%	9%	8%
8.7	Sexually abused you?	3%	1%	3%	2%
8.7	Threatened or intimidated you?	14%	15%	14%	
8.7	Victimised you because of medication?	1%	4%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of debt?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of drugs?	4%	2%	4%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your race or ethnic origin?	11%	6%	11%	9%
8.7	Victimised you because of your religion/religious beliefs?	7%	4%	7%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because of your nationality?	7%	3%	7%	
8.7	Victimised you because you were from a different part of the country?	5%	5%	5%	3%
8.7	Victimised you because you are from a Traveller community?	1%	1%	1%	
8.7	Victimised you because of your sexual orientation?	2%	1%	2%	0%
8.7	Victimised you because of your age?	4%	2%	4%	1%
8.7	Victimised you because you have a disability?	3%	2%	3%	2%
8.7	Victimised you because you were new here?	6%	6%	6%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of your offence/crime?	7%	4%	7%	7%
8.7	Victimised you because of gang related issues?	7%	3%	7%	4%
	For those who have been victimised by staff or other prisoners:				
8.8	Did you report any victimisation that you have experienced?	43%	34%	43%	30%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

		HMYOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2013	HMYOI Feltham 2009
	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 9: Health services</b>					
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	44%	20%	29%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	35%	63%	35%	46%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the dentist?	9%	19%	9%	9%
	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?	42%	61%	42%	57%
9.2	The nurse?	35%	67%	35%	39%
9.2	The dentist?	33%	46%	33%	23%
9.3	The overall quality of health services?	35%	55%	35%	37%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	20%	23%	20%	18%
	For those currently taking medication:				
9.5	Are you allowed to keep possession of some or all of your medication in your own cell?	55%	86%	55%	
9.6	Do you have any emotional well being or mental health problems?	24%	21%	24%	19%
	For those who have problems:				
9.7	Are you being helped or supported by anyone in this prison?	36%	38%	36%	
<b>SECTION 10: Drugs and alcohol</b>					
10.1	Did you have a problem with drugs when you came into this prison?	24%	29%	24%	22%
10.2	Did you have a problem with alcohol when you came into this prison?	17%	24%	17%	18%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	18%	12%	15%
10.4	Is it easy/very easy to get alcohol in this prison?	8%	14%	8%	
10.5	Have you developed a problem with drugs since you have been in this prison?	7%	4%	7%	3%
10.6	Have you developed a problem with diverted medication since you have been in this prison?	5%	2%	5%	
	For those with drug or alcohol problems:				
10.7	Have you received any support or help with your drug problem while in this prison?	85%	78%	85%	
10.8	Have you received any support or help with your alcohol problem while in this prison?	81%	100%	81%	
	For those who have received help or support with their drug or alcohol problem:				
10.9	Was the support helpful?	69%	83%	69%	67%

## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2013	HMYOI Feltham 2009
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%	53%	18%	
11.1 Vocational or skills training?	20%	56%	20%	
11.1 Education (including basic skills)?	37%	65%	37%	
11.1 Offending behaviour programmes?	12%	47%	12%	
Are you currently involved in any of the following activities:				
11.2 A prison job?	27%	35%	27%	36%
11.2 Vocational or skills training?	10%	20%	10%	14%
11.2 Education (including basic skills)?	25%	40%	25%	27%
11.2 Offending behaviour programmes?	3%	11%	3%	6%
11.3 Have you had a job while in this prison?	63%	74%	63%	63%
For those who have had a prison job while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the job will help you on release?	43%	52%	43%	47%
11.3 Have you been involved in vocational or skills training while in this prison?	50%	72%	50%	58%
For those who have had vocational or skills training while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the vocational or skills training will help you on release?	42%	67%	42%	71%
11.3 Have you been involved in education while in this prison?	66%	86%	66%	71%
For those who have been involved in education while in this prison:				
11.3 Do you feel the education will help you on release?	43%	71%	43%	48%
11.3 Have you been involved in offending behaviour programmes while in this prison?	47%	67%	47%	55%
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?	32%	56%	32%	38%
11.4 Do you go to the library at least once a week?	26%	39%	26%	45%
11.5 Does the library have a wide enough range of materials to meet your needs?	43%	50%	43%	
11.6 Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	10%	26%	10%	11%
11.7 Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	23%	48%	23%	41%
11.8 Do you go on association more than five times each week?	52%	49%	52%	70%
11.9 Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday?	2%	8%	2%	6%
<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?	25%	44%	25%	41%
12.2 Have you had any problems with sending or receiving mail?	43%	52%	43%	47%
12.3 Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	31%	34%	31%	31%
12.4 Is it easy/ very easy for your friends and family to get here?	29%	47%	29%	



## Main comparator and comparator to last time

### Key to tables

Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	HMYOI Feltham 2013	Young adults prisons comparator	HMYOI Feltham 2013	HMYOI Feltham 2009	
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?	67%	87%	67%	
For those who are sentenced what type of contact have you had with your offender manager:					
13.2	No contact?	49%	31%	49%	
13.2	Contact by letter?	20%	32%	20%	
13.2	Contact by phone?	8%	25%	8%	
13.2	Contact by visit?	31%	37%	31%	
13.3	Do you have a named offender supervisor in this prison?	31%	85%	31%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.4	Do you have a sentence plan?	27%	65%	27%	22%
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.5	Were you involved/very involved in the development of your plan?	54%	61%	54%	85%
Who is working with you to achieve your sentence plan targets:					
13.6	Nobody?	57%	34%	57%	
13.6	Offender supervisor?	14%	50%	14%	
13.6	Offender manager?	20%	33%	20%	
13.6	Named/personal officer?	20%	25%	20%	
13.6	Staff from other departments?	14%	15%	14%	
For those with a sentence plan:					
13.7	Can you achieve any of your sentence plan targets in this prison?	53%	80%	53%	57%
13.8	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in another prison?	18%	16%	18%	
13.9	Are there plans for you to achieve any of your targets in the community?	33%	25%	33%	
13.10	Do you have a needs based custody plan?	13%	4%	13%	
13.11	Do you feel that any member of staff has helped you to prepare for release?	17%	19%	17%	20%
For those that need help do you know of anyone in this prison who can help you on release with the following:					
13.12	Employment?	35%	59%	35%	
13.12	Accommodation?	48%	37%	48%	
13.12	Benefits?	23%	46%	23%	
13.12	Finances?	14%	38%	14%	
13.12	Education?	30%	54%	30%	
13.12	Drugs and alcohol?	43%	53%	43%	
For those who are sentenced:					
13.13	Have you done anything, or has anything happened to you here to make you less likely to offend in future?	51%	57%	51%	54%

## Diversity analysis



### Key question responses (ethnicity, foreign national and religion) HMYOI Feltham (young adults) 2013

**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	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better						
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>113</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	47%	65%	36%	58%	47%	57%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	23%	21%			32%	18%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	99%	94%	95%	99%	98%	97%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	98%	91%	91%	98%	97%	96%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?			71%	68%	90%	58%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	3%	6%	9%	3%	3%	4%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	47%	13%	53%	33%		
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?	11%	19%	20%	12%	8%	16%
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	3%	4%	12%	1%	3%	3%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	47%	49%	50%	46%	42%	51%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	46%	54%	47%	48%	43%	51%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	70%	65%	67%	68%	62%	70%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	69%	77%	63%	74%	64%	75%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	55%	59%	47%	59%	54%	58%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	71%	78%	78%	72%	75%	73%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	58%	62%	62%	58%	50%	63%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	64%	79%	63%	70%	64%	71%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	76%	75%	74%	76%	75%	75%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	36%	25%	34%	33%	40%	29%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners	British prisoners	Muslim prisoners	Non-Muslim prisoners
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse						
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details						
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference						
4.4	Are you normally offered enough clean, suitable clothes for the week?	64%	71%	70%	64%	65%	67%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	84%	93%	88%	87%	89%	87%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	32%	42%	33%	35%	36%	33%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	9%	16%	12%	12%	12%	10%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	22%	42%	31%	27%	24%	30%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	37%	44%	37%	39%	33%	45%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	66%	62%	72%	61%	73%	58%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	63%	57%	67%	59%	47%	67%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	62%	53%	54%	59%	60%	59%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	49%	42%	41%	48%	44%	49%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	39%	42%	38%	40%	39%	41%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	45%	51%	52%	44%	36%	52%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	24%	17%	21%	23%	22%	24%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	62%	65%	59%	64%	52%	69%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	67%	62%	67%	64%	66%	66%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	22%	25%	26%	21%	18%	26%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	47%	45%	44%	48%	46%	47%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	44%	35%	60%	36%	42%	42%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	13%	10%	15%	12%	11%	14%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	24%	28%	40%	21%	28%	24%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	12%	13%	14%	12%	9%	14%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	5%	9%	12%	4%	5%	6%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	3%	3%	5%	2%	3%	2%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	9%	7%	17%	6%	11%	7%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	2%	4%	5%	2%	3%	2%

## Diversity analysis

### Key to tables

		Black and minority ethnic prisoners	White prisoners	Foreign national prisoners		British prisoners		Muslim prisoners		Non-Muslim prisoners	
Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better											
Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse											
Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details											
Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference											
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	38%	36%	43%	36%	37%	37%				
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	13%	14%	17%	12%	10%	16%				
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	11%	14%	21%	9%	8%	13%				
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	8%	3%	17%	4%	12%	4%				
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	8%	7%	21%	4%	8%	7%				
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	3%	3%	7%	1%	2%	4%				
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	20%	22%	18%	20%	13%	24%				
9.1	Is it easy/ very easy to see the nurse?	33%	42%	38%	35%	31%	39%				
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	20%	21%	22%	19%	21%	20%				
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	22%	30%	33%	22%	18%	27%				
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	12%	16%	9%	14%	8%	16%				
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	31%	21%	24%	28%	22%	30%				
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	12%	6%	6%	11%	13%	9%				
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	27%	21%	27%	25%	28%	25%				
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	5%	0%	0%	4%	4%	3%				
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	26%	24%	38%	23%	35%	21%				
11.6	do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	10%	11%	12%	9%	8%	12%				
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	22%	27%	23%	24%	15%	28%				
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	55%	46%	50%	54%	53%	53%				
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	3%	0%	0%	3%	2%	2%				
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	44%	41%	37%	44%	39%	47%				
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	32%	24%	31%	29%	28%	32%				

## Diversity Analysis



### Key question responses (disability) HMYOI Feltham (young adults) 2013

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

#### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</b>
	Any percentage highlighted in blue is significantly worse		
	Any percentage highlighted in orange shows a significant difference in prisoners' background details		
	Percentages which are not highlighted show there is no significant difference		
<b>Number of completed questionnaires returned</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>141</b>
1.3	Are you sentenced?	57%	52%
1.5	Are you a foreign national?	34%	21%
1.6	Do you understand spoken English?	95%	98%
1.7	Do you understand written English?	95%	97%
1.8	Are you from a minority ethnic group (including all those who did not tick white British, white Irish or white other categories)?	57%	71%
1.9	Do you consider yourself to be Gypsy/Romany/Traveller?	10%	2%
1.1	Are you Muslim?	24%	39%
1.12	Do you consider yourself to have a disability?		
1.13	Are you a veteran (ex-armed services)?	9%	2%
1.14	Is this your first time in prison?	48%	48%
2.6	Were you treated well/very well by the escort staff?	43%	48%
2.7	Before you arrived here were you told that you were coming here?	62%	69%
3.2	When you were searched in reception, was this carried out in a respectful way?	45%	75%
3.3	Were you treated well/very well in reception?	50%	57%
3.4	Did you have any problems when you first arrived?	100%	70%
3.7	Did you have access to someone from health care when you first arrived here?	60%	58%
3.9	Did you feel safe on your first night here?	43%	72%
3.10	Have you been on an induction course?	76%	76%
4.1	Is it easy/very easy to communicate with your solicitor or legal representative?	14%	36%

## 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
	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?	62%	66%
4.4	Are you normally able to have a shower every day?	80%	88%
4.4	Is your cell call bell normally answered within five minutes?	9%	37%
4.5	Is the food in this prison good/very good?	5%	12%
4.6	Does the shop/canteen sell a wide enough range of goods to meet your needs?	38%	26%
4.7	Are you able to speak to a Listener at any time if you want to?	24%	42%
4.8	Do you feel your religious beliefs are respected?	52%	66%
4.9	Are you able to speak to a religious leader of your faith in private if you want to?	52%	61%
5.1	Is it easy to make an application?	52%	59%
5.3	Is it easy to make a complaint?	32%	49%
6.1	Do you feel you have been treated fairly in your experience of the IEP scheme?	34%	40%
6.2	Do the different levels of the IEP scheme encourage you to change your behaviour?	29%	48%
6.3	In the last six months have any members of staff physically restrained you (C&R)?	24%	23%
7.1	Do <b>most</b> staff, in this prison, treat you with respect?	47%	65%
7.2	Is there a member of staff you can turn to for help if you have a problem in this prison?	57%	66%
7.3	Do staff normally speak to you at least most of the time during association time? (Most/all of the time)	24%	23%
7.4	Do you have a personal officer?	38%	47%
8.1	Have you ever felt unsafe here?	62%	38%
8.2	Do you feel unsafe now?	32%	11%
8.3	Have you been victimised by other prisoners?	52%	20%
8.5	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by other prisoners here?	24%	10%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By prisoners)	24%	3%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By prisoners)	9%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By prisoners)	28%	5%
8.5	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By prisoners)	14%	1%
8.5	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By prisoners)	14%	1%

## Diversity Analysis

### Key to tables

	Any percentage highlighted in green is significantly better	<b>Consider themselves to have a disability</b>	<b>Do not consider themselves to have a disability</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		
8.6	Have you been victimised by a member of staff?	60%	33%
8.7	Have you ever felt threatened or intimidated by staff here?	23%	13%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your race or ethnic origin since you have been here? (By staff)	28%	9%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your religion/religious beliefs? (By staff)	11%	6%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your nationality? (By staff)	23%	5%
8.7	Have you been victimised because of your age? (By staff)	11%	3%
8.7	Have you been victimised because you have a disability? (By staff)	11%	2%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the doctor?	24%	18%
9.1	Is it easy/very easy to see the nurse?	36%	35%
9.4	Are you currently taking medication?	29%	19%
9.6	Do you feel you have any emotional well being/mental health issues?	57%	18%
10.3	Is it easy/very easy to get illegal drugs in this prison?	22%	11%
11.2	Are you currently working in the prison?	21%	29%
11.2	Are you currently undertaking vocational or skills training?	15%	10%
11.2	Are you currently in education (including basic skills)?	21%	26%
11.2	Are you currently taking part in an offending behaviour programme?	6%	3%
11.4	Do you go to the library at least once a week?	11%	28%
11.6	Do you go to the gym three or more times a week?	9%	10%
11.7	Do you go outside for exercise three or more times a week?	15%	25%
11.8	On average, do you go on association more than five times each week?	30%	55%
11.9	Do you spend ten or more hours out of your cell on a weekday? (This includes hours at education, at work etc.)	0%	2%
12.2	Have you had any problems sending or receiving mail?	55%	42%
12.3	Have you had any problems getting access to the telephones?	60%	26%